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Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Ash and Tongham
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4149  **Respondent:** 8717921 / Helen Jefferies  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash and Tongham

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

- I strongly object to the proposal for new greenbelt in Ash and Tongham (this is not the Guildford Green Belt it is the Metropolitan Green Belt and you cannot get further from London in the borough than Ash and The only exceptional circumstance for this proposal is that the leader of the Council and other members of the Council’s Executive live there.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp173/688  **Respondent:** 8746561 / Sarah Horsley  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash and Tongham

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

4.1.8 The inclusion of Ash and Tongham as 'countryside beyond the Green Belt' in the New Local Plan has the effect of changing a rural area into an urban one. I am referring in particular to Amendments 1-9 Ash and Tongham i.e. additional land parcels at A28 and A29. This means that Ash Green Road could potentially be surrounded by new developments on all sides. To the north, the development at Ash Manor would destroy a gap between Ash Green (historically a village in its own right separate from Ash) and to the south in Drovers Way, development would back on to properties on that road. Housing density would be exceptionally high and urban sprawl would spread from Ash Station up to the southern end of White Lane, taking into account existing developments in planning (at White Lane/Hazel Road). The creation of the Ash and Tongham Urban Area appears to be swamping us and it seems to me that small sites have been selected in an indiscriminate manner which does not protect and preserve the rural and historical character of Ash Green.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3914  **Respondent:** 8749409 / Mrs Randall  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash and Tongham

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

Ash Vale is full. Apart from the Keogh barracks site, which is brownfield anyway, there is no more room in Ash Vale for any further developments.

Unfortunately the proposals put forward in the plan indicate that any remaining green area in the Ash Wharf ward (which isn’t much) is designated to be built over with great swathes of Ash South and Tongham going the same way. The only saving grace is the proposal at policy P2 (4.3.17) to extend the Green Belt boundary between Ash Green village and the Ash South and Tongham urban area to prevent coalescence. However disappointingly there is nothing proposed to
prevent further coalescence of Ash South and Tongham, the latter until recently having been an entirely separate village. In fact it still retains its own Parish Council. It would have been pleasing to have seen some attempt made to allow Tongham to retain its own individual identity and not just for Ash South and Tongham to be amalgamated as part of the urban sprawl which the area is fast becoming. It appears that what the plan is indicating is that the urban area of Ash South and Tongham (which includes the fast dwindling green space remaining in Ash Wharf ward) will ultimately begin from Harpers Road and extend right through Ash and Tongham almost as far as the Blackwater Valley relief road.

Specifically with reference to Harpers Road there has until now been a small community of residences which are part of Ash but which are somewhat separate from the main urban area – a sort of tiny “village” on the outskirts of the Parish. It would appear that this small pocket of individuality will ultimately be lost if this part of the strategic site at A29 remains as it stands. Whilst it could be argued that this should not stand in the way of development it is disheartening that this housing microcosm could not be protected to some degree.

Until the advent of the NPPF the Ash area maintained some protection from development having been designated as Countryside beyond the Green Belt. Once the NPPF came into existence the protection ceased to have any meaningful application and Ash and Tongham became the target for a multitude of development applications (see below).

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? ( )

Page 333 Ash and Tongham Legend :

{Green Belt -box outline is missing or unclear, unlike other parts of the legend.

Special Protection Area -box should have dots (see large area of land at NE corner).

Map:

Green Belt boundary is missing along eastern side of urban area etc.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4208  **Respondent:** 8944929 / A Jefferies  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash and Tongham

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

I strongly object to the proposal for new greenbelt in Ash and Tongham (this is not the Guildford Green Belt it is the Metropolitan Green Belt and you cannot get further from London in the borough than Ash and Tongham. The only exceptional circumstance for this proposal is that the leader of the Council and other members of the Council’s Executive live there.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/615  **Respondent:** 8961249 / Z A Hutton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash and Tongham

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

This letter is a direct objection to the 2017 house building plans in the Ashgreen, Ash and Tongham area. We understand the need for new housing within these areas; unfortunately the numbers proposed are monstrous.

This is also a letter of rejection to the moving of the Ashgreen boundary just to incorporate the council quota in new builds in the Ash- Tongham boundary. The use of Ashgreen just to make the council house building plan add up is frankly comical. Ash, Tongham and Ashgreen are all separate communities and do not need to be merged just to serve the council or governments planning requirements.

Ashgreen is regarded by all un-sundry as a beautiful rural part of this area, with buildings of Historical importance as well as areas of natural beauty .Ash Manor, a historical farmstead of three listed buildings including a medieval hall house. Ashgreen has not neglected the need for new housing. The main requirement for any expansion of Ashgreen is the fact that any building work undertaken is moderate and within the keeping and character of the area.

The four main objections to the council housing plans are;
• The number of houses proposed.
• The moving of the boundary to accommodate the council numbers.
• The lack of any plans regarding the infrastructure such as roads, schools, and other amenities required to make a housing project of this size safe, viable and of benefit to the present community.
• The Flooding. This could be an issue. The residents of Ashgreen already deal with huge amounts of coming of the A31 the Hogs Back. Recently a bund has been constructed to relieve any flow of water from the hills looking down on Ashgreen. New builds in great numbers and in areas surrounding Ashgreen could in future have a detrimental effect on the houses and surroundings of Ashgreen.

So these are our four main reasons for opposing the build.

Point 1

A suicidal number 1750 of houses being built in and around one of the busiest transport hubs in the South of England. Access to the A31 -331-A3-M25 and M3 are all heavily congested and frequently at a standstill due to accidents and the volume of traffic. So traffic from these main roads will regularly use White lane, Foreman Road and Ashgreen road which are narrow roads, without foot paths and are used for a cut through to get towards Guildford Hospital etc. This could be an additional 3700 cars on these rural roads and would be dangerous and very unsafe.

Point 2

We have a deep contempt to the council’s underhand movement of the boundary that they can justify to the government that the planning proposals for this area are on track this is scandalous.

Point 3

To build the number of houses proposed and with no plans for the infrastructure within this area we feel is crazy. All the main roads are heavy with traffic virtually every day from early in the morning. You plan to build in an area where of all roads leading to the main transport links are totally unsuitable for purpose. The roads in and around Ashgreen are narrow mostly without footpaths and are also used by cyclists, walkers and horse riders. Placing such a large number of new homes in an area with already overloaded roads, a lack of schools, surgeries and other important amenities is a recipe for disaster with no planning of any kind for the infrastructure.

Point 4

We live in Drovers Way Ashgreen we have been here thirteen years our garden is never dry even at the hottest time of the year we feel the building of so many houses could cause a problem with the natural flow of water coming of the hogs back. The building of so many houses could lead to areas of Ashgreen having problems with flooding because the water cannot run its natural course. The Ashgreen bund has recently been built to alleviate any potential flooding problems so why would you want to build so many houses with the possibility of causing potential flooding problems.

Our Conclusion

The high number of new houses proposed for the Ashgreen, Ash and Tongham are totally unreasonable because of some of the points highlighted in this letter. As we understand things there are no proposals for building in Normandy why? This is an unjust and unfair plan by the council to destroy the lives liveyhoods and a reasonable way of life in ASHGREN, ASH AND TONGHAM.

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 responding to the local development plan, with particular focus on Ash and Tongham. You plan to build 2000 dwellings, most on previously rural land, causing an increase of about a third in the population of this settlement. This is too much for the settlement to accommodate and will impair the quality of life of those already living there.

Your infrastructure plans are mostly vague aspirations, uncosted and undated, despite the fact that building work has already commenced on several hundred homes.

1. Primary education.

You state that 1-2 extra forms of entry will be needed, most likely at Ash Grange school as it is nearest to the bulk if the new development. As FOEs have to be whole numbers, this means turning a 1 FOE school to a 3 FOE school. Has the feasibility and cost of this been seriously considered? What consultations have taken place? Who will pay? This is a matter of some urgency as the classrooms have to be built and staffed before the first children arrive, which will be within the next 3 years. I would also mention potential difficulties with parent parking, already a problem in the area near the school. If instead you added one of the FOEs to the Walsh school, you would have the same issues at that school.

2. NHS General practices.

Your (almost illegible) map of GPs in the borough shows none in the western part of the borough, despite the existence of a large practice in Ash Vale (the only one in the area). Can this practice deal with a 30% increase in patients? Will they use the land offered in the Ash Lodge Drive development? How much will it cost? Who will pay? The Ash Vale practice has poor access, with very limited parking, and is not on a bus route. It is also too far from the proposed new developments for people to walk.

5. Sustainability

Ash scores highly on sustainability because it has the necessary community infrastructure for its current population, but this infrastructure is at full capacity, so will need significant investment to deal with the large number of extra homes. The sustainability score should reflect this. Where is the funding for all this infrastructure work?

The policy of Guildford Council towards development in Ash and Tongham is developer-led, not community-led. The developers can gobble up the green fields without having any responsibility for the impact on the community. The Council are playing catch-up with vague and unfunded plans. Given that development on several hundred houses has already started, the council need to get its act together.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/184  Respondent: 10634465 / Peter Stratford  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash and Tongham

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

The scale of the proposed development under Policy A29 is unsustainable in terms of local infrastructure and amenities. Manor Road is already heavily congested during the morning and afternoon school runs. Residents from the new housing developments wishing to commute to local employment centres or to local stations for commuting further afield will find the congestion on the roads leading out of the development sites unacceptable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I wish to OBJECT to any development on Greenbelt area proposed by the Guildford Borough 2016 Local Plan.

The main reason for my OBJECTION are:

The detrimental effect these developments will have on transport, local roads and safety. I think of Ash and Tongham areas: the local roads won't absolutely be able to cope with the inevitable increased volume of traffic nor will the other public transports.

Considering the last 2 years degradation of Railway services due to increasing number of uses from the area i think both roads an railways are beyond their limit and most infrastructure work in this area are very very poor.

The increase in pollution and flooding risk.

The definitive loss of areas of high environmental and ecological value. Sites such as Blackwell Farm and the Hog's Back should be safeguarded as AONB not destroyed forever.

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

Attached documents:

---

1. Any increase in traffic along the A323 is totally unacceptable. Any plans that are eventually implemented must have access elsewhere as this road is already up to capacity, especially if there are problems on the A3. This area is still rural and inhabitants need to be able to walk safely along footpaths and cross the road.
2. I have no objection to the rerouting of the road over the railway line provided there is a footbridge at Ash station and there is no other building in the area. With more local traffic the problems will just be rerouted. Why not reroute the road to accommodate a bridge over the existing road?
3. The addition of office accommodation near Ash station might be handy for commuters but it would just add to the traffic chaos. Presumably this would again hit the A323, or Ash Hill, which is always busy in the rush hour.
4. Drainage continues to be an issue in the area, with flooding in parts.
5. This is all Green Belt land.

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

Attached documents:
I would like to comment on the Draft Local Plan 2017 (Reg 19) as follows and relate to the proposed extensive development in Ash, Tongham and Ash Green.

Of particular concern is extensive development to the east of Ash and north of Ash Green, and I note that Ash Green has effectively been split into two parts, the northern part (north of the disused railway line) now being subsumed into Ash. Subterfuge on a grand scale.

It is at this point I would like to introduce page 2 from the NPPF. (attached file)

Observations

1. Just how will this plan deliver any of the 3 goals described above. Concreting over valuable green spaces, some of which is arable land, is not going to satisfy any of the three dimensions. In the 2013 Guildford Borough Settlement Hierarchy study Ash Green ranked last - score 31 for Sustainability and score 15 for Functional ranking. Meanwhile Normandy and Flexford scored 5 and an 1 respectively in the same study. Ash Green had a population in this study of 593 and Normandy and Flexford 1794, both 2011 figures. Looking at the proposed development sites A27, A28 and A29 represents a environmental disaster on a grand scale. A29 incorporates part of Ash Green into what is a massive dense urban expansion, totally out of character and sympathy with the existing housing stock. The density of the proposed housing is on a scale that is more suited to inner cities. Tomorrows ghettos in the making. Taking into account the housing proposed around Ash Manor, Ash Green Road and the sites A27 and A28, Ash Green will more than double in size, whilst Normandy and Flexford emerge from this environmental disaster free of any significant development, despite the earlier plan having made provision for some housing which would have "spread the load".

2. When this proposed environmental catastrophe is complete I just wonder who is going to held to account. Not only will this monstrous scheme load the environment for the foreseeable future just how are the basic needs of water, drainage, air quality, services and recreational space to be provided. That most of the area in north of Ash Green is an effective sump to which precipitation drains has not been mentioned. That the soil is predominantly clay with poor infiltration is also conveniently ignored. That run off water will find its way to the Blackwater river, and though a SUDS system might help, the shear density of the housing and geography will make this very challenging indeed. What about the rail crossing on the A323 at Ash that is effectively closed for 23 minutes in every hour. The proposed road over bridge for the rail line is a mere proposal. Until this is realised then any development should be "on-hold" because the traffic load will simply overwhelm the carrying capacity of the road system. Ash Green Road will become the biggest rat run in Surrey, all because the planners at Guildford did not plan. With 1850 + houses planned in the ATUA and Ash Green how is the water supply going to be guaranteed. Add in the 4000 + homes in Aldershot that will be built in the same time frame and this will add a considerable burden to the water supply. Where are the additional 750 million litres of potable water to be obtained?

3. What about the transport system and the choke points. A31 for example. Miserable at Farnham and Guildford at peak hours. Same for A331 at the A31 and M3 junctions. A323, a total disaster with multiple choke points. A3 in Guildford; a nightmare now, and even worse nightmare in the making. The rail network. Try getting seat at peak times. It is at full capacity now, how will it cope in the future. Since neither Ash, Tongham and especially Ash Green has limited employment opportunities any person living in this location has to travel to a place of work. That means loading the transport system for which there are limited options now and even more limited options in the future.

4. If we look at the future needs for social services, medical services, schools and recreational space these proposals fall well short. There is an acute need for housing suitable for elderly people yet this scheme pays scant attention to the issue. Land plots A28 and A29 would better serve the borough and be more sympathetic with the local area if development were restricted to provision of housing and green space for the elderly. This could be a mix of sheltered and and purpose built housing. Current residents in Ash, Tongham and Ash Green have few options to downsize and stay in the area (see 2.2.1 of Draft Local Plan). Providing options to do this will release a variety of properties to the market.

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

Attached documents:  Stephen Bowers Fig.1.doc (157 KB)
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Draft Guildford Borough Local Plan – Consultation Response.

We write as residents of Ash Wharf having attended the public exhibition at the Ash Parish Centre on Saturday 30th September 2014 and subsequently have examined the emerging local plan in this consultation. It is of considerable relief that the Borough Council has finally decided to progress with a new Local Plan, some 10 years after the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) first introduced the Local Development Framework style of development plans. The current Guildford Borough Local Plan is woefully out of date and not consistently compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) so any new local plan will be welcomed. However, even after almost 12 years of potential works and drafting, the consultation draft on the Local Plan appears rushed and unduly politically influenced.

• As residents of the greater Ash settlement area, we have identified the following issues that have not so far been addressed by the Council in the draft plan and which, if strategically approved at this stage, will leave little scope for further input or changes in approach. We have identified the following areas of concern:
  The Level of residential development to be provided in Ash and the lack of co-ordinated approach to development both in site specific terms and as part of the duty to co-operate with other local authorities
  The impact of development on the local highway network
  The inappropriate provision of Sustainable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) so close to the Ash Ranges

Each of these points are addressed in more detail in the remainder of this letter.

Residential Development

Ash is in the position of being located on the Guildford, Rushmoor, Waverley and Surrey Heath borders. In its Core Strategy, Rushmoor Borough Council has already identified a large housing development in the Aldershot Military Town. Waverley is currently working on a new draft Core Strategy Local Plan having fundamentally failed the test of the duty to co-operate with other Authorities. This same duty of co-operation appears to be missing from the draft Guildford Local Plan. It is clear that Waverley Borough Council are focusing considerable development onto Badshot Lea. With the planned development at Aldershot and then the suggested housing allocations at Ash and Tongham which have been published in the draft Guildford Local Plan, there appears to be little, if any, consideration of the cumulative impacts on this cross border location.

We suggest that the Council has taken the easy and politically safe option to force high amounts of development on the Ash area and we urge the Inspector to give this apparently unjustified approach some proper consideration when examining the emerging Local Plan for soundness. The promise of additional Green Belt in the Ash/Tongham area is a token gesture aimed at distracting local residents of what the main plans are for the area.

Local Highway Network

The SA identifies the current issues on the road around the existing pinch point of the level crossing at Ash railway station. This regularly causes traffic to tail back almost a mile to the Guildford Road/Pirbright Road junction on the A323. This part of the highway network is already well beyond capacity (as identified within SCC’s Transport Assessment, January 2014 which makes up part of the evidence base for the Local Plan) and therefore any additional traffic will exacerbate the existing problem unless there is a co-ordinated approach to future local infrastructure provision which, in our opinion has to include a new bridge over the railway between the developments to relieve the traffic demand on the existing level crossing.

There are also no guarantees that the highway impact of the proposed Ash housing development can be mitigated and, unless this can be proved otherwise, the LPA could find themselves in the position of not being able to deliver on its housing allocations. Unfortunately, the more likely event is that the LPA will conclude that the houses have been strategically allocated and therefore must be delivered regardless of what associated infrastructure is offered.
The evidence base for the draft Local Plan should be used as a tool to assess what the impact of the proposed allocations should be and then the LPA should assess and plan for the mitigation before any acceptance that the housing allocation should be pursued and formally allocated. This process has fundamentally failed in this instance and the LPA has not completed sufficient work to establish that they can sustainably deliver the quantum of development proposed in Ash.

It is further noteworthy that the settlements in the east of the Borough have no road links identified as being over capacity. All the links over capacity are those where the development is being proposed. We have already alluded to the probable reasons for this.

Allocation A30 suggests a road bridge over the railway at Ash Station, something our earlier representations focused on. This is essential if significant residential development is to be allocated. The suggestion is another 30 seconds per vehicle without mitigation – effectively gridlock. However, how is it going to be delivered? S123 of the CIL regulations refer to pooling and the restriction to 5 sites to contribute towards a pot of S106. On the basis that multiple sites in Ash are going to be allocated, S106 will not be able to deliver the road bridge with genuine concerns that individual developer/land owners will seek to pass-the-puck to prevent paying for the new infrastructure. If the time to produce this local plan is taken as an indicator, the Council cannot rely on CIL to deliver the road bridge in the near future. Surrey County Council’s Strategic Highway Assessment Report (June 2016), 4.5.3 confirms that the mechanism for mitigation must be agreed at Examination Stage. We agree with this, it cannot be left to the developers to deliver the infrastructure. If the footbridge and road bridge are going to be delivered as an allocation of its own right, then how is this to be delivered? It needs to be linked to the development themselves otherwise they could easily fall to the wayside and not be delivered.

Ash Hill Road will reduce to Level E (number 24 northbound). The information is unclear as to what is being proposed to mitigate against this. Again, referring back to 4.5.3, this should be agreed prior to the EIP otherwise there will be no mitigation.

The A323 (Guildford Road) and B411 (Ash Hill Road) suggest traffic signals yet “they are unable to be represented in the strategic SINTRAM”. Why not? This is not explained. It appears an unwillingness to model this.

The A323 Guildford Road in Ash has a Ratio of Flow Capacity (RFC) of 1.18 and a corresponding level of service F (the lowest value possible). In the scenario 3 “do something (2031) the RFC goes up to 1.35 with development appropriate mitigation. This is not providing a do-nothing situation. It is inappropriate to put added stress on a road with and RFC of 1.18 in the first place, let alone with no commitment to mitigation.

If you are putting this much development in Ash, then top of the priority list is understanding the highways implications of the proposal. For instance, as another example, the A323 and A342 junction is forecast to have a 112 second delay increase per vehicle. There appears to be no understanding from the Council of the implications of this level development, let alone how it will be mitigated.

Schools

Ultimately 2,300 new homes are proposed within 1 mile of each other at Ash, Flexford and Normandy. Whilst a new Secondary school is proposed in Normandy/Flexford, no new primary/junior schools appear to be proposed. This is essential with the existing primary schools full in the local area.

Conclusion

We are not against the principle of new residential development in the Ash area and understand that all settlements potentially have a duty to provide more dwellings. That is why it seems unreasonable and unjustified in planning terms that the Borough Council is clearly focusing as much development outside Guildford itself and the affluent villages to the east of the Borough with the focus on development to the western end of the Borough. This is being done with no evidence of satisfying the duty of co-operation with the neighbouring boroughs and clearly following political desire to focus development in the east of the Borough. This has apparently unduly influenced the draft plan to the extent that strategic housing sites are being suggested for allocation in the Local Plan without the appropriate evidence base to back up their allocation or even prove that the impacts of development have been considered. On this basis, it is highly likely that an Inspector will find the draft Local Plan unsound on submission. The LPA has had 10 years to do the required background work and it is alarming that they would be willing to strategically allocate 1200 houses without properly identifying how these will be mitigated on a road network which the Council’s own evidence base shows cannot take any
more traffic at peak times. The commitment to the new road bridge at Ash Station is weak and there appears little chance of it being delivered as an allocation in its own right. Developers should fund the whole bridge and there should be no reliance on Network Rail or Surrey CC.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4267</th>
<th>Respondent: 11659905 / Thakeham Homes (Anthony Heslehurst)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash and Tongham</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>

Land north of Grange Road, Ash

Thakeham Homes wishes to recommend the site for residential development and as such supports the inclusion of the site within the housing site allocation ‘A29 Land to the south and east of Ash and Tongham’ in the Pre Submission Local Plan. The red line location plan for the site has been appended to this representation at Appendix 1.

Figure 1. Extract from Pre Submission Local Plan, showing the site within strategic allocation A29.

Availability

The NPPG provides the following guidance in regard to considering whether a site is available for development:

“A site is considered available for development, when, on the best information available, there is confidence that there are no legal or ownership problems, such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips tenancies or operation requirements of landowners. This will often mean that land is controlled by a developer or landowner who has expressed an intention to develop”

NPPG Paragraph 021 Ref. 3-020-20140306

As highlighted within this representation, the site is controlled by Thakeham Homes Ltd and we will be actively engaging with the council over the coming months prior to submission of a full planning application for residential development. Thakeham is current progressing a reserved matters application for the adjacent site to the north for the delivery of 26 dwellings (Planning application ref 16/P/00663) following the grant of outline consent in December 2013.

Thakeham has a proven track record for delivering a number of high quality residential schemes across Surrey, Sussex and Hampshire and will be seeking to deliver circa 20 dwellings on the site with a view to commencing development on site at the earliest opportunity.

Suitability

The NPPG provides the following guidance when considering whether a site is suitable for development:

“Sites in existing development plans or with planning permission will generally be considered suitable for development although it may be necessary to assess whether circumstances have changed which would alter their suitability”

NPPG Paragraph 019 Ref. 019-20140306

The site is located on the eastern edge of Ash village and is within walking distance of the various local amenities of Ash High Street. The Ash and Tongham Urban Area falls on the top tier of the settlement hierarchy and is therefore considered to have a range of services and facilities to meet the needs of the existing community as well as providing key services for surrounding smaller villages. The site has good transport links, with a railway station within walking distance of the site, and there is good access to bus links from Grange Road on the south western corner of the site.
The site has been submitted to and included within the Land Availability Assessment and promoted to the Local Plan, which acknowledges its suitability for residential development.

It is therefore evident from the proposed allocation and the supporting evidence including the LAA, that the site is considered suitable for development within the meaning of the NPPG.

**Achievability**

In determining whether a site is achievable for development, the NPPF provides the following guidance:

“A site is considered achievable for development where there is a reasonable prospect that the particular type of development will be developed on the site at a particular point in time. This is essentially a judgement about the economic viability of the site and the capacity of the developer to complete and let or sell the development over a certain period”

NPPG, Paragraph 021 Ref. 021-20140306

Given the acute housing need within the Borough and the proposed inclusion of the site within a strategic allocation in the Pre Submission Local Plan, it is considered that there is a reasonable prospect of residential development being achieved on site by 2021.

As stated above, Thakeham has a proven track record for delivering schemes of a similar size and scale throughout Surrey, Sussex and Hampshire, and has the capacity to deliver the development of the site to provide much needed new homes within the first 5 years of the plan period.

**Deliverability**

For the reasons above, the site is considered to be available, suitable and achievable, and therefore deliverable in accordance with the NPPG. As such, we consider that the site could provide much needed housing development within the plan period and support the proposed strategic allocation A29 Land to the south and east of Ash and Tongham.

**Conclusions**

In conclusion, we consider that an increase in housing land supply is required if the plan is to be consistent with national policy and therefore ‘sound’ with respect to the NPPF.

With regard to the expected shortfall of circa 2,000 dwellings by 2017/18, it is our view that at least a further 400 dwellings per annum are required in the first 5 years of the plan period, to enable the Council to meet its OAN prior to larger strategic sites coming forward in accordance with the housing trajectory in the LAA. In addition, we consider that the plan should account for market signals and the duty to cooperate, to ensure a robust and realistic housing land supply.

Given the issues discussed within this representation, it is our view that the council should work proactively to identify and include additional housing site allocations in sustainable locations in the towns and villages and areas of least constraint. This would allow the Council to bring forward housing more quickly in the early years of the plan period in a way that fits the overall strategic vision of the Local Plan.

We have sought to demonstrate within these representations that the site is achievable, suitable and deliverable for residential development which could be delivered within the first 5 years of the plan period. As such, we wish to support the proposed allocation under Policy A29 for development to the south and east of Ash and Tongham, including this site.

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

Attached documents:

- [2016 07 18 GBC Pre Submission LP Representations Ash Grange Road Appendix 1.pdf](#) (100 KB)
- [2016 07 18 GBC Pre Submission LP Representations Ash Grange Road.pdf](#) (498 KB)
This letter constitutes Persimmon Homes Thames Valley's formal response to the above consultation. As part of the Persimmon Group, Persimmon Homes represents one of the largest house builders in the UK and is a significant stakeholder in the Borough with a vested interest in its long-term future.

We have made a number of comments, but reserve the right to make further comments as appropriate. We are keen to work with the council moving forward.

The comments within this letter relate to our interests at Foreman Road, Ash, which lies on the edge of Ash. The Site has the potential to accommodate circa 120 dwellings.

We have set out some general comments below and have then looked to answer the specific questions raised by the council.

Overview of the site

The site allows for an extension to the existing Ash settlement boundary and provides an excellent opportunity to accommodate new homes. Development of the site, in coordination with the provision of a potential pedestrian crossing to the railway line to serve the area would provide betterment to the local area. The site comprises one large field of approximately 4 hectares and is a grass field bordered by mature vegetation, including scrub, tree belts and mature individual trees. The Site is identified within two specific policies of the plan, namely A29 and A30. Specific comments on both policies will be set out within these representations.

Persimmon Homes have an option agreement with the landowners. The site is available, suitable and deliverable for residential development in the short term (0-5 years).

Question 1: The evidence base and submission documents

Do you agree that the evidence used for the Proposed Submission Local Plan Strategy and Sites is adequate, up-to-date and relevant?

Guildford BC planning context & housing numbers

Guildford BC is currently in the process of producing a new Local Plan which is to cover the period 2013 - 2033 and guide development within the borough and is to be compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This representation is in response to the Regulation 19 consultation phase for the pre-submission version of the draft Local Plan. Persimmon Homes are pleased to have been given the opportunity to make representations on this concerning the Site and general planning matters within the Borough. Persimmon are also pleased that Guildford BC has acknowledged the significant challenges that the borough faces in delivering sufficient housing to meet its needs. The previous interim housing figure of 322 dwellings per annum agreed on May 2012 did not take account of up to date assessments of housing need and therefore was not NPPF compliant. The reliance on this figure has meant that Guildford BC has significant under-delivered on their housing requirements over the past five years as shown in the below table:

As the housing completions above show, Guildford has not only been under delivering against the now up-to-date Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) but there has also been consistent under-delivery against the interim housing target, which also needs to be factored into an emerging housing target moving forward.

The most recently produced Annual Monitoring Report (AMR), published in October 2015 for the period 2014/2015 showed that net completions of dwellings in the borough for this period was 242 and that the majority of homes completed in this period are on sites of under 20 homes. As the AMR notes "the number of new homes completed this year (2014/15) is still lower than required to meet our objectively assessed need...contributes to a growing deficit of new homes". The recommendation within the AMR following this states that "housing provision is currently restricted by the lack of available and deliverable development land in the borough....delivery rate is only likely to increase when larger
areas of land are suitable and available for development”. This shows the necessity for suitable and available sites to be considered and this should apply to all sites within the borough that meet this criteria. Persimmon Homes have control of the Site through an option agreement with the landowners and the Site is available for development. The council also consider the site to be suitable for development, having identified it within the proposed submission Local Plan.

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

Attached documents:
- 20160718114724534.pdf (928 KB)
- 20160718152652831.pdf (1.4 MB)
- 20160718152735975.pdf (1.1 MB)
- 20160718152825671.pdf (1.5 MB)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/302  Respondent:  15083457 / David Stonebanks  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash and Tongham

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 plan for new homes in Ash on the land behind Ash Manor school.

There is not enough facility's in the area such as doctors, schools and main road links. The road network in the area is already sub standard and constantly having delays. The schools are already full.

It must not happen and I wish to register my objection

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1271  Respondent:  15384481 / M J Levers  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash and Tongham

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 GBC Local Plan 2016 Policy Numbers A27, A29, A46.

1. Loss of countryside in Ash and Tongham.
Loss of Green Belt in Normandy. Extra traffic, more congestion, more parked vehicles at local shops, more demand for important services (e.g. doctors, hospital).

2. Congestion caused by Ash railway station A323, whereby the frequency of trains with closure of the gates sometimes for 10-15 minutes, making long queues especially at peak travelling times.

3. The difficulty for pedestrians of crossing the A323 Guildford Road, Ash / Normandy border, as invariably traffic does not keep to 30 and 40 MPH limits and the pedestrians crossing does not serve this area.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPA16/1599  Respondent: 15434753 / Hilary Clements  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash and Tongham

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

I wish to strongly object to the policies which will directly affect me and my family.

These are namely Ash & Tongham (Policies A27, A28 and A29) and Normandy (Policy A46)

My address 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], so I am right in between these 2 areas of development

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2016  Respondent: 15466657 / Yvonne Farmer  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash and Tongham

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

On personal note I am concerned about site allocation A29 - Specifically parcel of land directly to the north of field way, Tongham

My concern is that if property is built in this vicinity I will lose privacy to my home and garden area. I would also like to see TPO’s placed on trees bordering my property.

General concerns on large number of additional properties within Ash and Tongham area. Presently Tongham has a good community spirit feel that Tongham will become part of a large conurbation with Ash / Ash Green and Ash Vale. Understand need for additional housing but at what cost to us and future generations in this area.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2690  Respondent: 15569121 / Richard & Suzanne Radford  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash and Tongham

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

I object to Policy Numbers A27, A28, A29 and A46 due to loss off green belt in Normandy and loss of green space in Ash/Tongham, additional traffic (the roads in the area already struggle to cope with the amount of traffic) and the extra demand for services such as Doctors.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3554</th>
<th>Respondent: 15608481 / Laura Schrock</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash and Tongham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 planning policies A27, A28, A29 and A46 because of the loss of green belt and the increase in traffic and extra demand for services. These areas are already congested with traffic especially in the rush hour and services are stretched with the population as it is. This is a semi rural area and the planning requested will change the area detrimentally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/4219</th>
<th>Respondent: 15673185 / Simon Jefferies</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash and Tongham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 proposal for new greenbelt in Ash and Tongham (this is not the Guildford Green Belt it is the Metropolitan Green Belt and you cannot get further from London in the borough than Ash and Tongham.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: pslp173/78</th>
<th>Respondent: 17199937 / Jean Middleton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash and Tongham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 wish to object to the above mentioned plans policy numbers A27 A28 &amp;A29 and to the map on page 301(offices).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Area is already overcrowded and any further buildings will exacerbate the present situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has any thought been given to the loss of countryside, extra traffic causing yet more congestion &amp; pollution - I doubt it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is high time that other areas around Guildford are targeted with extra houses etc and NOT Ash as appears to be the first choice of the Council!!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: pslp173/80</th>
<th>Respondent: 17200225 / Susan Sparks</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
In response to the proposed plan targeting Ash and Tongham areas, I strongly disagree with the construction of 1750 new homes being built. I object to policy numbers A27, A28, A29 and to the map on page 301 (offices) because of the loss of countryside and amenity, along with the roads in this area not being able to cope with all the extra traffic that would because by this. There will be an increased numbers of parked cars which will increase congestion levels around this area.

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

Attached documents:

---

I am writing to object to the proposals to move this part of Ash Green into the Tongham ATUA. I believe like many others that the location around Ash Manor, including its fields and historic buildings are part of the character of Ash Green. This will be lost if the area boundary is moved to include us in the tongham ATUA with its plans for 17

I fully agree with the amendment which states that thought instead should be given to protecting the intrinsic character of Ash Green, preserving the role it plays in maintaining the separate identity of Ash, Ash Green, and Tongham. In particular I feel that the provision of a green buffer separating the new development and the properties fronting onto Ash Green rd, Foreman rd, and White Lane will do much to preserve the rural character of Ash Green.

There is concern also that not enough thought has been given to the protection of the Ash Manor site itself which is of considerable heritage importance. In particular views of it from the approaches from White Lane must be preserved.

Further concerns over how the transport infrastructure needed for these new developments is to be implemented should be addressed, namely The Street in Tongham, and the A331/A323 intersection, and also the A31/White lane junction. Until these are resolved there should be no development on A29 permitted.

My view then in regard to these concerns is that Ash Green must not be included in the Ash & Tongham Urban Area, and therefore that the ATAU boundary must not extend south of Ash Green road and Foreman road.

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

Attached documents:

---

The traffic measurement figures for the Ash and Tongham proposals do not reflect the day to day traffic levels for the roads during the morning and evening peak, in light of recent changes by Rushmoor borough Council to traffic signals in Aldershot.
The Addendum to Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan “June 2016” Strategic Highway Assessment Report, states that conclusions of the SHAR 2016 is that:

“The results show that for Scenario 5, which represents the quantum and distribution of development proposed in the Proposed Submission Local Plan together with the key highway schemes, there will not be a severe impact on the local and strategic highway network” (p.62), and that,

“Nevertheless, the results of this assessment indicate that should the RIS schemes not be forthcoming then the residual cumulative impact of the Proposed Submission Local Plan on the highway network could be considered severe”

Certainly for the proposed developments in and around ash, in particular the Ash Lodge Drive development will have a significant impact on already saturated road network.

Recent changes to traffic signal timings and synchronisation in Rushmoor borough at the junction of North Lane and Ash Road has had a serious impact of traffic movements and journey times to the east of the borough boundary with traffic during morning and evening peak periods impacting Ash Street, the A331 and all of the local road network around Tongham, Ash and the A31/A331 junctions.

Traffic figures provided in the consultation documents are woefully inadequate and one has to question their validity, how they have been derived and the period during which they were obtained. on the 27th June, for less that 24 hours, a series of traffic monitoring cameras were deployed in and around Tongham, the A31 and the Manor Road / Ash Street junction (Greyhound Roundabout). The purpose of the cameras was not clear (Turning movements, origin / destination journey information, traffic counts etc.) however, what benefit could be derived from any data which is gathered in a period of less than 24 hours. Also, many of the senior pupils at Ash Manor school would not have been at school as this is during the exam period. any results from these video surveys will be worthless and of no value.

It is the case every day that the schools are open that traffic along Ash Street, Manor Road, Shawfield Road and Aldershot Road are brought to a complete standstill due to the volume of traffic. This is primarily due in the morning to parents taking children to school, as parking facilities at the local schools are non-existent. Additional homes in this area will only increase this burden on the local roads even with the developers contribution as the required infrastructure and services need to be overhauled, root and branch and minimal developer contribution will not address the real needs; they are merely a gesture.

Policy A29: Land to the south and east of Ash and Tongham Capacity of the site has been increased from 1,200 to 1,750 homes. No major impact on traffic impacts from those reported in the SHAR 2016.

The overall scale of growth in this strategic location for development has remained consistent but the capacity of the allocation for this site policy has been increased from 1,200 to 1,750 homes. The site policy now includes the various planning permissions in this area that have not yet commenced. There are no implications for the SHAR 2016 of this change.

With regards the additional 550 homes in this policy A29, how is the impact on the highways being mitigated? Detail is lacking and to what improvements are being proposed and how the benefits of any improvements have been forecast and measured.

How is it that land has cannot be removed from the Green Belt in other areas of the borough to meet housing needs. Why are locations such Clandon, Ripley, Bramley and Shackleford not sites designated for development. They have much better access to the Strategic Road Network. Is it because GBC wish to move the developments as far as possible away
from the showcase of their prized town centre and hope that the residents of those new developments will work and shop across the border in Hampshire? It strikes me that the Borough Council is Cherry Picking those areas which shall and shall not be removed from Green Belt protection based upon the class of the residents, their likelihood of complaining and the desire for the borough to remain a certain political hue.

Policy P3: Countryside

4.3.29 Originally consisting of the three small rural villages of Ash, Ash Vale and Tongham, the Ash and Tongham urban area has grown considerably in size and now forms Guildford borough’s second largest urban area. Given its relative sustainability, countryside to the south and east of the urban area is allocated as a strategic location for development.

How has the sustainability of such large developments been calculated? The area is barely sustainable at the moment. What mitigations are proposed to improve an already poor level of sustainability and deliver improvements not only for the existing population of the area but for those who seek to move in to the new development.

What liaison has GBC had with Rushmoor BC to ensure that the overall developments of the two authorities do not destroy the environment and irreparably ruin an already difficult way of life for countless residents?

Local Plan, Page 212, Item 6. Why have the residents of Ash Green Road now been lumped in with Ash and Tongham. This seems ridiculous and only serves not only to upset and annoy the local residents, but also to put the borough planners in a poor light (not that it is looking to good so far).

The proposal for the bridges at Ash Level Crossing has been badly thought through. It is as if the BC is trying to make journeys through the area as difficult as possible to ensure travelers avoid the area. This is not always the case and people will have to live with this poor decision forever.

Local Plan, Page 330, What about Ash Walsh Schools. They are closer to the Ash Lodge Drive development and places here are in greater demand than Ash Grange. This needs a serious rethink.

Local Plan, Page 333. If Ash Manor school is to be expanded, serious improvements need to be made to the road infrastructure throughout Tongham, Ash and Ash Green. The values quoted in the report for developer contribution will, in no way, be enough to accommodate the expansion at these schools.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/671</th>
<th>Respondent: 17528705 / Gleeson Developments LTD and Mr and Mrs T Poulsom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent: Vail Williams LLP (Jane Terry)</td>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash and Tongham</td>
</tr>
<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>

LRN21 New Road bridge and crossing at Ash
The change from Developer Contributions to Developer Funded for consistency through the IDP is noted.
While no justification has been provided as to the need for a new bridge crossing, should GBC pursue this aspiration, it is evident that the additional pressure on this crossing is likely to come about as a result of increased movements on the North Downs Line, and strategic road / junction closures and as such the identified mitigation is not solely development related. Therefore, in our opinion for consistency with other strategically driven infrastructure schemes included in the IDP, the wording should be amended to allow for some funding to come via the Local Growth Fund.
LRN21
New Road bridge and crossing at Ash
Between 2018 and 2024
Surrey CC

£15m Developer Contributions funded / Network Rail / Local Growth Fund

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

Attached documents:

Total records: 28.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Ash Green
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

**Comment ID:** pslp173/526  **Respondent:** 8830529 / Val O'Dea  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash Green

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

Ash Green is not part of Ash and Tongham and I fully support the objections made on behalf of our village by the Ash Green Residents Association regarding policies P3, A28 and A 29. Building before infrastructure is contrary to the NPPF.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2094  **Respondent:** 8933185 / Peter See  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash Green

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

Page 334. Ash Green

Legend:

(Green Belt - box outline is missing or unclear. Map:

Green Belt boundary is missing in NW corner of map?

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp173/343  **Respondent:** 17324737 / David Weller  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash Green

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

In 1932 we were described as Ash Green in Estate Agents particulars, Frimley Health NHS , list us as Ash Green, Land Registry, Durham, the official Property Register state we are Ash Green,

1996 Guildford Borough Council, Director of Environment address us as Ash Green.

The Pension Service, Dept for work & Pensions address us as Ash Green. The Co-operative Energy, address us as Ash Green.

HM Customs & Excise, address us as Ash Green.

1999 Guildford Borough Council, address us as Ash Green.
1995 Browns Estate Agents address us as Ash. Green The Post Office address us as Ash Green.
The Inland Revenue address us as Ash Green Sky address us as Ash Green.
South East Water address us as Ash Green.
DVLA address us as Ash Green.

I somehow think and believe that we live in Ash Green !! NOT Ash !

And yet I see in later correspondence 2007 and 2015 that Guildford Borough Council start addressing us as Ash. This seems to be a calculated preparation to influence the change in boundaries at this present time, definitely premeditated.

An unauthorised sign ASH GREEN has been erected on the approaches to the bridge on White Lane, just to confuse matters ! I wonder who put up this unauthorised sign ??!

Tongham, Ash, and Ash Green are historic villages, but Ash Green is rural not urban.

It is imperative that these villages have green space between them and not for them to be lost in an urban sprawl.

Ash Manor and its associated buildings are grade ll listed ( an application has been made to Historic England for an upgrade in listing) It is officially listed as a " Palace" and. Fortified Manor House with "Earthworks", owned by a Saxon Lord And several Kings of England, from Edward the Confessor and it was Edward ll who lived in the Manor House and was responsible for digging the Moat, with Drawbridge, followed by Edward III, Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V, Henry VI, later Henry VIII and Edward VI . It's approaches and setting are significant and MUST be protected. This is our Heritage !

and the field north of Ash Green Road, not only has two Roman roads meeting , but it is the site of the original Ash Green from whence the village got its name. This field is ASH GREEN !

The roads in the immediate area are narrow country lanes with no footpaths, and cannot sustain increase of motor transport. The area is rural and cannot in anyway support an urban settlement.

I respectfully ask that the boundaries stay as they are and not to be played with just to suit requirements. It's impractical and immoral !

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: pslp173/625  Respondent: 17462113 / Ian Whitby  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Ash Green

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

- “4.3.29 Originally consisting of the three small rural villages of Ash, Ash Vale and Tongham, the Ash and Tongham urban area has grown considerably in size and now forms Guildford borough’s second largest urban area. Given its relative sustainability, countryside to the south and east of the urban area is allocated as a strategic location for development”

I object to several implications of this statement:

- The Local Plan lists Ash, Ash Vale and Tongham separately but then proceeds to speak of the “Ash and Tongham urban area” as if Ash Green were part of this. Ash Green is distinctly separate and has an entirely different, rural character from the “Ash and Tongham urban area”.

- The boundary of Ash Green has been redrawn by the local Plan to suit the planners ambitions. Ash Green includes Ash Grange, Drovers Way and Ash Green Road. Although it may be convenient for an ambitious planner to suggest that these areas are within the “Ash and Tongham urban area” they are not and never have been. The Deeds of my house very clearly state that it lies within Ash Green. There is a clear separation of these 2 areas and the buffer zone between them should be maintained to retain the rural character of Ash Green, Ash Manor, Ash Green Road and Drovers Way. It is not acceptable to join these areas and lose the area’s rural character.

- There are very few amenities or services in the “Ash and Tongham urban area”. Ash has one secondary school and a number of heavily subscribed primary schools. There are 3 shops in Ash, a petrol station and 1 pub. Tongham has a similar number. To suggest that “Given its relative sustainability…” is fanciful. The “Ash and Tongham urban area” is not well served with services and amenities and adding additional houses before first providing such services would create a sprawling urban area with no community heart or social centre.

- “4.3.30 We do however wish to ensure that whilst accommodating this growth, we are able to protect the remaining countryside around it from inappropriate development in order to protect its intrinsic character and preserve the role it plays in maintaining the separate identify of Ash and Tongham.”

Ash Green is not mentioned in this statement. Ash Green already has a separate identity very different from Ash or Tongham. Ash is characterised by its housing estates (either council or private) and its acres of identical houses. Ash Green is characterised by Ash Grange, Ash Manor and individual houses dating from the 1900s with unique Edwardian or Victorian features.

The Borough’s responsibility is to maintain the uniqueness that already exists. A green buffer zone maintained between Ash and Ash Green is essential to ensure this.

- “4.3.30 We do however wish to ensure that whilst accommodating this growth, we are able to protect the remaining countryside around it from inappropriate development in order to protect its intrinsic character and preserve the role it plays in maintaining the separate identify of Ash and Tongham.”

See point above - namely, that the Borough’s responsibility is to maintain the uniqueness that already exists. A green buffer zone maintained between Ash and Ash Green is essential to ensure this.

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

Total records: 5.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth
<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPA16/2572</td>
<td>8767265 / Pam Hewitt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth</td>
<td>I’m writing to strongly object to the proposal to remove Chilworth from the ‘green Belt’. The whole point of the green belt was to prevent ‘urban sprawl’ and once removed the village would have no protection against development. The traffic problems getting in and out of the village currently are a nightmare so adding even more houses would render it virtually impassable at certain times of the day. People move to the Surrey villages because they want to live in and enjoy the countryside and they pay a premium to do so., it’s very short sighted to think that by allowing development on the green belt and concreting over the countryside that people come here in large numbers to enjoy will somehow enhance the area, shame on you for even considering it. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSLPA16/2825</td>
<td>8839681 / Joanne Marin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth</td>
<td>I STRONGLY object to plans to remove green belt protection from the village of Chilworth. Green belt protection is essential to prevent development sprawl, associated strain on roads and infrastructure and to protect the beauty and benefits for local families of the countryside. I have young children myself and our green spaces are essential for health and mental wellbeing for them and generations to come. Once lost they can never be clawed back. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSLPA16/841</td>
<td>8909025 / Tracey Bull</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth</td>
<td>I object to the removal of Chilworth from the Green belt as proposed in the 2016 Guildford Local Plan. I believe we need the continued protection of the Green belt to stop inappropriate development in our area and I strongly disagree with the proposed removal of Chilworth from the Green Belt. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2682  **Respondent:** 8954593 / Anne and Julian Denmark  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth

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

I feel passionately that Chilworth should remain in the Greenbelt, my main concern being once this status has been changed there is no protection against development. With each new home built, there would be 2 plus extra cars travelling along the A248, causing even further congestion through Chilworth, with cars turning towards Shalford at Rice’s corner. At present the traffic from two schools (that causes grid lock between 7.45 and 9am), plus the new housing that has already taken place in Chilworth in recent years, would be greatly added to. There is also the planning for 1,800 homes at Dunsfold Park, creating even more traffic for our villages. At present both New Road and Dorking Road Chilworth have major parking problems, with cars parking up on pavements, caused by both schools, The Percy Arms Public house (whose car park cannot cope) and the parking restrictions at the Station. Travelling through Chilworth is like negotiating a chicane, apart from the danger to pedestrians crossing roads, it also causes gridlock at certain times of the day. By increased housing and more vehicles these problems can only worsen. The Drs surgery in Wonersh, where the majority of residents of Chilworth are registered would also be put under extra strain, as would both schools.

You have to live in Chilworth to fully know the extent of the problem and for this reason are deeply disagree in taking Chilworth out of the Greenbelt.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1220  **Respondent:** 9025217 / Lynne Hanes  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth

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

I very strongly object to our beautiful villages being removed from the protection of the Green Belt.

Any development within them will cause major disruption to our heavily congested roads, already restricted by parking on pavements, verges, as well as narrowing the high way.

Our schools, hospitals and infrastructure cannot support this. We need to fight for any green space and countryside for relaxation and health to combat our working lives for the health of our children.

There must be other suitable sites for development where the traffic is not an issue. Guildford and its villages have a large number of schools and stations creating huge rush hour problems, especially for those trying to access Royal Surrey Hospital and other major routes.

Hope all the above are taken into consideration.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3293  **Respondent:** 9060289 / J Boston  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth

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

I very strongly object to our beautiful villages being removed from the protection of the Green Belt.

Any development within them will cause major disruption to our heavily congested roads, already restricted by parking on pavements, verges, as well as narrowing the high way.

Our schools, hospitals and infrastructure cannot support this. We need to fight for any green space and countryside for relaxation and health to combat our working lives for the health of our children.

There must be other suitable sites for development where the traffic is not an issue. Guildford and its villages have a large number of schools and stations creating huge rush hour problems, especially for those trying to access Royal Surrey Hospital and other major routes.

Hope all the above are taken into consideration.

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

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

We wish to object most strongly to the removal of Chilworth and other villages from the Green Belt.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2387  Respondent: 9063457 / C.A. Brain  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth

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

I am strongly against the plan to lift Green Belt protection from the village of Chilworth and parish of St Martha.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3802  Respondent: 9227073 / St. Martha Parish Council (Anne Tait)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth

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

The Tillingbourne Valley with its string of villages is a geographical gem in its own right. It is located within the Surrey Hills AONB and within an AGLV. The scenic quality of this sensitive rural landscape and the need for it to be protected has been recognised since 1958. This is reinforced by the fact that the whole of the Surrey Hills AONB falls within the Metropolitan Green Belt. This has the strategic role of checking development sprawl, safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, and providing areas where outdoor recreational activities can take place and wildlife habitats be maintained. The views from the valley at Chilworth are spectacular, with the Chantries and St. Martha’s hill to the North, and the wooded high ground of Albury Heath and Blackheath to the South.

Chilworth is an ancient settlement with a fascinating history centred around the delightful Tillingbourne, which was the source for water-powered mills from Abinger Hammer to Shalford. These produced gunpowder, paper and wire over many centuries. The Surrey Hills AONB Board has received HLF funding to study the Tillingbourne Valley which has a largely forgotten but Nationally significant landscape heritage. The village communities in the valley are researching and recording an amazing history which will enhance the attraction of the Surrey Hills AONB to a wider public.

It is therefore vital that the heritage villages in the Tillingbourne Valley continue as discrete entities which are not allowed to coalesce through linear development. It is essential that all the villages including Chilworth remain within the Green Belt so that inappropriate development is prevented and the openness of the countryside is protected with its views to and from the AONB. Hence the Parish Council are very strongly opposed to taking the village of Chilworth out of the Green Belt.

Another major concern is the possible use of land at Old Manor Farm (Site reference 2286) for 20 new dwellings. This is Green Belt land in an AGLV, adjacent to a Conservation Area and outside the Settlement Boundary. The access to this site by a very narrow, single track, un-made up, un-adopted lane, totally unsuited for additional traffic. There are no
other access routes to the site. This would be an entirely inappropriate development. The land should remain open and within Chilworth’s Green Belt.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1696  **Respondent:** 11182081 / Robert Jones  **Agent:** Kiely Planning Limited (Colin Kiely)

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth

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

**Proposed Submission Local Plan Strategy and Sites June 2016**

We are instructed by Mr R Jones to submit the enclosed response to the Proposed Submission Local Plan. This representation relates specifically to the proposed settlement boundary to Chilworth with particular reference to the boundary in the vicinity of Tangley Mere (see plan extract below). We believe that the land outlined on the enclosed plan and shown below in the context of the settlement should be included within the defined boundary and thus removed from the Green Belt.

[IMAGE 1]

Tangley Mere is a large detached house situated in extensive grounds located on the south side of New Road. As can be seen from the enclosed Ordnance Survey there is a notable gap in development along the south of the Road. We consider this ‘open frontage’ to New Road should be included within the settlement boundary of Chilworth, thus enabling its future development.

In terms of the principle of additional development within Chilworth, as confirmed by the Settlement Profiles Study July 2013:

“Chilworth has a number of key community services and facilities which makes it one of the more sustainable villages. Subject to suitable sites being available, there is scope for a rural exception site to provide affordable homes for local people and potential for an extension to the village.”

(see Page 18)

Advice regarding the definition of Green Belt boundaries is set out at Paragraph 85 of the NPPF that states:

When defining boundaries, local planning authorities should:

- ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development;
- not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open;
- where necessary, identify in their plans areas of ‘safeguarded land’ between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period;
- make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development;
- satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period; and
- define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.

In relation to the above, the Local Planning Authority has confirmed that the settlement of Chilworth is sustainable and can accommodate additional housing in a manner consistent with the NPPF. In addition we see no reason why the land,
the subject of this representation, is necessary to keep permanently open. Finally, the proposed alteration of the Green Belt boundary sought would retain a clear, defensible boundary. As can be seen from the OS plan, the site is bounded by a large pond to the east which would provide a clear defensible boundary.

- With respect of whether it is necessary to keep the land ‘open’ we consider the impact of development on the five purposes of the Green Belt below and conclude:
  - It would maintain the separation of between to Blackheath (to the south) and Albury (to the east)
  - It would not conflict with the need to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. In this regard the land beyond the site would continue to form part of the Green Belt where future development (in a manner that conflicts with the purposes of the Green Belt) would be prevented.
  - Would not harm the setting of Chilworth.

Finally, it is accepted that the development of the site is constrained by mature trees and vegetation, however we consider this will assist in ensuring that any future development is of a low density maintaining a sylvan setting thus ensuring no harm arises to the character and appearance of the site or surrounding area. Furthermore, the Council have policies in place to ensure that any future development is satisfactory in relation other matters of planning importance including impact on the landscape. These considerations would need to be considered in relation to any future planning application.

We trust you will take the above comments into consideration and should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact us.

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

Attached documents:  IMAGE 1.png (298 KB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/751</th>
<th>Respondent: 15284225 / Colin Squance</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth</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>It is appreciated that we have to accept additional housing in the Guildford area, the amount of which is still to be justified, but there are still plenty of Brown sites and infilling available for consideration without removing the protection against development offered by the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In particular I object to the removal of the Green Belt in the Chilworth / St Martha area where there are historic areas of outstanding natural beauty and Scientific Interest which in their existing environment add to the special nature of this particular part of the Guildford area. The area of Chilworth / St Martha should not be damaged or reduced by development but should remain intact for the enjoyment of everyone, visitors and residents alike.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/800</th>
<th>Respondent: 15296065 / Leslie and Marie Field</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth</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 keep Chilworth in the Green.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/851  Respondent: 15301185 / David Allen  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth

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 inset Chilworth Village from the Green Belt. As it is located in the North Downs, surrounded by the Surrey Hills AONB, and includes the heritage site of Chilworth Gunpowder Mills, Chilworth needs to stay in the Green Belt to protect it from inappropriate development and urban sprawl. There is no justification for insetting it.

The Local Plan refers to only removing areas from the Green Belt for ‘exceptional circumstances’ and I can’t see any justification in the case of Chilworth, as future development would impact on the overlooking Surrey Hills AONB.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/905  Respondent: 15314081 / Lynda Camp  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth

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

The purpose of this email is to register my objection to the proposal ( contained in your new local plan) to remove Green Belt protection for the village of Chilworth.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/917  Respondent: 15314625 / Carol Bystram  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth

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

I am sending you this e/mail to voice my objection to youre proposal to remove the village of Chilworth from the green belt protection area I most strongly object to this proposal and hope you will reconsider this.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/922</th>
<th>Respondent: 15314849 / Chris Bull</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth</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>

I strongly object to the removal of Chilworth from the Green belt as proposed in the 2016 Guildford Local Plan. I believe we need the continued protection of the Green belt to stop inappropriate development in our area and I strongly disagree with the proposed removal of Chilworth from 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: PSLPA16/940</th>
<th>Respondent: 15321153 / Debbie Hustings</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth</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>

I have viewed the new proposals under the GBC local plan 2016 and I am writing to object to the removal of Chilworth Village from the Green Belt.

Although I appreciate the council is under pressure to find new land to accommodate further housing I believe there is plenty of brown field sites still available to develop.

The loss of green belt status will make a materialistic difference to the Village of Chilworth which has successfully accommodated new developments at Haywards Corner and Titan Sheds.

I'm am particularly concerned about the potential to develop the fields at the end of Manor Lane. This site lacks adequate access and all previous plans have tried to accommodate an unacceptable high level of housing which will impact negatively on this local beauty spot not least the historic Meadows Cottage.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/942</th>
<th>Respondent: 15321281 / Emily Fraser</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth</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>

I have viewed the new proposals under the GBC local plan 2016 and I am writing to object to the removal of Chilworth Village from the Green Belt.

Although I appreciate the council is under pressure to find new land to accommodate further housing I believe there is plenty of brown field sites still available to develop.

The loss of green belt status will make a materialistic difference to the Village of Chilworth which has successfully accommodated new developments at Haywards Corner and Titan Sheds.
I'm am particularly concerned about the potential to develop the fields at the end of Manor Lane. This site lacks adequate access and parking.

**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>PSLPA16/943</td>
<td>15321409 / Claire Stammers</td>
<td>Maps - Chilworth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I feel very strongly Chilworth should remain in the green belt. This status being lost would increase development in the village. During school drop off/pick up time the village is flooded with traffic, cars parked excessively along the roads and Tillingbourne school area is especially bad. Any future building development would hamper this even more with most houses having at least two vehicles as public transport in these rural parts is poor.

In addition to this, the main exit from Chilworth at Rices corner is grid locked morning and evening, many accidents have also happened here over the last few years.

I feel very strongly Chilworth should remain in the green belt.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPA16/947</td>
<td>15321537 / Matthew Hustings</td>
<td>Maps - Chilworth</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 the removal of Chilworth Village from the Green Belt.

I believe there to be plenty of brown field sites still available to develop.

I cannot see how the current infrastructure can possibly accommodate such a development.

To have World Heritage status is something to be proud of, and it would be a great pity to spoil this.

**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>PSLPA16/948</td>
<td>15321697 / Juliet Clarke</td>
<td>Maps - Chilworth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I have seen the new proposals, under the GBC local plan, 2016, and write to object to the removal of the village of Chilworth from the Green Belt. We have already had 2 new developments, in this area and further development between the Tillingbourne River, and the railway in the field beyond Manor Lane, would be very unsuitable. This is a historic, and rural valley, which would be permanently spoilt by high level housing.

The extra traffic generated would add to the growing danger to pedestrians, especially children & the elderly in Blacksmith Lane, a narrow lane with no pavements.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPA16/1007  ** **Respondent:** 15328353 / Lynne Ford  ** **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth

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

I wish to object very strongly to the Council's proposals to remove Chilworth and adjoining villages from the Green Belt. There will be no protection against development and will turn this area into a strip development area which will ruin this area of its natural beauty.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPA16/1008  ** **Respondent:** 15328417 / Malcolm Ford  ** **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth

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

I wish to object strongly to Guildford Local Plan to remove Chilworth and surrounding villages from the Green Belt.

The purpose of the Green Belt is to protect land around urban areas from new house building sprawl and give access to green spaces for town and city dwellers.

Your proposals do not conform to the above.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPA16/1039  ** **Respondent:** 15340993 / Alexander Piers Plummer  ** **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth
I would like to object to the proposal in the Guildford Local Plan 2016 to remove Green Belt protection from Chilworth:

1) Chilworth has already had many new houses built in recent years. Further expansion risks destroying the rural nature of the village, which Green belt protection helps to maintain.

2) Expansion at the edges of the village will gradually remove the buffer between Chilworth and the neighbouring villages of Shalford and Albury, resulting in an eventual conurbation with Guildford.

3) The existing traffic levels along New Road are excessive, resulting in high levels of air and noise pollution to those houses along the road. Further development will exacerbate this to unacceptable levels.

I believe that only by retaining Green Belt protection for Chilworth and its surrounding villages can these problems be controlled.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1737</th>
<th>Respondent: 15449313 / Michelle Georgiou</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth</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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dear Sirs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to raise an objection to the removal of Chilworth from Greenbelt status so enabling future development of housing in the village to go ahead unrestricted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to this on the following grounds;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilworth already suffers from severe traffic flow especially at peak travel times (early morning/early evening) so any additional housing built on green field sites in Chilworth would make this situation far worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main road running through the village is often extremely congested as it is the main route to connect to the A25 from all of the local villages in the area (e.g. Shalford, Bramley, Chilworth &amp; Wonersh).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is inadequate road infrastructure to accommodate further housing as it stands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is also a distinct lack of parking on New Road &amp; this is already exacerbated when the Tillingbourne School is in term time &amp; parents are collecting &amp; dropping off their children for school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is already heavy demand on the local schools for child places which would only get worse if additional houses were built in the village. Local children are not automatically accepted at the two Chilworth schools due to overdemand on places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed sites earmarked for losing Greenbelt status would mean that fields would be lost to the village &amp; this would have a detrimental effect on the feel of the village &amp; the wildlife these areas support as well as removing playing fields which the local community can currently use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional housing will also place an extra stress on the already overstretched local doctors’ surgery at Wonersh which currently supports the residents of Chilworth as well as other local villages such as Wonersh, Shalford &amp; Bramley.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the past several years there have already been extra houses built in Chilworth where the local garage on New Road was removed & built upon & a residential care home was closed in favour of a modern flat complex being developed.

All of this proposed development would have a negative feel on the village & would remove part of the rural character of the village. Chilworth is a historic village & part of the Surrey Hills & should be preserved as such for future generations to enjoy.

In summary, I object to Chilworth being removed from Greenbelt status & wish to file my objection.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1866  Respondent: 15458433 / K Chaimon  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth

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

We have lived in Chilworth for nearly forty-seven years, during that time we have seen the village expand with more houses being built we really don’t want any more. The traffic gets really bad through the village, it would be even worse if more houses were built, let’s keep Chilworth as it is, a country village.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2228  Respondent: 15482369 / Klaus Eckhart  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth

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

I do not believe that Chilworth should lose it’s GreenBelt status.

Currently Chilworth is gridlocked twice a day during school term time due to the amount of traffic that reduces movement to single line traffic. Furthermore the Blacksmith Lane road through to Guildford is also inundated with traffic as parents use this road to take their children to schools in Guildford. Chilworth also has an enormous amount of through traffic from the A248. If there is to be large scale building of houses on either side of the village this will only magnify the problem even more. The infrastructure cannot absorb any more traffic, or an increase of population, without completely destroying the village.

The Green Belt must be preserved and not destroyed by unsightly new building projects. The current infrastructure cannot cope with any more expansion.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2305  Respondent: 15483841 / Tony Questa  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth
I am writing to register my objection in the strongest possible terms to the plan to remove Chilworth and Shalford from the green belt.

I have just in the last few days become aware of a deadline – which I understand is midnight tonight, please correct me if I’m wrong - to respond to this plan and so have had little time to understand this aspect of the plan and research and organise appropriately. I do no recollect receiving any correspondence from GBC to inform me of this deadline. Neighbours have also made similar comments about correspondence.

I have lived in Chilworth for 18 years. I moved here because of the particular nature of the area: it has a particular semi-rural feeling and a strong community spirit. Any building of mass-produced housing would completely change the nature of the area.

Chilworth for example has two well-regarded schools which have no scope for increased intake. The inevitable result of which would be a reduction in their hard-earned and deserved reputations.

This is in a community that has a trunk-route – the A248 – running through it that is obviously used as the main road link from the Blackwater valley dual-carriageway to the A25.

However the road network itself is completely inadequate for the population that is already here and for the traffic that already passes through it. During peak traffic periods there is considerable congestion and very lengthy delays along the A248 and the B2128 which feeds in turn to the congestion along the A281 into Guildford. Travelling at peak times to work is very difficult and must contribute significantly for example to decreased working productivity and to CO2 and toxic nitrogen-compound emissions in the area. Both schools are on the A284.

In addition the quality of the roads themselves are disgracefully inadequate due to years of neglect.

The idea of adding to these substantial existing problems with further population increase is unthinkable.

Finally for now this plan is strongly opposed by the overwhelming majority of residents in Chilworth and Shalford and in a democratic and representative society we have a right to expect elected representatives to support our views – I assume therefore GBC will do so. Perhaps this is why there was no need to inform residents of the referenced deadline.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2568   Respondent: 15504673 / Nicole Richmond   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Object: Keep Chilworth In the Green Belt. Schools and doctors are full, roads already too busy, we are not equipped for more homes! Keep our beautiful countryside for the next generations.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2774   Respondent: 15572929 / Jane Thomas   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth
I would like to object to the proposal in the Guildford Local Plan 2016 to remove Green Belt protection from Chilworth:

1) Chilworth has already had many new houses built in recent years. Further expansion risks destroying the rural nature of the village, which Green belt protection helps to maintain.

2) Expansion at the edges of the village will gradually remove the buffer between Chilworth and the neighbouring villages of Shalford and Albury, resulting in an eventual conurbation with Guildford.

3) The existing traffic levels along New Road are excessive, resulting in high levels of air and noise pollution to those houses along the road. Further development will exacerbate this to unacceptable levels.

4) Due to UK agreeing to leave the EU and the resulting reduction in the net immigration figures the projected housing requirement will be reduced.

I believe that only by retaining Green Belt protection for Chilworth and its surrounding villages can these problems be controlled.

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:
Myself and my family have just recently moved to Chilworth and what brought us here was the amazing greenery and wildlife, buy taking away the green belt we will lose this (especially where we live!) By building houses (in an already busy village) the impact of what would be increased traffic down New Road, Dorking Road, Christmas Hill and Shalford will be such that it will be almost impossible to drive to Guildford, Cranleigh or Godalming during what already is an extremely busy rush hour! The safety of our children down these roads I think will also be compromised because of this increased traffic.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3086  Respondent: 15585761 / Christine Forss  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth

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

I wish to register my objection to the removal of the green belt from the villages of Chilworth and Shalford. Having lived in Chilworth for over 10 years and presently in Guildford town centre, I feel the green areas we are so lucky to have in this area should be protected.

I do understand the need for housing as I am in that bracket of needing a house in the area that I have grown up, but I feel this should be considered development. Preferably making use of areas which have had a building of some sort or disused site etc. Once green belt areas are developed there is no going back.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3294  Respondent: 15591105 / David Armstrong  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth

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

I would like to formally register my objection to the Guildford Local Plan 2016. I am a resident of Chilworth and object to the insetting of my village along with the surrounding villages from the Green Belt.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3636  Respondent: 15611489 / Emma Meekings  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Chilworth

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 plans to the insetting of Chilworth and the removal of Green Belt status on grounds of
1. Loss of countryside in the beautiful Tillingbourne valley.

2. Intolerable increase in levels of traffic through small communities.

3. Loss of individual character of Surrey villages

I have been a resident in Chilworth for twenty years, having been attracted here by the specific character of the village, namely a single string of houses lining New Road (A248). This enables wonderful access to walking on many footpaths in the lovely unspoilt countryside along both sides of the Tillingbourne valley, including the Down's link, of which many locals and visitors to the area take full advantage.

The unique character of the village has recently been more widely appreciated with the essential clearing work of the heritage site at the old Gunpowder factory works, around which the village originally sprung up. Much money, time and effort has gone into the reclamation from thick undergrowth of the old works and a newly installed information trail is designed to encourage more visitors to come and enjoy the historical significance of our village, once famous throughout Europe. It really is a picturesque setting alongside the Tillingbourne river, with views to St Martha's hill and church having been opened up. A launch event is scheduled for September.

However, since moving here, I have witnessed a steady increase in the amount of traffic on New Road, which peaks at school dropping off and picking up times due to Chilworth infant school and the Tillingbourne middle school situated at either end of the village, both of which are popular schools locally. This causes long queues through the village. There really is no other way for the traffic to go, apart from along New Road. Due to a programme of infilling over recent years, with the development around Chilworth station and St Thomas's Close among others, the increase in traffic has been inevitable such that new residents complain that Chilworth, once a quiet little village, now has a real traffic problem.

Encouraging more visitors to the old Gunpowder works, though welcomed by the locals many of whom have been involved as volunteers in clearing the area, will further add to this traffic congestion.

The loss of Green Belt protection in the area surrounding Chilworth would be devastating, leading to the possibility of Chilworth being subsumed into Blackheath, Albury, Shalford or Wonersh and an intolerable increase in traffic through these small communities. Each of these villages has it's own specific identity and charm, the loss of which would be seriously detrimental to the overall beauty and attractiveness of the Surrey Hills.

I urge the planners and Guildford Borough Council to reject this plan.

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

Attached documents:
I am writing to object to the plans to the insetting of Chilworth and the removal of Green Belt status on grounds of

1. Loss of countryside in the beautiful Tillingbourne valley.
2. Intolerable increase in levels of traffic through small communities.
3. Loss of individual character of Surrey villages

I have been a resident in Chilworth for twenty years, having been attracted here by the specific character of the village, namely a single string of houses lining New Road (A248). This enables wonderful access to walking on many footpaths in the lovely unspoilt countryside along both sides of the Tillingbourne valley, including the Down's link, of which many locals and visitors to the area take full advantage.

The unique character of the village has recently been more widely appreciated with the essential clearing work of the heritage site at the old Gunpowder factory works, around which the village originally sprung up. Much money, time and effort has gone into the reclamation from thick undergrowth of the old works and a newly installed information trail is designed to encourage more visitors to come and enjoy the historical significance of our village, once famous throughout Europe. It really is a picturesque setting alongside the Tillingbourne river, with views to St Martha's hill and church having been opened up. A launch event is scheduled for September.

However, since moving here, I have witnessed a steady increase in the amount of traffic on New Road, which peaks at school dropping off and picking up times due to Chilworth infant school and the Tillingbourne middle school situated at either end of the village, both of which are popular schools locally. This causes long queues through the village. There really is no other way for the traffic to go, apart from along New Road. Due to a programme of infilling over recent years, with the development around Chilworth station and St Thomas's Close among others, the increase in traffic has been inevitable such that new residents complain that Chilworth, once a quiet little village, now has a real traffic problem.

Encouraging more visitors to the old Gunpowder works, though welcomed by the locals many of whom have been involved as volunteers in clearing the area, will further add to this traffic congestion.

The loss of Green Belt protection in the area surrounding Chilworth would be devastating, leading to the possibility of Chilworth being subsumed into Blackheath, Albury, Shalford or Wonersh and an intolerable increase in traffic through these small communities. Each of these villages has it's own specific identity and charm, the loss of which would be seriously detrimental to the overall beauty and attractiveness of the Surrey Hills.

I urge the planners and Guildford Borough Council to reject this plan.

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

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

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Compton
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPA16/746</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15275009 / Compton Parish Council (Fiona Curtis)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Compton</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maps have different ratios, which can be rather misleading in terms of comparing one with another.

The map for Compton suggests that the dotted pink line is the boundary line for the village when in fact this is just the village settlement area. The wider village includes Priorsfield Road and The Avenue and Down Lane and parts of New Pond Road and the Hog's Back and Blackwell Farm, all of which are missing. Common land should ideally be marked up. Blackwell Farm is currently shown on a map called 'Guildford Urban' which of course does not exist and hence this could be misleading.

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

**Attached documents:**

Total records: 1.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - East Clandon
### Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1022  **Respondent:** 8796321 / Nick Etches  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Clandon

<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>

2. I **object** to the Settlement Boundary which has been imposed on East Clandon without any consultation. This imposition provides no protection to further development outside of the settlement boundary (Policy P2 para 4.3.25) and is deemed by me as being unnecessary in an already tightly developed ancient and rural conservation village with high archaeological merit. I demand that this proposal be removed as it will endanger the openness of the Green Belt, the views in and out of the AONB (protection of the AONB Policy P1) and the character of our village.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2784  **Respondent:** 8928033 / P. Richardson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Clandon

<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>

**Erosion of Green Belt**

The extensive and systematic erosion of Green Belt is unlawful and unacceptable: the insetting of the Horsleys in Green Belt to allow development of some 500 homes, and the land grab for Gosden Hill Farm are examples of this. The NPPF states that Green Belt can only be used in exceptional circumstances. “Unmet housing need 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 the Green Belt”.

(National Planning Policy Guidance 06 03 2014) and also by the Inspectorate for Planning. This housing demand estimate of 652 homes p.a cannot justify GBC landgrabbing tracts of agricultural and Green Belt land (as with Gosden Hill Farm, Effingham & Send). Our Green Belt is designed to protect Guildford from urban sprawl and makes our area such a delight to live in, and such a delight for visitors and our wider tourism industry. It is recognised that in some areas, small and limited incursions /development in Green Belt may be needed. This can only be justified once all other brown field and non-Green Belt sites have been used.

**Proposed Settlement Boundary for East Clandon**

The proposed (but not recommended by the Local Plan) new Settlement Boundary for East Clandon: I object to the proposed Settlement Boundary for our village. This would potentially allow infill development in an already very compact and beautiful village, and one that is a conservation village of historic note, dates back to the Domesday Book and beyond, and is a leisure and tourist attraction along the Surrey Hills AONB.

You should also note that East Clandon lies entirely in Green Belt, parts are in AGLV and AONB and will be included fully in the AONB once the AONB boundaries have been processed by Natural England (NE). The NE propose to extend the AONB to include East Clandon conservation village along with both National Trust properties - Hatchlands and Clandon Park. Further, as you have noted, East Clandon is low on your sustainable village ranking, having no shops or local services. Because of its
compactness, it is therefore not suitable for further development as a rural local centre.

Finally, the proposed settlement boundary for East Clandon offers 'no material benefit to the village', and as a resident of the village I am against such a move. I hope that these and other views from residents in the borough are properly considered and the DLP is amended to take them into account. There seemed to be little appetite to listen to the comments of residents at the televised council meeting earlier this year. The attitude of the GBC needs to become more flexible regarding consultation.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1381  Respondent: 8930465 / Michael & Carol Cook  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Clandon

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

The Clandons have many historical and interesting buildings, many listed and scale of development is just not appropriate within this area.

Likewise the countryside will be spoilt with all this proposed extra development.

I object to East Clandon being deemed a settlement area and the settlement area being extended in West Clandon.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4137  Respondent: 8944257 / Bruce Tindale  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Clandon

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

Objections to the Guildford 2016 Local Plan

I have lived in East Clandon for over 10 years and am appalled by the proposed Local Plan.

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as a whole and in particular I object to the specific issues (listed below). I believe that this deeply flawed Local Plan will have a direct and detrimental effect on the lives of my family and other residents of East Clandon and an even greater detrimental impact on our neighbouring villages of West Clandon, Ripley, West and East Horsley. It erodes the openness of the Green Belt and endangers the beauty and views in and out of the Surrey Hills AONB.

I object to the Settlement Boundary which has been imposed on East Clandon without any consultation. This imposition provides no protection to further development outside of the settlement boundary (Policy P2 para 4.3.25) and is deemed by me as being unnecessary in an already tightly developed ancient and rural conservation village with high archaeological merit. I demand that this proposal be removed as it will endanger the openness of the Green Belt, the views in and out of the AONB (protection of the AONB Policy P1) and the character of our village.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2590  Respondent: 9334785 / Carol Cook  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Clandon

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

The Clandons have many historical and interesting buildings, many listed and the scale of development is just not appropriate within this area.

Likewise the countryside will be spoilt with all this proposed extra development.

I object to East Clandon being deemed a settlement area and the settlement area being extended in West Clandon.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3224  Respondent: 10803809 / David Jones  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Clandon

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

1. I object to the Settlement Boundary which has been imposed on East Clandon without any consultation. I request that this proposal be removed as it will endanger the openness of the Green Belt, the views in and out of the AONB (protection of the AONB Policy P1) and the character of my village.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3073  Respondent: 10910625 / Alyson Blackwell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Clandon

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

I object to the Settlement Boundary, which has been imposed on East Clandon without any consultation. This imposition provides no protection to further development outside of the settlement boundary (Policy P2 para 4.3.25) and is deemed by me as being unnecessary in an already tightly developed ancient and rural conservation village with high archaeological merit. This proposal needs to be removed as it will endanger the openness of the Green Belt, the views in and out of the AONB (protection of the AONB Policy P1) and the character of our village.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4473</th>
<th>Respondent: 10954849 / David Hayward</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 Settlement Boundary which has been imposed on East Clandon without any consultation. This imposition provides no protection to further development outside of the settlement boundary (Policy P2 para 4.3.25) and is unnecessary in an already tightly developed ancient and rural conservation village. This proposal would endanger the openness of the Green Belt, the views in and out of the AONB (protection of the AONB Policy P1) and the character of the 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: PSLPA16/655</th>
<th>Respondent: 11160001 / Andy Freebody</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 possible inclusion of the land on the A246 between Clandon cross roads and Merrow roundabout being included in the draft plan at the last moment in the hope that it will be accepted as being suitable for development without proper consultation having taken place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust that the objections made above are fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/4561</th>
<th>Respondent: 15145377 / WYG (S Fidgett)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 DELIVERY AND SUITABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of Onslow Park is possible within the early part of the Local Plan period, ensuring a meaningful contribution to supply within the initial years of the required housing trajectory, when starts on site projected within the Plan are lower than they might otherwise be and are below the level required to meet OAN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relationship of supply with the housing trajectory is considered further in the next section.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The potential for the early delivery of the proposed development is important also for the social and economic infrastructure proposed. Early delivery of Onslow Park within the plan period would result in improved access to open space, recreational facilities, healthcare facilities and employment opportunities for existing local residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Availability

This submission confirms the availability of the land. The landowners, the Trustees of The Clandon Estate, for the Earl of Onslow, and the existing golf course operator are in agreement that the land is available and would be developed as proposed, should the site be identified in the Local Plan process.

There are no other owners or occupiers of the land. Both parties are committed to delivering the site and substantially commencing development within the first five year period of the DLP.

Lord Onslow and the Trustees also propose a continuing, long term involvement in the management of Onslow Park. It is proposed that all common parts, including community spaces and a substantial part of the housing stock proposed, would be retained by the Estate and managed for future generations. The aim in large part, is to help create a sense of place and belonging for the community with a commitment to the long term management and quality of the environment, infrastructure and facilities.

Construction

It is proposed that the development would commence within the first 5 year period of the Local Plan and would be likely to contribute up to 200 homes each year over a 5 year period. It should be noted that this corresponds to the period of least supply within the Local Plan trajectory, which is below OAN for the first noted that this corresponds to the period of least supply within the Local Plan trajectory, which is below OAN5 years of the Plan from the date of likely adoption.

As many of the homes will be either affordable homes or private rented stock, the development can proceed at a faster rate than may often be considered if constructed through more traditional methods which are dependent on the rate of market sale.

It is also proposed to adopt a contractor led approach to the delivery of such housing, using modern methods of site fabrication which facilitates a quicker delivery on site.

The provision of a proportion of serviced self-build plots offers a further delivery route for part of the supply.

Sustainable Design and Construction

The ability to use off site construction techniques also means that the sustainability of the design and performance of the homes and buildings provided will meet the highest specification and result in sustainable, low carbon living that reduces energy and resource demands, delivers low fuel bills and running costs for residents and a low carbon footprint, tackling the effects of climate change.

Infrastructure

The site is not dependent on significant up front infrastructure requirements that would prevent or slow housing delivery.

A suitable vehicular access exists from the existing park and ride and golf course junction onto the A25 Epsom Road and this would be utilized as the principal site access. A secondary access and egress is proposed to supplement this also onto the A25. This submission is supported by a Transport Feasibility Study 2016 that sets out the proposed accessibility and transport implications of the development proposed, in conjunction with the development options identified in the Submission Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

While some localized off-site improvements are required as a result of existing projected growth on the highway network, these are already identified in the IDP as part of the Local Plan proposals and would be supported, where necessary by additional contributions from the development of Onslow Park under both CIL and s106 obligations.

The site is well located as an extension of the existing urban area to access a full range of goods and services and benefits from easy walking, cycling and bus services. Aside from minor, localized improvements to facilitate enhanced connections between the site and the surrounding footpath and cycle network, there are not wider requirements that would add to the commitments in the Local Plan.
The expansion of the park and ride within the site to double its capacity significantly enhances the ability of the site to remove existing car journeys entering Guildford from the A25 to the east and offsets a significant proportion of vehicle movements.

The provision of additional and enhanced community facilities as part of the garden village proposals increases the level and quality of services available to the existing community within Guildford in an accessible and inclusive manner. This includes the sports hub, the primary and secondary schools, community facilities and community parkland, all within easy reach of the existing urban area, and extending to the Downs beyond.

4.0 JUSTIFICATION

In general the overall approach identified within the Local Plan is supported, that in order to meet the needs of the Borough and its residents, a range of housing, employment and other facilities are required over the period of the Plan and that these must be provided for in line with those needs in order to maintain and provide for a prosperous, vibrant and growing economy with access to high quality housing and a full range of services for all members of the community. At the same time, this must be balanced with the maintenance and enhancement of the built and natural environment of the Borough.

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

Attached documents:
I wish to register my objection to your Local Plan and specifically to the Gosden Hill proposed development and its effects on the surrounding area.

I was brought up in West Clandon, attended Kindergarten there, went to school in Guildford and had my first jobs in the town. Both my brothers attended school in Ripley. My mother still lives in, and we all still regularly visit, the same house that she and my father purchased 56 years ago in 1960. It was a village without much traffic and the whole area was very green and wooded.

A huge increase in traffic is one of the obvious changes in that time and the Gosden Hill Development would increase the already huge numbers of cars dramatically. In my own street in Sussex, there has been a threefold increase in cars in the past few years and soon to be more with teenagers learning to drive, and the same will happen on any development. The Street in West Clandon is narrow and winding and already busy as a through road. It is not suited to large amounts of traffic. The A3 is a very busy road and even 20 years ago when driving to Clandon from London there were invariably delays, often long. Just a few years ago, we were witness to an accident at Burnt Common roundabout as a car with hit by a lorry, lifting the car off the ground.

With regard to services at Gosden Hill, even now providing enough water to houses presents problems without extra housing developments. Disposal of waste water and sewerage and the provision of electricity and gas will be a strain on overburdened resources. The Grid struggles at times already to provide enough electricity.

The Green Belt, which is being destroyed, was created to provide a green lung around towns so that people could get fresh and healthy air. This is needed more and more as the population increases and more countryside disappears under housing schemes.

I understand that an industrial unit is also intended at the same site – one sees these buildings left empty for years on end and I feel that building another cannot be necessary.

If the Gosden Hill development proceeds, it will damage entire surrounding areas with the knock-on effect of more cars crammed onto already log-jammed roads, the need for but lack of healthy air and green spaces, and the destruction of land for any future agriculture.

I would, therefore, urge you to reconsider your proposals. Set out below are further objections in more detail.

I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary.

I set out below my objections to specific policies and matters within the Plan.

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

Attached documents:
<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>1. I <strong>object</strong> to the Settlement Boundary which has been imposed on East Clandon without any consultation. This imposition provides no protection to further development outside of the settlement boundary (Policy P2 para 4.3.25) and is deemed by me as being unnecessary in an already tightly developed ancient and rural conservation village with high archaeological merit. I demand that this proposal be removed as it will endanger the openness of the Green Belt, the views in and out of the AONB (protection of the AONB Policy P1) and the character of our village.</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: PSLPA16/4256</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15682305 / Monika Mundy</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Clandon</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 fact that GBC have not met the requirements of the NPPF Paragraph 155 which imposes an explicit obligation to have early and meaningful consultation. This has not been met in a number of areas by GBC. We have not had a meaningful consultation on imposing a settlement boundary on East Clandon, on the absence of meaningful economic and population growth figures for Guildford showing various scenarios with high, medium and low growth scenarios being offered.

I demand that there should be a significant challenge to the GBC scenario planning and the housing and growth numbers should be revised and especially in the light of uncertainty and change which will accompany Britain’s withdrawal from the EU.

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

Attached documents:

Total records: 15.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Effingham
### Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/600</th>
<th>Respondent: 8557953 / Effingham Parish Council (Arnold Pindar)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Effingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Home Farm, Effingham Page 402**

We are pleased to see that sites earlier proposed for development at Home Farm, Effingham have been removed from the submission local plan as these developments are now in hand.

**Maps, Appendix H Effingham Page 12**

We note that the revised inset boundary is an improvement on the previous plan. However, we note it does not meet our previous submission which should be re-considered at examination.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1663</th>
<th>Respondent: 8575617 / Effingham Parish Council (Ian Symes)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Effingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effingham Parish Council’s response to the Guildford borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites, June 2016.**

Effingham Parish Council (EPC) welcomes the fact that Effingham Lodge Farm (ELF) is no longer regarded as a strategic site in planning terms, as it was in the 2014 draft Local Plan.

Please also find, herewith, a map showing EPC’s requested amendments to the proposed inset boundary – Policy P2.

**EPC’s comments on the June 2016 Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites are below in Policy order.**

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4006</th>
<th>Respondent: 8835873 / Effingham Residents' Association (Vivien White)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Effingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effingham EPC Inset.pdf** (3.2 MB)
Re: Effingham Residents Association’s Regulation 19 Comments on GBC Draft Local Plan

This letter contains Effingham Residents’ Association’s comments on the draft GBC Local Plan under Regulation 19.

The Effingham Residents Association exists to safeguard and promote the interests of the residents of Effingham. All Effingham Residents are considered members of the Association. There are 1,054 households in Effingham and we have only four residents who have asked not to be members. These comments are based on our members’ views and are largely taken from two surveys of members of the Residents’ Association in August 2014 and July 2016, with the number of respondents 349 and 244 respectively. Summaries of the responses to these questionnaires are attached as annexes.

We are very supportive of a Local Plan being agreed as we appreciate that there are major disadvantages in only having a Local Plan dating from 2003. However, we have some major concerns about some of the policies in the draft Local Plan as they affect Effingham.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4007  Respondent: 8835873 / Effingham Residents' Association (Vivien White)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Effingham

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

Protecting Policies

We support Policy P1 to protect the Green Belt, but are concerned about parts of Policy P2. In particular, our recent survey of Effingham residents showed that 64% were against the insetting of Effingham. According to the NPPF and as quoted in the draft Plan:

“villages whose open character makes an important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt should be included in the Green Belt.”

It can well be argued that Effingham’s open character contributes to the openness of the Green Belt,

particularly on the northern side, where the older part of the village has open views to the green fields to the north, which significantly contributes to the importance of Effingham’s Conservation Area as confirmed by Historic England.

We understand that insetting would allow some limited development in the village, although we would point out that Effingham has had a higher rate of development over the last ten years than the average for the borough (6.6% against the Borough average of 5%). The same result could be achieved by a limited extension of the settlement area.

If Effingham is to be inset we believe that the proposed boundaries of the inset contain a number of anomalies and technical errors, a number of which have been pointed out to us by residents and which they have commented on in their responses to you. We understand that the inset boundary has to be where there is existing development and must follow natural boundaries that are likely to be permanent. We would therefore like a detailed review of the proposed boundaries, including ours and individual residents’ comments on them.

There are certain areas in the proposed inset that we feel are inappropriate according to the guidelines and should be excluded. These are:

1. The centre of the Conservation Area as it is open to the green fields to the north, including St Lawrence Church, Brown’s and Brown’s Field.
2. The Howard of Effingham School, or at least its playing fields to the east side which form an important green gap between Effingham and Little Bookham and have been classified as on high sensitivity Green B The current
proposed inset boundary on the south side of Howard of Effingham Playing fields does not following any natural physical feature.
3. The Allotments, especially as they lack permanent natural boundaries
4. Grove House, especially as it has no physical natural boundary on its western bound
5. The small field used as recreational space for Middle Farm Place, especially as it has no permanent natural boundaries.

The following possible minor anomalies have also been pointed out to us which mainly concern the proposed inset not following permanent natural or property boundaries. This list may not be exhaustive.

1. Inset not following property boundary at 69 Strathcona Avenue
2. Inset not following property boundaries at 1 Beech Close and Orchard Well
3. Inset not following property boundaries from Yew Tree Walk to 4 Middle Farm Close (line appears to go through the middle of a building)
4. Inset not following property boundaries at Moonshine, Effingham Common Road, and all along Lower Road (Old Village Hall, and Sir Douglas Haig cut by inset boundary).
5. Inset not following property boundaries in Barnes Wallis Close
6. If Browns Lane is to be included which we dispute, the inset should run along the west side of Browns Lane and not the east side.

We are also concerned about the intention to remove the land of the former Wisley Airfield from the Green Belt (also in A35). Many Effingham residents objected to the recent planning application on many grounds, but those which they felt would badly affect Effingham were the increase in traffic congestion on local roads which are already dangerously under pressure and the inadequate access to public transport of the proposed development. The proposal for the proposed development’s residents to use Effingham and East Horsley railway stations is untenable as they are already over used. The station car parks are unable to cope with current demand and unable to be extended. The proposed bus service would not be sufficiently used to mitigate against this as has been shown on similar developments. All new large developments should have new train stations and car parking facilities where the nearest ones are at capacity.

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: PSLPA16/3892  Respondent: 8836033 / Alexandra Perkins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Effingham

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

I object to the current local plan for the following reasons: I am a resident of West Horsley and work in neighbouring Bookham. My daughters attend schools in Effingham and use the school bus to get to and from school. I believe the increase in housing would place a huge burden on local schools, infrastructure and other essential local services. As it is the local schools are in huge demand as is the doctors surgery. The village roads through the village flood regular during heavy rainfall, as do other areas and it does appear to be on the increase. Our beautiful village must stay as it is and the treasured and important Greenbelt which surrounds and is part of must continue to be cherished and respected. I believe the vast majority of the local residents do not want these changes inflicted upon them.

I hope this email helps to dismiss the proposed changes once and for all.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4253  Respondent: 10270913 / ECA (Martha Covell)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Effingham

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: [131015_SITELOCATIONPLAN.pdf](622 KB) [151022EFF_D_A+GBAss.pdf](1.3 MB) [120515Master.pdf](1.0 MB) [160718_ECA_Reps.pdf](1.2 MB)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4097  Respondent: 10771105 / Effingham Residents Co Ltd (Andrew Bedford)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Effingham

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

We have had an opportunity of reviewing the Council’s proposals in respect of the draft local plan (Strategy on Sites 2016) our main comments relate to the impact of the local plan insofar as it relates to the village of Effingham. Accordingly our comments are with reference to:

1. Policy P2: insofar as it relates to Effingham/Green Belt; and
2. The extent of the Inset boundary of Effingham proposed in the draft local plan (Page 338).

3. **Policy P2 Green Belt (page 49)**

We are concerned with the concept of “limited infilling” and having regard to the proposed designation of Effingham within the local plan as an inset village. We consider that it is important that the inset boundary truly reflects as a matter of fact on the ground, the extent of the relevant village. In our view, the inset boundary insofar as it relates to Effingham, should consider incorporating within that inset boundary all land which is on the ground, within the village and to exclude from the inset boundary any lands which are plainly currently outside the existing village boundary or indeed do not comprise “infilling” in the context of the NPPF, within the current confines of the village boundary.

We are aware of the five essential characteristics of Green Belt which are advocated by the NPPF.

1. **Effingham Inset Boundary (Appendix F), (Page 338 Proposed Submission of Local Plan)**

The attached plan illustrates the extent of the proposed new inset boundary surrounding Effingham village beyond which is to be designated Green Belt.

We would wish to object and for representations to be made, for those parcels of land which are numbered 1-6 on the attached plan (and coloured yellow) to be excluded from the Inset Area of the village for the following reasons:

- **Parcel 1** (Extension of part of Howard of Effingham School)

This land is plainly not within the village and also, still contributes to the fundamental aim of the purposes of the Green Belt (as advocated by the NPPF) in that:

- it prevents urban sprawl and coalescence of Effingham towards Bookham;
- it checks the unrestricted sprawl of the village beyond its natural boundaries;
- it safeguards the countryside (it being opposite to open green space (Effingham Lodge Farm) and adjacent to a continuation of green space with the adjoining land within Mole Valley’s boundary).

If ever it is considered that this land was suitable for redevelopment for the benefit of the school or otherwise, then there is no reason why an application could be considered for development in Green Belt but having the need to prove exceptional circumstances (page 83, NPPF) justifying the development of Green Belt land. There is certainly no prima facie justification for this land’s inclusion within the inset boundary/village boundary of Effingham. Furthermore, it is not advocated in the LAA as land contributing towards the Council’s housing supply. Accordingly it should be removed from being within the Inset Boundary.

- **Parcel 2** (Open Space amenity land at the rear of Middle Farm Place)

This was transferred to the Council for open space purposes by the developer of Middle Farm Place back in 1991 by way of a Section 106 planning gain. This parcel also includes the three adjacent dwellings adjoining Oreston Lane.

This land should be excluded as whilst it is a village amenity, it is open space and also checks the unrestricted sprawl of the western boundary of the village westwards where there exists a clear current delineation of the village boundary. It is also advocated to be removed from the inset boundary in order to preserve the setting and character of the village and safeguard the countryside. The maintenance of the village delineation on its western boundary should be retained in its current position to avoid a “creep” into Home Farm and the reduction of this open farm land and visually and historically important aspect to the village, particularly when seen on entering the village from Horsley on the A246. This boundary/delineation alone sets the scene for the village in its current environment.

- **Parcel 3** (Agricultural land/buildings at Home Farm) and **Parcel 5** (Existing Allotment Gardens)

The comments relating to the Middle Farm Place amenity area (Parcel 2) are equally applicable in respect of Parcels 3 and 5 in terms of ensuring a check on the unrestricted sprawl of the village from its current western boundary delineation. It is not a coincidence that Parcels 2, 3 and 5 are owned by the local authority although their justification to be included within the Inset boundary is completely unwarranted and does not reflect the extent of the village ‘on the ground’. The comments relating to Parcel 2 are reiterated in relation to Parcels 3 and 5 terms of the need to safeguard the...
countryside, preserve the setting and character of the village and to check the unrestricted sprawl of the village from its current western boundary.

- **Parcel 4 (the Barn)**

For similar reasons as stated above in relation to parcels 2, 3 and 5, the inset boundary should not be extended into the countryside by permitting this land to be included within the inset boundary and therefore potentially developed.

Our concerns about the ability to develop this land (it is stated as being one of the sites referred to in the LAA as being available) are set out later in this e-mail. However, notwithstanding that it is and comprises a walled garden, it is still an important contribution towards safeguarding the countryside and the sprawl of the western boundary of the village into the existing countryside. Accordingly, we strongly object to its inclusion within the inset boundary.

- **Parcel 6 (Brown’s Land Field)**

This land has been the subject of recent publicity as being included within the recent Howard of Effingham planning application for housing. It was robustly refused by the local planning authority for development. We are at a loss to explain as to why it has been included as “safeguarded land” within the inset boundary on the premise that it is, in accordance with the local plan policy, being safeguarded “to meet the development needs beyond the plan period”. It is our view that for the purposes of this plan, this land should be removed from within the inset boundary. If, following the expiry of the plan period, a new local plan is introduced and it is considered meritorious at that time that this land be included (whether for housing supply reasons or otherwise) then that will be for a matter of public scrutiny and review on a democratic basis at that time. Currently, this land forms an immediate green aspect when exiting the crossroads at the A246 and the swathe of open land afforded by the KGV playing field. It also is an instrumental aspect of the use by Effingham and Leatherhead Rugby Club which is an important amenity and economic driver for the maintenance of KGV which remains a highly significant and very important aspect and amenity of Effingham village generally.

- **Land Edged Pink**

Notwithstanding the objections above referred relating to the exclusion of certain areas within the proposed inset area of Effingham village within the initial draft local plan, we are also at a loss to explain why an important aspect of the village has not been included within the inset boundary.

We strongly advocate that the land shown edged pink on the attached plan should be included within the inset boundary. First, it is an intrinsic part of the village comprising St Lawrence School, a former convent, adjacent church and the adjacent British Legion (the latter being a relatively poor quality part of the village but nevertheless part of the village). All of this land “in the ground” forms part of the village! How can the authority advocate including parcels 1-6- none of which are “on the ground” in the village but seek to continue to exclude the land coloured pink which in our view within the fabric of the village, being less than 50 yards to the two village pubs in the village (and in the inset boundary!)

The land coloured pink on the attached plan also includes a small piece of land adjacent to the St Lawrence Primary School Playing Fields, which is wedged between the school playing field and Effingham Common Road, immediately opposite the Leewood Way development. This land is shown hatched blue on the attached plan (Lyon’s Field).

Arguably, this land already comprises “limited infilling” permitted under green belt policy. This land is locally known as “Lyon’s Field” to which we draw reference later in this e-mail as to why it should be included on grounds of suitability and availability. We consider the land shown edged pink on the attached plan is and contributes far more towards the village and is an inherent part of the village than those areas which we have sought to advocate removal. We also advocate the inclusion of that part of the land shown coloured pink and hatched blue as part of the inset plan on the basis that this land can be or could be provided for housing to meet Effingham’s housing requirements in the plan period as advocated by the Emerging Effingham Neighbourhood Plan.

We strongly advocate that the inset boundary is extended to include the land shown coloured pink for the reasons above stated.

**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? ( )

Further to the local plan submission I would fully support the Church Street, Effingham site, even though it is in greenbelt, it would seem a very sensible infill site. Regarding the other allotted sites I notice Lyons Field, Effingham Common Road has been missed off. Surely this is a site which would again give good infill and ease the burden of housing?

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

Attached documents:

I note with interest regarding Effingham's local plan. I would fully support the Church Street, Effingham site, it seems a good infill site. The glaring omission would be Lyons Field, Effingham Common Road, to me presents an ideal opportunity to ease the housing problem within Effingham.

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

Attached documents:

I am writing with my comments on the draft Local Plan for Guildford under Regulation 19. These mainly concern Policy P2 and Effingham where I live.

I very much support the main thrust of the plan and, in particular, support the concept of “insetting”. I believe that a limited amount of new build is desirable but that this should not be to the detriment of the Green Belt. I understand that according to the NPPF, that where boundaries are changed in the Green Belt, they should not include land which it is necessary to keep permanently open and should be defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.

I was therefore rather baffled to find that Manor House Lane had been excluded from “insetting” in the latest plan. My understanding is that it had been recommended for inclusion for inserting in the Green Belt and Countryside Study, 2014 and in the EAB Draft. The reasons I think that it should be included are:

? “Insetting” should be designed to protect the Green Belt from development spreading into it, but it should include as much of the village’s centre as possible so that it defines a small, continuous residential area.
Manor House Lane is very much a part of the perceived settlement area of the village of Effingham as noted in the Green Belt and Countryside Study, 2014. To be excluded suggests we are a peripheral group of houses outside the village, which is not the case, as we are a continuous part of the village perceived settlement area from Guildford Road/A246.

The more logical boundary for “insetting” would be to include Manor House Lane as it is a clear continuation of the settlement on Guildford Road with no natural permanent boundary separating it from it. The houses in Manor House Lane have clear physical boundaries on the other three sides. It is defined by rows of mature trees on two sides (one to the west bordering King George V and one to the south bordering Manor House School) and by the road with a row of mature trees on the eastern side to Little Bookham. These are clear boundaries of physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent as required under the NPPF and noted in the Green Belt and Countryside Study.

Manor House Lane seems to have been excluded from the proposed inset area when it was decided to exclude the King George V playing fields. These are well used, and enjoyed playing fields, which it is sensible to exclude from the inset area although they are protected from development by the trust establishing them. However, this should not exclude Manor House Lane from being inset as it has its own separate, physical boundaries as noted above and thus does not affect the openness of the Green Belt around it.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/757</th>
<th>Respondent: 15284513 / Diana Hansford</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Effingham</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>

I am writing in reference to the local plan for housing development in Effingham and in particular to the revision of its settlement/inset boundary as detailed on page 338 of the local plan.

I am objecting to the revision of the inset boundary to include those areas marked in yellow.

In particular:

1. The amenity land at rear of Middle Farm Place is designated open space and there is no need to include it in the settlement as this increases the 'crawl' of the village westwards.
2. The land immediately behind the houses in Middle Farm Close has no access is part of the conservation area and is adjacent to farm land.

4/5. The inclusion of this land enables the urban 'crawl' westwards as stated above. Regarding the proposed allocation of the Barn (no 4) for housing, this is a barn of historic interest and from an access feasibility point of view can only accommodate a max of 5-7 residences. Any site allocation for such purpose should reflect a proper feasibility assessment on highway grounds.

In terms of land which could be accommodated within the settlement which at present are not, are the lands shown edged blue. These lands are in the main already developed and are intrinsic to the village configuration, particularly St Lawrence school and the Red House and British Legion. The only potential issue is the vacant land known as Lyons Field adjacent to the school, which is a natural extension to the village boundary and is arguably infill in any event, being bordered on 3 sides by development and on the other by the school playing fields.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I am writing in reference to the local plan for housing development in Effingham and in particular to the revision of its settlement/inset boundary as detailed on page 338 of the local plan.

I am objecting to the revision of the inset boundary to include those areas marked in yellow.

In particular:

1. The amenity land at rear of Middle Farm Place is designated open space and there is no need to include it in the settlement as this increases the 'crawl' of the village westwards. It is also an important part of the Middle Farm Place children's' recreational area and is constantly used for ball games etc.

2. The land immediately behind the houses in Middle Farm Close has no access and is part of the conservation area and is adjacent to farm land.

4/5. The inclusion of this land enables the urban 'crawl' westwards as stated above. Regarding the proposed allocation of the Barn (no 4) for housing, this is a barn of historic interest and from an access feasibility point of view can only accommodate a max of 5-7 residences. Any site allocation for such purpose should reflect a proper feasibility assessment on highway grounds.

In terms of land which could be accommodated within the settlement which at present are not, are the lands shown edged blue. These lands are in the main already developed and are intrinsic to the village configuration, particularly St Lawrence school and the Red House and British Legion. The only potential issue is the vacant land known as Lyons Field adjacent to the school, which is a natural extension to the village boundary and is arguably infill in any event, being bordered on 3 sides by development and on the other by the school playing fields.

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

Attached documents:
1. the amenity land at rear of Middle Farm Place is designated open space and there is no need to include it in the settlement as this increases the 'crawl' of the village westwards.

2. the land immediately behind the houses in Middle Farm Close has no access is part of the conservation area and is adjacent to farm land.

4/5. The inclusion of this land enables the urban 'crawl' westwards as stated above. Regarding the proposed allocation of the Barn (no 4) for housing, this is a barn of historic interest and from an access feasibility point of view can only accommodate a max of 5-7 residences. Any site allocation for such purpose should reflect a proper feasibility assessment on highway grounds.

In terms of land which could be accommodated within the settlement which at present are not, are the lands shown edged blue. These lands are in the main already developed and are intrinsic to the village configuration, particularly St Lawrence school and the Red House and British Legion. The only potential issue is the vacant land known as Lyons Field adjacent to the school, which is a natural extension to the village boundary and is arguably infill in any event, being bordered on 3 sides by development and on the other by the school playing fields.

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

Attached documents: Attachment 1.pdf (515 KB)

---

Comment ID: pslp173/32  Respondent: 15457953 / Ian Symes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Effingham

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

Sang 1 Page 325 Effingham Common

Remaining maintenance and management costs of £8,969 plus interest funded by developer?

What exactly is funded and what does this mean for Effingham Common? There is no explanation of this statement.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/33  Respondent: 15457953 / Ian Symes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Effingham

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

Maps, Appendix H, Page 12, Effingham

Would you kindly review the inset boundary proposal to the east of Effingham village. The proposed inset boundary to the east of the village is still unclear. I suggest the boundary comes up Browns Lane and Church Street until it reaches footpath FP118. This footpath, which goes to the north of the St Lawrence Church and to the south of the Howard of Effingham School joins up with the rest of the Submission LP proposed inset boundary at the north west of the KGV fields.

This follows a much more clearly defined and permanent boundary – based on roads and footpath FP118. If this changed boundary were applied it would be clear and defensible over the plan period and avoid confusion in the future.
The proposal to redevelop the Howard of Effingham School is unjustified. The school has confirmed that it does not plan to change its catchment area, and can only be described as oversubscribed when demand from outside the catchment area is taken into account. A new school is therefore clearly not a strategic need and as such should not appear in the Local Plan, which by definition is a document of strategy. It is important to note that the record of the meeting on 31 March between EPC and GBC shows that Cllr Mansbridge stated that any proposal for redevelopment of the School would NOT be included in the Local Plan.

As ratepayers of Effingham and Guildford Borough Council (GBC) we enclose our formal objection to key elements of the 2016 draft Local Plan.

Our objections focus on the proposals impacting Effingham, Wisley and The Horsleys in particular and to the extremely high number of homes suggested as needed across Guildford.

As a general principle we find the plan, much like the draft of 2014, to run contrary to the original aims of the National Planning and Policy Framework (NPPF) and clearly at odds with the promises of green belt protection offered by all parties including the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats prior to the most recent general election.

We object in the strongest terms to the insetting of small villages including Effingham, believing this to be unjustified and unsound.

Our key objections are referenced according to the draft plan documentation policies and sections as noted.
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

<Local plan rep map attached>

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

Attached documents: [The Barn, Effingham- Local Plan Reps.pdf](#) (440 KB)

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

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Fairlands
### Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1267</th>
<th>Respondent: 8810017 / Alison White</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Fairlands</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>

Reference 16/P/01397 Fairlands Farm

I also object to this application.

Again the land is Green Belt. The reason given for dropping the nearby Liddington Hall and Fairlands sites from the Draft Local Plan was because of the "high sensitivity Green Belt". The same should apply to the Fairlands Farm site. The arguments in the application that there are "highly exceptional" reasons is nonsense. The community benefits are slight and Fairlands already has a thriving community centre and playing fields. The community benefits are arguably greater as the development exists today. To argue that Guildford does not have five years of housing supply is to disregard the Regulation 19 consultation that ends this month. The legislation cannot have intended to allow this sort of opportunism.

I also object on the grounds of increased traffic as per my objection to the Keens Lane development.

I confirm that I am happy for my comments to be made public & require an acknowledgement of this objection.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3193</th>
<th>Respondent: 8826529 / Martin Barker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Fairlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Site 118. Land adjoining Fairlands. Safeguarded

This land is located within the Green Belt and meets the following purposes of the Green Belt which are to: check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; to prevent the coalescence of Fairlands with the town; to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; to preserve the setting and special character of our historic town. Very special circumstances would be required to justify the loss of such sites given their proximity to Whitmoor Common SPA, SSSI, LNR.

The safeguarded land could provide for just over 500 houses and two traveller pitches almost doubling the existing size of this satellite suburb and would completely change the character of Fairlands leading to the urbanisation and destruction of the village environment.

The local road network is already at capacity. The A323 experiences significant delays during the rush hour with a particular pinch point at Rydes Hill roundabout. These delays represent a significant loss of income in terms of the local economy. The cumulative impact of development in Aldershot, Farnborough, Ash, Tongham, Normandy and Pirbright will greatly exacerbate the existing problems.

Any development at Fairlands would increase vehicle movements on the A322 which would have a detrimental impact on air quality which in turn would have a detrimental impact on Whitmoor Common, SPA, SSSI, LNR.
C15, the road that runs through Wood Street Village, which is already used as a rat run to the Research Park, University, Hospital and Tesco is at capacity. Any development at Fairlands would have a knock-on impact on the traffic using the road through Wood Street Village.

Both Wood Street Infant School and Worpleson Primary School are already oversubscribed – the proposed expansion of Worpleson Primary School to 540 places will only address the existing need. St Joseph’s has been expanded and Stoughton Infants is being expanded to deal with existing need.

Whilst primary school places are being increased at St Joseph’s School, Aldershot Road to take account of current demand, there will also need to be an increase in senior school places. The proposed site in Salt Box Road is inappropriate.

There is only one way in and out of the Estate. There is a significant increase in the volume of traffic entering and leaving the Estate during school drop off and collection times. The road network within the Estate could not possibly cope with the increase in traffic that a new development would bring.

The existing sewerage system cannot cope – major sewage leaks have been experienced on Broad Street Common (SNCI) twice in the last 12 months. On days when there is sudden, heavy rainfall raw sewage leaks into the gardens in St Michael’s Avenue.

The water table in this area is very high, whilst the land itself is low lying. Surface water flooding in Fairlands is an issue that is recognised within the Surrey Flood Risk Strategy and the Guildford Surface Water Management Plan. Any additional development would make the risk of household flooding worse.

Fairlands is located at the end of a particularly long power transmission network. Due to overhead lines and the length of the network the Estate suffers from frequent power outages. We do not believe that the existing network could cope with a housing development here.

Such a development would have a detrimental impact on Littlefield Common SNCI, which provides habitat for a number of protected species including nightjars and bats.

This particular land contributes to a vital wildlife corridor which links Whitmoor Common SPA/SSSI, Chitty’s Common, Rydes Hill, Common, Broad Street and Backside Commons to the Hogs Back AONB.

There are remnants of the cultural landscape associated with the medieval Royal Deer Park within the Rydes Hill/Fairlands rural-urban fringe. It is important that the separation of Fairlands from the historic settlement of Wood Street Village is maintained. Large scale development at this location would be wholly inappropriate.

There is an existing problem with the no right turn out of the Estate being abused. Any increase in the number of vehicles using the entrance would correspondingly increase the risk of a serious or even fatal accident occurring on the A323.

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

**Attached documents:**
The Fairlands and Liddington Hall and Gravetts Lane Community Association (FLGCA) was formed in the 1950s to represent the interest of the people of Fairlands, Liddington Hall, Gravetts Lane, Holly Lane and the Aldershot Road between these locations. The officers of the Association are elected annually by the residents.

In September 2013, following a meeting to discuss the Issues and Options consultation initiated by Guildford Borough Council, a meeting of over 200 local residents unanimously voted to form an action group, as a section of FLGCA. This group subsequently became known as FLAG.

1.2 FLAG

Since 2013 FLAG has been extremely active in representing our residents. We have held 5 public meetings at various times during the process. We have also canvassed our residents, and we are able to report 95% positive support having spoken with 228 residences with 218 in favour of FLAG representing their wishes and objecting to the threat of development around Fairlands, with only three against the representation and in favour of development.

Our mandate to represent the residents of our area of benefit was renewed at the AGM of July 2015.

1.3 September 2014 Response

FLAG responded to the consultation in September 2014 with a twenty-two page comprehensive response. Whilst some of our objections and comments have been addressed many of the themes still exist in the new plan.

As a consequence some of the content from our original response is repeated here.

2.1 Summary

We recognise the huge amount of effort that has been expended on this version of the Plan and are grateful to the Council staff for all their hard work. Whilst residents are pleased that the inappropriate developments in Fairlands and Liddington Hall have been removed from the Plan, we find there is enough in the Plan that requires us to object to it as a flawed document overall. We summarise our objections as follows:

We object very strongly to the scale of growth predicted in this plan, driven by the Strategic Housing Market Analysis, a figure that is neither transparent nor scrutinised.

Overall, we must object to the policies in this plan as we believe:

Policies in this plan are couched in imprecise language and, with a presumption in favour of development, this will not enable the policies to prevent inappropriate development.

Monitoring of the policies is weak and ineffective, often not even monitoring resources that policies are required to protect.

There is insufficient housing in the plan for low wage and key workers. Affordable housing is simply NOT affordable in our area due to the high cost and there is an insufficient allocation of social housing.

Infrastructure is currently insufficient to support the existing population. Whilst the CIL may go some way to mitigating new development, it cannot, and will not, be used to rectify current problems.

We object to the Thames Basin Heath Protection Policy in particular, this is ineffective with irrelevant monitoring.

2.2 Growth

There is concern over the aggressive growth predicted in this version of the plan, particularly in view of the recent referendum results. Whilst we are currently undergoing a period of uncertainty, there is an almost unanimous reduction in projections for economic growth, at least in the short term.
Nowhere is this growth constrained in any way, although the plan can be constrained by lack of infrastructure or for preservation of the Green Belt.

2.3 Policies

These will be dealt with in the body of this document, but overall we find the language to be imprecise, monitoring to be ineffective or entirely development biased.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/579  Respondent: 8957441 / Hazel Cleasson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Fairlands

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

Inset Villages: - Whilst I am pleased the land around Fairlands Village is no longer safeguarded I am concerned that Fairlands is now to be inset from the Green Belt. Fairlands will have Green Belt on 3 sides - the fourth is the Aldershot Road. Leaving Fairlands vulnerable to future expansion and possibly effectively merging with Perry Hill Ward. "In accordance with the NPPF (para 84), any site allocations should be directed to those villages that are inset (rather than washed over) The potential development areas are identified on the basis that should exceptional circumstances warrant amending the Green Belt boundary in order to accommodate growth that could not be suitably provided elsewhere, development here would not harm the main purpose of the Green Belt. If allocated, the inset boundary surrounding the village would be extended to incorporate the site."

Infrastructure: - I object that GBC seem to be pursuing a "cart before the horse" mentality. Our roads are already at breaking point. A minor prang/accident in one area has an immediate ripple effect over many miles which invariably results in a mass gridlocking of all arterial roads. Until the issue of our road systems is resolved any increase in housing numbers will cause even greater congestion problems than we already have.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1935  Respondent: 10587585 / D M Lavender  Agent: MGA (Michael Gilfrin)

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Fairlands

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

I am instructed by my client, Mrs D M Lavender, the owner and occupier 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] to submit representations on her behalf regarding specific proposals contained in the local plan that impact upon her property. Representations have previously been submitted on her behalf in response to the Council’s SHLAA consultation, the consultation response indicating that the land comprising the residential curtilage to No.24 ts available
and suitable for future residential development. A copy of the submitted SHLAA plan identifying the site is attached hereto.

Mrs Lavender fully supports the Council’s proposals to include Fairlands as one of 14 villages to be excluded from the Green Belt with a defined settlement area boundary, as shown on the Fairlands Plan comprising part of Appendix F, extending along the west side of the Aldershot Road, to include the entire garden area to No.24 within the settlement area.

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

Attached documents:  D M Lavender.pdf (29 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4406  Respondent: 15280737 / Miller Developments (David Milloy)  Agent: The Chine Consultancy Advice Ltd (David Pugh)

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Fairlands

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

Overview

Please treat this as a written representation to the consultation on the School Travel Plan referenced above.

We (Miller Developments) are promoting a proposal for residential development on land (Hook Farm and Hunts Farm – formerly identified in the Green Belt and Countryside Plan as H8C) south of Worplesdon Primary School and the existing Fairlands community.

Our proposals would enable the delivery of the Travel Plan’s objectives / targets and secure the main Traffic Mitigation Measures recommended in the Surrey County Council (SCC) report requested by Worplesdon Parish Council (WPC), the Fairlands, Liddington Hall and Gravetts Lane Community Association (FLGCA) and Cllr Keith Witham (SCC) in January 2015.

Background

Having attended the meeting of SCC’s Planning and Regulatory Committee on 25th March 2015 when the decision was made to grant planning permission (for the construction of new 2 storey teaching block comprising 8 classrooms and extension to existing school hall following removal of two existing modular buildings; extension of playground onto existing parking area and provision of new car park) we noted that the officer’s report to the committee made reference to the objections received from local residents: “mainly on grounds of the effects of the additional traffic generated by the development exacerbating current problems of congestion and on-street parking”.

We are aware that whilst officers considered the highways / transport impact of the proposal could be mitigated through the imposition of conditions – including the School Travel Plan – Councillors asked for an informative to be added to the decision notice, formally noting that consideration is given to the provision of a controlled pedestrian crossing on the A323 Aldershot Road at Fairlands, and making clear that they support the ongoing investigation and development of this project as a potential contributor to reducing school-related traffic in the area. Securing a crossing across the A323 is also a key objective / target of the proposed Travel Plan.

We also note the Planning and Regulatory Committee’s decision, on 10th December 2014, to defer consideration of the school’s application due to one of the then proposed traffic mitigation measures no longer being available. At a subsequent meeting on 7th January 2015 between representatives of Worplesdon Parish Council (WPC), the Fairlands, Liddington Hall and Gravetts Lane Community Association (FLGCA), SCC (Highways, Planning and Property) and Cllr Keith Witham (SCC) alternative mitigation options were discussed. At this meeting it was agreed that a number of possible mitigation options should be investigated. A “Report on Traffic Mitigation Measures” was then prepared which formed part of the background papers to the subsequent decision to grant planning permission.
As the report to the committee on 25th March 2015 set out, one of the potential options was “a new vehicular access from Aldershot Road to the school via Hunts Farm or Hook Farm”, however, the aforementioned Report on Traffic Mitigation Measures made clear that, “SCC is not in control of the land adjacent to FP 447 in order for this to be developed into a road”. The report went on to confirm that:

“N.B. During this investigation SCC Property has been made aware of a potential future residential development on the property south of the school that could provide alternative access. However, this project / land is out of our control and is too early in the viability stages to be considered as a feasible mitigation measure for this school expansion.”

Consequently, it concluded that neither this nor other options to mitigate the potential increase in traffic arising from the proposed school development “are considered viable at this time”. Accordingly, paragraph 68 of the officer’s report stated that there is “little that can be realistically and reasonably done” due to “the isolated position of Fairlands”. This is despite acknowledging that the existing number of pupils at the school currently causes localised difficulties on the highway network at drop-off and pick-up times and that it is also clear that the increase in enrolment by 120 children would exacerbate the current situation. Nevertheless, the officers concluded that the school has been proactive in addressing the issues of traffic congestion and parking, especially in the preparation of the School Travel Plan and involvement with the Living Streets Programme, but there remain unresolved issues which still require a long-term solution.

**Our proposals and their alignment with the School Travel Plan**

In light of all the above, and the continuing local concerns about the impact of the school’s expansion on the existing Fairlands community, we consider that our proposals for a development at Hook Farm and Hunts Farm represent the only realistic prospect of addressing the objectives / targets in the School Travel Plan (including the informative agreed by Councillors last March) and delivering the main Traffic Mitigation Measures as set out in the report requested by WPC, FLGCA and Cllr Witham in January 2015. Given that the school (which was originally intended to accommodate 240 pupils) is increasing from 420 to 450 this coming September, with further uplifts to 540 in the coming years, the need for such measures to be implemented is ever more pressing.

As you will be aware, Guildford Borough Council (GBC) is currently preparing the next iteration of its Local Plan, ahead of a Regulation 19 consultation in June. To aid the Council’s deliberations on site allocations, we (Miller Developments) have submitted a detailed brochure for their consideration, in support of our proposals for land at Hook Farm and Hunts Farm. As this document sets out, our plans offer a unique opportunity to solve the congestion issues within Fairlands at school drop off and pickup times.

In preparing this submission, we have spoken with the School’s Headteacher, Alistair Parsons, who is also the author of the School Travel Plan. We support his endeavours to implement the plan and particularly wish to assist him in progressing Objectives 4, 5 and 6, and Target 5 relating to the delivery of these objectives. These objectives and our corresponding proposals are set out below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Plan Objective</th>
<th>Our Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open discussions with Surrey County Council or relevant planning authority for a crossing to be provided across the A323 to enable families to safely cross the A323 and enable walking and cycling to school from the Rydes Hill, Stoughton and Queen Elizabeth Park areas.</td>
<td>Our brochure explains how a new traffic light controlled junction on the A323 Aldershot Road at Gravetts Lane could provide an alternative access to the school, offering a safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists with dedicated crossing points. Vehicle speeds along the Aldershot Road would also be reduced to the benefit of highway safety. We are in discussion with SCC Highways about these proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the amount of parents, pupils and staff travelling sustainably on the journey to / from school is increased.</td>
<td>This would be achieved as a result of the vastly improved pedestrian, cycle and vehicular routes that would be enabled by our development, including the new direct access route between the A323 Aldershot Road and the Primary School (see paragraph 13 below) which would allow for separate, safe use by motorists and non-motorists alike.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open discussions with Surrey County Council or relevant planning authority for an all year round usable Pathway to be built between Wood Street Village and Fairlands Estate to allow families to cycle or walk between the two communities and to support the increased numbers of families travelling from Wood Street Village to Fairlands.

Our brochure sets out a willingness to deliver the objective for an all year round route (for cyclists and pedestrians) from Wood Street Village utilising the existing footpath that runs south to north between Hook Farm and Hunts Farm to Fairlands / the Primary School.

Target 5 of the School Travel Plan states:

“Contact Surrey County Council or relevant planning authority to discuss; installing time plates for the school Zig Zag lines, a crossing over the A323, a permanent pathway between Wood Street Village and Fairlands, regular maintenance of pathways and vegetation along the A323 by October 2016.”

We would be pleased to work constructively with the school (and SCC as the education authority) in helping to achieve this target. As paragraph 16 below makes clear, our development would enable the funding for these significant improvements, at no cost to SCC.

Meeting the aspirations of the Report on Traffic Mitigation Measures

With our proposal for a new vehicular access from Aldershot Road, across Broad Street Common, we can exceed the objectives of the School Travel Plan and put in place a long-term sustainable solution in line with the aspirations of the Report on Traffic Mitigation Measures; thereby addressing the concerns of WPC, FLGCA and others.

As the proposed new access road would require the use of land which is currently designated as Common Land, we are in active dialogue with SCC officers about this. Whilst SCC previously advised that such mitigation was not deliverable as they did not control the required privately owned land, we would ask that this opportunity is now revisited as we are prepared to make the adjacent land available for this purpose.

A long-term alternative to parking restrictions

On a related matter, we are aware that on 8th December 2015 the Guildford Local Committee considered proposals for a Parking Order to mitigate the effect of school traffic on a number of roads in Fairlands, but chose to defer making a decision until 23rd March 2016 “to allow for further discussions with local borough and county councillors and other interested parties”. We understand that whilst there are mixed views locally about the desirability of such parking orders being put in place, they are likely to be agreed next month given the increase in pupil numbers at the school this coming September. Therefore, whilst the Parking Order may be a short term answer, a better solution would result from the new access arrangements proposed as part of our development. Such an approach would allow the parking restrictions to be subsequently removed, thereby addressing the concerns of those residents who do not wish to see them put in place.

The way forward

We support the proposed School Travel Plan and would ask that SCC approves it as the relevant planning authority. However, it is clear from our recent discussions that there is no standalone funding available to support the significant measures which are required, and therefore the only realistic prospect of delivering (and exceeding) the Plan’s objectives would be by supporting a residential development at Hook Farm and Hunts Farm (with the highway improvements being funded via a Section 106 agreement required as part of the conditional permission).

Given that our proposed development would offer such significant local benefits (as outlined above) which align with the objectives of SCC, the Primary School, WPC, FLGCA and local residents, we are asking Guildford Borough Council to take these into account when reviewing which sites should be allocated for residential development in the Local Plan. We are aware of a number of sites in the Worplesdon parish (and elsewhere in the Borough) being promoted for residential development, but none of them offer the scale of highway and community benefits associated with our proposals.

In light of all the above, we would ask that the applicant (SCC), in seeking approval for the School Travel Plan, makes representations directly to GBC setting out how the objectives of the Plan could be enabled through the allocation of Hook Farm and Hunts Farm for residential development. As GBC intends to publish its draft consultation document on...
the proposed Local Plan in April, there is limited time available to promote the benefits that would flow from this potential allocation.

I will arrange for a copy of our brochure (setting out more details of our plans) to be forwarded to you in the near future.

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

**Attached documents:**
- Submission by Miller Developments on SCC Ref 2016-0005 - Worplesdon Primary School Travel Plan - final.pdf (488 KB)
- Letter from Headteacher of Worplesdon Primary School - Miller Developments.docx (1.3 MB)

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4407  **Respondent:** 15280737 / Miller Developments (David Milloy)  **Agent:** The Chine Consultancy Advice Ltd (David Pugh)

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Fairlands

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

<document attached>

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

**Attached documents:**
- 15057_Boards_FINAL_LR.pdf (9.7 MB)

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1254  **Respondent:** 15382977 / Johnathan White  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Fairlands

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

Reference 16/P/01397-Fairlands Farm

I also object to this application.

Again the land is Green Belt. The arguments in the application that there are "highly exceptional" reasons is without justification.

I object on the grounds of increased traffic & infrastructure as per my objection to the Keens Lane development and there are no exceptional circumstances to be applied to this application.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1256  **Respondent:** 15383745 / Bernard Callanan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Fairlands

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Planning Reference 16/P/01397 - Fairlands Farm

I also object to this application.

Again the land is Green Belt. The reason given for dropping the nearby Uddington Hall and Fairlands sites from the Draft Local Plan was because of the "high sensitivity Green Belt". The same should apply to the Fairlands Farm site. The arguments in the application that there are "highly exceptional" reasons has no substance and should be discounted. The community benefits are arguably greater as the development exists today than for the proposed development. To argue that Guildford does not have five years of housing supply is to disregard the Regulation 19 consultation that ends this month. The legislation cannot have intended to allow this sort of opportunism.

I also object on the grounds of increased traffic and infrastructure pressure.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1257  Respondent: 15383937 / Laurence White  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Fairlands  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Planning Reference 16/P/01397 - Fairlands Farm

I also object to this application.

Again the land is Green Belt and therefore not to be used development The arguments in the application that there are "highly exceptional" reasons cannot be justified.

I object on the grounds of increased traffic & infrastructure as per my objection to the Keens Lane development and there are no exceptional circumstances to be applied to this application.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1265  Respondent: 15384161 / Laura Dawson  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Fairlands  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Reference 16/P/01397 - Fairlands Farm

I also object to this application.

Again the land is Green Belt. The arguments in the application that there are highly exceptional” reasons is without justification.

I object on the grounds of increased traffic & infrastructure as per my objection to the Keens Lane development. This development must not be allowed to proceed.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1269  **Respondent:** 15384449 / Christine Adams  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Fairlands

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

Reference 16/P/01397 - Fairlands Farm

I also object to this application.

Again the land is Green Belt. The arguments in the application that there are "highly exceptional" reasons cannot be justified.

I object on the grounds of increased traffic & infrastructure as per my objection to the Keens Lane development and there are no exceptional circumstances to be applied to this application.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2513  **Respondent:** 15503233 / J & R Tangye  **Agent:** Harriet Richardson

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Fairlands

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

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Guildford Borough Council (GBC) is producing a new Local Plan to cover the plan period 2013 to 2033 and guide development within the borough whilst also complying with the principles and wider national policies identified within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

1.2 These representations are made as part of the Regulation 19 to the public consultation for the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

1.3 The representations relate to Land to the west and south west of Fairlands – ‘Land adjoining Fairlands, Guildford’ which was identified in the former Draft Local Plan Document as a ‘safeguarded’ site under Site Allocation 1. The site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

1.4 This statement provides a site summary and a review of Policy 2 of the borough wide strategy. It then addresses reasons why the land at Fairlands should be allocated for housing development in the Submission version of the Local Plan, covering issues such as housing requirements, the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and the questionable deliverability of large scale strategic sites that have been included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.
2. Site Summary

2.1 The land to the west and south west of Fairlands has been identified on the map below:

Image 1: Site Location plan

2.2 The land adjoining Fairlands, Guildford’ was identified in the former Draft Local Plan Document as Site Allocation 11

2.3 The site was also identified in Volume III of the Green Belt and Countryside study as providing opportunities to accommodate development without significantly compromising the purposes of the Green B. The parcels of land identified as H8-A/H8-B (former allocation 118) have a capacity of circa 500 dwellings. The site is well related to existing services such as a local service centre, a doctor’s surgery and bus routes located within Fairlands, which is a residential area in character. The site provides the opportunity for a natural extension to the residential area of Fairlands on a contained site which is surrounded by defensible boundaries and tree cover.

2.4 This site is deliverable and available now. It is within a single ownership and as it was last in agricultural and equestrian use there are no constraints to the site coming forward for residential development. The site is achievable, it is capable of being delivered within five years and is entirely viable.

2.5 Fairlands uniquely is capable of accommodating an on-site SANG to mitigate the impact of any development upon the Thames Basin Heaths. The developable area is shown edged red on Image 1 and the proposed SANG land is edged blue and hatched. We have discussed this with Natural England who have advised that this could be bespoke SANG land to support the development.

2.6 There is an existing access to Littlefield Manor and the land shown hatched brown on Image 1 will be used as a principle access road to the development land from the A323 Aldershot Road.

2.7 Fairlands is a sustainable settlement, with a number of services including a school, doctor’s surgery, post office, community centre and shops. Fairlands is located just 2 miles from Guildford, providing access to a range of quality services and infrastructure. It is therefore a wholly sustainable location for development.

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

Attached documents: 2016-07-15 written reps to Proposed Submission Local Plan HR FINAL.pdf (453 KB)

Total records: 13.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Former Wisley Airfield
### Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2779</th>
<th>Respondent: 8597025 / Mr Peter Bennett-Davies</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Former Wisley Airfield</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>

4) Additional Objection

I object to the continued inclusion in the Local Plan of site A35 (land at the former Wisley Airfield, now known as Three Farm Meadows) Wisley Property Investments Ltd’s outline planning application for development of 2,100 dwellings on Site A35 was unanimously rejected by GBC’s Planning Committee in April 2016, after some 14 months of consideration (and various extensions and amendments). Serious concerns about this site and the proposals were raised by a broad number of authoritative sources across the UK, including Highways England, Surrey County Council, Thames Water, National Air Traffic Services and the Environment Agency.

It is very clear indeed to me that development along the lines proposed in the Draft Local Plan 2016 is completely unsustainable and a betrayal of the Green Belt concept. I, together with many residents do recognize the need for a limited amount of additional housing, but not on the scale set down in the Draft Local Plan. Such homes building, represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

There is no alternative for Guildford Council but to

1) investigate the errors in the West Surrey SHMA which if found to be correct will bring a significant drop in the number of homes required to 2033.
2) amend the Local Plan to make greater use of brownfield/previously used land rather than target rural villages for removal from their current ‘washed over’ Green Belt status.
3) identify credible, evidence-based plans for sustainable development sites in 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: pslp173/487</th>
<th>Respondent: 8894977 / Janet Burgess</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Former Wisley Airfield</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>

2. I OBJECT to the proposed development on the former Wisley Airfield. Despite further proposed amendments (as part of the current appeal) they do not alter the fact that this is a wholly inappropriate development for this site the impact, of which, will be devastating for the surrounding communities in, and outside, the borough. The proposed development cannot possibly meet true sustainability objectives.

3. Despite proposed changes to the Local Plan, I OBJECT to what I see as disproportionate development. The local area (including the Horsleys, Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill Farm and Ripley/Send/Burnt Common) appears to be taking a major proportion of the borough's total proposed housing development. The area does not have the infrastructure (road, rail, schools, medical facilities, sewage systems, etc.) to support such development numbers. The sheer volume of such developments (in the rural/semi-rural east of the borough), combined with proposals in other local authorities, will only add to the gradual coalescence of the London suburbs with towns, villages and other settlements to the south west of the capital.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4262</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 11149217 / Royal Horticultural Society (Sir or Madam)</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong> Montagu Evans LLP (Montagu Evans)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Former Wisley Airfield</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>&lt;See attachments&gt;</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>[Wisley Village Inset.pdf](137 KB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/700</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15236449 / Peter Gelardi</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Former Wisley Airfield</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 change of site boundaries as these are not identified correctly on the plan (Appendix H p16)</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: PSLPA16/4135</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15254049 / Strutt &amp; Parker LLP (John Smith)</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Former Wisley Airfield</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><strong>RE:</strong> Land to the North of Ockham Lane, Ockham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guildford Borough Council Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites – Regulation 19 Consultation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These representations have been prepared on behalf of our client, Mr Woolfgang and Mrs Paula Matthews, in relation to the land North of Ockham Lane, Ockham (hereafter referred to as ‘The Site’) which lies within Mr &amp; Mrs Matthews’ ownership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These representations have been prepared in response to the Guildford Borough Council Proposed Submission Local Plan. Mr &amp; Mrs Matthews seeks to engage positively and constructively in the plan-making process in Guildford Borough. In these representations we comment on the following matters:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The requirement to objectively assess new housing needs, and the need to review the Guildford Green Belt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The A35 strategic proposals; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The potential for a standalone housing allocation at Ockham Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr & Mrs Matthew’s land ownership is identified on the attached land ownership map at Appendix A. The site is bounded to the west by Hatch Lane, beyond which is residential land; to the east by a driveway leading to a dwellinghouse and farm buildings; and to the north by a farm beyond the existing boundary.

The site is situated in fairly close proximity to Guildford town centre, and benefits from good railway links, with Effingham Junction Train Station located just over 2 miles from the site providing a direct service to London Waterloo and Guildford stations. It is also situated just over one mile from the A3 via car.

Housing Need and the Green Belt

The submission is made on the basis of broad support for the Council in preparing a revised Local Plan which has been necessary in order to meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) should positively seek opportunities to meet the objectively assessed development needs of their area. There are potentially significant implications for the Council if it does not have an up-to-date Local Plan, as it will become more susceptible to speculative planning applications. As highlighted by the Housing and Planning Bill, local authorities are required to have a Local Plan in force by March 2017; otherwise applicants will be able to submit planning applications directly to the Secretary of State for determination, and in addition the Secretary of State will have the power to prepare Local Plans for these LPAs.

In accordance with the NPPF and NPPG requirements the Council, in preparing its Local Plan, must first identify the objectively assessed need for the local area. In this regard, Mr & Mrs Matthews support the Council’s intention to identify a plan to deliver what it considers to be its current objectively assessed local need of 693 homes per annum. As set out within the NPPG ‘Household projections published by the Department for Communities and Local Government should provide the starting point estimate of overall housing need’ [Reference ID: 2a-015-20140306]. We initially note that the recently released (July 2016) 2014-based DCLG Household Projections highlights a national increase to 214,000 households per annum over the period from 2012 to 2037, up from 210,000 in the 2012 projection. Furthermore, the most recent 2014-based household projections for Guildford now average 570 per annum in the plan period 2013 – 2033, compared with the demographic need in the SHMA, derived from the 2012-based household projections of 517 per annum in this period.

In addition, it is significant that the London Plan (2015) indicates that a minimum of 42,000 dwellings per annum is to be met in Greater London, although the 2013 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identifies a need for 49,000 (2015-2036) per annum. Pertinently, the Inspector in finding the FALP sound, called for wider engagement with local planning authorities beyond the GLA’s boundaries (which could include Guildford for example), in accommodating the Capital’s growth.

In summary, we note there remains robust and increasing need for housing within the region but acknowledge that Guildford as a Borough is heavily constrained by Green Belt, particularly within the eastern part of the Borough. Green Belt boundaries should only be reviewed in exceptional circumstances by LPAs when reviewing Local Plans, as established at Paragraph 83 of the NPPF and in this respect Mr & Mrs Matthews welcomes the Council’s commitment to review Green Belt boundaries in recognition of the Council’s consideration of its identified housing need. Accordingly, we would highlight our support for the proposed removal of The Site from the Green Belt, as proposed within the draft Policies Map.

Comments on Policy A35– Wisley Airfield

We would like to take this opportunity to confirm our support for this draft allocation, which provides the strategic level of growth required to make a significant contribution to the Council’s proposed housing targets, as well as providing associated infrastructure to accommodate this level of development.

We welcome the positive and pro-active approach taken by the Council to planning to meet what it considers to be its development needs, as required by the NPPF.

Land to the north of Ockham Lane– Standalone Allocation
Notwithstanding the above, we are also promoting The Site as a standalone allocation.

Firstly, we note that The Site has now been included within the Wisley Airfield Allocation which confirms that the Council considers The Site can perform a housing delivery function. However, the site is also considered suitable for allocation for housing in its own right, irrespective of the wider proposals at Wisley Airfield, for the following reasons:

- As recognised by the Sustainability Appraisal for the submission draft Local Plan, the wider site for Policy A35 performs well as a location for growth, noting that it avoids the need to place pressure on landscapes designated as being of larger-than-local importance or the most sensitive Green. In this respect, we note that the site (located within area C18 of the Green Belt and Countryside Study by Pegasus Planning Group in 2013), was considered to meet only two of the Green Belt purposes set out at Paragraph 89 of the NPPF.

- The Green Belt and Countryside Study highlights that Potential Development Areas have been identified as potentially suitable to accommodate new development, located to the north of Ockham (sites C18-A and C18-B) which is in close proximity to The Site. Whilst these two land parcels at sites C18-A and C18-B do not include The Site, we would highlight that they share very similar characteristics with it, in terms of capacity, location to the north of Ockham Lane and containment by existing buildings, and with very similar access to local services and transport links. In this respect, the site would be capable of delivering up to 50 dwellings as part of a suitable extension to the existing settlement at Ockham, which features a number of existing services, and access to the strategic road network, with the A3 and M25 in close proximity. The development could make a significant contribution to the Council’s housing requirements (potentially including affordable housing requirements), and make financial contributions to the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace. Any development would be high quality, and would be designed sensitively with due regard to the proximity to the nearby Conservation Area.

- As identified by the assessment of the Potential Creation of a New Settlement at Wisley Airfield, the proposed Wisley Airfield site would provide the opportunities to deliver permanent and defensible Green Belt boundaries, including at The Site adjoining Ockham, in accordance with NPPF. In addition, the Green Belt and Countryside Study also confirms that land parcel C18 provides an opportunity to accommodate appropriate development without significantly compromising the purposes of the Green Belt.

- We note the airfield had been subject to a planning application, which was refused in April 2016 and which The Site did not form part of (LPA ref: 15/P/00012). However, the comments within the assessment of the ‘Potential Creation of a New Settlement at Wisley Airfield’ identifies that the southern parts of the draft A35 allocation, within which The Site is located, are the least environmentally sensitive.

- The site fronts onto Ockham Lane so there are opportunities for provision of a suitable access. The site is entirely within Flood Zone 1 so is appropriate in flood risk terms.

- The site is deliverable and developable in the short, medium, or long term.

In summary we welcome the inclusion of draft allocation for Policy A35 and removal from the Green Belt, for which Mr & Mrs Matthews’s land is included. However, for the reasons set out in this letter it is considered that Mr & Mrs Matthews’ site to the north of Ockham Lane is also suitable for an allocation in its own right and should be considered on this basis.

Thank you once again for the opportunity to respond to the Council’s Proposed Submission Local Plan consultation exercise. We would be very grateful for confirmation that these representations have been received.

Mr & Mrs Matthews respectfully requests that the Council notifies Strutt & Parker, on its behalf, of the future arrangements for the Examination of the Local Plan. Moreover, Mr & Mrs Matthews wishes to take this opportunity to formally request the right to appear at all stages of the Examination in Public.

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

Attached documents: rsgdgd.png (71 KB)
Total records: 5.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4191  Respondent: 8563233 / Shere Parish Council (Joy Millett)  Agent:

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

The term ‘Identified Boundary of the Village’ is misleading, as it fails to clarify the significance for infill development

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/672  Respondent: 15253409 / Rupert and Sara Trevelyan  Agent:

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

Policy P2

We support proposed Policy P2 which allows limited infilling in the Green Belt within the identified settlement boundaries of villages including Gomshall.

Paragraph 84 of the NPPF states:

"When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary".

Gomshall is a sustainable location, given its existing access to sustainable public transport (buses and railway station) and a number of local services within the village including a village hall, public houses and local shops. It is considered that Policy P2 which allows for infill development within the villages washed over by the Green Belt is in accordance with Paragraph 84, as it will direct development to sustainable locations, such as Gomshall.

We note that the Council has provided a definition of limited infilling in paragraph 4.3.26, which provides three circumstances which would be defined as limited infilling:

- Development of a small gap in an otherwise continuous built-up frontage;
- Small-scale redevelopment of existing properties within a built-up frontage; and
- The infilling of small gaps within built development.

We suggest that the third criteria is reworded to read 'the infilling of small gaps within the identified settlement boundary'. The re-wording of this policy would confirm that development within the settlement boundary is acceptable in principle and would be in accordance with the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development, given that Gomshall village is a sustainable location for development.
Gomshall Proposals Map

We support the amendments to the proposals map for Gomshall and the amended identified boundary for the village which now includes the whole of the residential curtilage of Weybrook. It is considered that the proposed boundary is in accordance with paragraph 85 of the NPPF which states that when defining boundaries, local planning authorities should define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.

As noted above, the site is in a highly sustainable location, proximate to services and facilities within Gomshall and as such it is considered to be an appropriate location for small-scale, residential development within the identified settlement boundary. The large undeveloped area to the rear of the existing dwelling offers an opportunity to provide infill, residential development in a sustainable location within the borough.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/676  Respondent: 15253409 / Rupert and Sara Trevelyan  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Gomshall

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

The whole village of Gomshall is washed over by the Green Belt, however, we consider that the land to the rear of Weybrook is suitable for development and does not meet the five purposes of the Green Belt set out in paragraph 80 of the NPPF:

• to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
• to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
• to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
• to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
• to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

We set out our justification for the suitability of the site for development below.

Firstly, the site does not check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. Gomshall lies around 10 km to the south-east of Guildford and is therefore distinct from large built-up area. The site itself is to the north-east of Gomshall, beyond which is open countryside with some agricultural premises. The land to the rear of Weybrook does not check the unrestricted sprawl of a large built-up area and therefore does not meet the first purpose of the Green Belt.

Secondly, Gomshall remains distinct from the surrounding villages of Shere (to the west) and Peaslake (to the south). As noted above, to the north of the site is open countryside and there are no neighbouring towns for some distance, as such it is not considered that the site meets the second purpose of the Green Belt.

Thirdly, the Green Belt seeks to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. The site is within the residential curtilage of Weybrook, to the rear of the Tillings cafe/restaurant and now within the proposed settlement boundary for Gomshall. The site is not a countryside location and therefore it is not considered that the site meets the third purpose of the Green Belt.

Fourthly, it is the purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and character of historic towns. The Council has not specifically noted the historic character of Gomshall, the village has not been designated as conservation area and as such it is not considered that the Green Belt in this location fulfils this purpose of the Green Belt.

Fifthly, the Green Belt should assist in urban regeneration by the recycling of derelict and other land. Given the scale of the site it is considered that any development will meet a need for housing within the rural area of the borough, close of
public transport
links. The site is not of sufficient scale to impact the regeneration of urban sites within the borough.

We would be grateful for written confirmation that these representations have been received and duly made, as part of this consultation exercise. We would be happy to discuss proposals for residential development at Weybrook, Gomshall in due course.

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: Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Town Centre
## Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp173/450</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong></th>
<th>8907137 / Jennifer A. Milligan</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Town Centre</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>Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the removal of sites A4, Telephone Exchange and A18, Guildford College as they would provide 200 homes in a sustainable location and 100 homes at A33 Broadford Business Park.</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>pslp173/501</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong></th>
<th>17425569 / Jack Cross</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Town Centre</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>Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to removal of sites A4, Telephone Exchange and A18, Guildford College as they would provide 200 homes in sustainable location, and 100 homes at A33, Broadford Business Park.</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>

Total records: 2.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Urban Area
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/718  Respondent: 8570273 / Fiona Curtis  Agent: Fiona Curtis

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Urban Area

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

The maps have different ratios which can be rather misleading in terms of comparing one with another.

The map for Compton suggests that the dotted pink line is the boundary line for the village when in fact this is just the village settlement area. The wider village includes Priorsfield Road and The Avenue and Down Lane and parts of New Pond Road and the Hog's Back and Blackwell Farm, all of which are missing. Common land should ideally be marked up. Blackwell Farm is currently shown on a map called 'Guildford Urban' which of course does not exist and hence this could be misleading.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2176  Respondent: 8573793 / Harry Eve  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Urban Area

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

Appendix H Maps

194. The introduction of a "Village Boundary" to an area described as "Horsleys - East Horsley (south)" is an unacceptable weakening of planning restrictions in this gateway to the It includes two areas of countryside - Wellington Meadow which is managed as a wildflower meadow and known for its special biodiversity - and private chalk grassland fields on the south-western side. These fields belong to residents of Chalk Lane and, in some cases, the boundary between field and garden is no longer evident on the map. At least one of these fields, under favourable management, has nine species of orchid recorded and several rare invertebrate species. The invertebrate species include at least two that are not recorded at The Sheepleas SSSI close by as far as I am aware. A colony of the Small Blue butterfly, which is a Surrey Biodversity Action Plan species,persists in one these fields but became extinct on the SSSI many years ago. The Greater Butterfly Orchid, Platanthera chlorantha, reaches population densities that are unlikely to be achieved on the publicly accessible Sheepleas SSSI.

196. I can see no justification for including these areas within the new designation of "Village Boundary" - the purpose of which is to encourage "limited infilling" in the Green Belt.

197. One of the roads within the "Village Boundary" is Chalk Lane - an ancient sunken drove road now surfaced as a single lane It is tree-lined with the branches meeting over the lane and creating a picturesque "green tunnel" that can a lso serve as a corridor for the movement of dormice (which move in the tree canopy). Traffic using this lane has to pass oncoming vehicles by using residents' driveways. Adding further residences that would use this lane makes no sense whatsoever.

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

Attached documents:
This refers to a map disassociated with this document and fails to provide a version number, location or name of the file. There are, at least, 220 separate documents associated with this plan. There should be an electronic link to this map. Either within the main document, or leading to a website where it can be found (see above in section 4).

The ‘Green Belt Boundary’ on the assumed map, at Local Plan Appendix 7, fails to identify the ‘prime’ boundary of Guildford Town itself. By implication there is no ‘Green Belt boundary’ around the Guildford urban area. Thus making this map incomplete and unsound.

The base map fails to identify with any accuracy where these lines are, and fails to provide hyperlinks to the associated Policies (areas) identified on the map. Reference A25 bears no resemblance to Sites C1 and C2 on the Green Belt Traffic Light map provided at Reg. 18.

The map fails to identify the Site of Archeological Interest behind Pimm’s Cottages, Burpham Lane in Burpham, which is a registered historic site and also designated Local Green Space Land in the Burpham Neighbourhood Plan.

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

Attached documents:

We write on behalf of our client, Ashill Land Ltd, to submit representations to the draft Local Plan (submission version) to support residential development at the site at Keens Lane/Tangley Lane, Worplesdon. A site location plan identifying the land is enclosed at Appendix A.

Ashill has previously made representations to draft Local Plan consultations including the Issues and Options document (Autumn 2013) and draft Local Plan (Summer 2014). These representations support the release of the land from the Green Belt and the allocation for residential development to contribute towards the Council’s strategic housing land allocation. Our representations to the draft Local Plan (submission version) are detailed within the following sections of this submission.

In addition to the above, Ashill have engaged with Guildford Borough Council (GBC) through pre-applications over the last year and the development of land at Keens Lane and Tangle Lane Worpleston. In addition, Surrey County Council (SCC) has been consulted with regards to highways. Both GBC and SCC have been supportive for development of the site for housing.

Background to the Site

The site is 5.25 ha in size and is currently used as arable farming land. Built development on site comprises horse stables and agricultural buildings which are ancillary use. The boundaries of the site to the north and east are characterised by existing hedgerows and a bridleway. Adjacent to Keens Lane and Tangle Lane are residential areas which form part of Guildford Urban area. Residential dwellings are located on Keens Lane and Tangle Lane in the south west corner of the site. The site is located at the edge of the Guildford Urban Area to the north west of the town centre. It lies to the north of...
Keens Lane and is in close proximity to Gravetts Lane and the A322 which is approximately 200m away. To the north of the site is open farmland and the settlement of Worplesdon and to the north-east is Whitmoor Common which forms part of the Thames Basin Heath SPA. To the east and south of the site are existing residential areas. To the west is residential dwellings and agricultural land. The site is adjoined by development on the east, south and west and partially to the north. It is within short walking distance of a range of local amenities and services on Worplesdon Road approximately 450m away. Bus stops are located on Worplesdon Road and Cumberland Avenue (route 26, 27, 28 and 91) and are located within approximately 400m in walking distance of the site. This connects the site to Guildford town centre and the wider employment, leisure and retail services.

Summary of Representations and Recommendations

We submit these representations on behalf of Ashill Land Ltd, with particular interest to their site at Keens Lane, Tangley Lane at Worplesdon. The representation is submitted in support of residential development at this site for the following reasons:

1. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identifies a low Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) per annum for the Guildford area;
2. The Land Availability Assessment (LAA) confirms the housing target over the plan period and per annum for Guildford which uses the base OAN but is low given the deficit against housing need;
3. The 5 year housing land supply relies on a number of extant planning permissions to be delivered within the period to meet the housing need;
4. The overall housing targets included within draft policy S2 ‘Borough Wide Strategy’ need to reflect the housing need provided within the evidence base;
5. The site has been classified as ‘medium sensitivity’ in the Green Belt Review and thus appropriate for release for development.
6. The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary and is suitable and sustainable site for housing development.
7. The site is the only medium sensitive site in the Green Belt Review in the Guildford Urban Area.
8. The site is suitable and deliverable to offer a significant amount of new housing to contribute towards the council’s housing need within the first 5 year period.
9. We support the requirements of the allocation (A22) but the residential development can be maximised to a minimum of 150 dwellings.
10. We support the requirements of the allocation (A22) to incorporate a residential care home to be provided within the 400m Thames Basin Heaths SPA buffer.
11. We request that the opportunity for self-build plots is removed from the allocation (A22) as there is little evidence to support this requirement.

The representations, on behalf of our client, to the draft Local Plan (submission version) with regards to the above are set out in the following paragraphs.

Housing Numbers and Evidence Base

**SHMA June 2016**

The West Surrey SHMA (June 2016) provides an evidence base for the housing policies and targets included within the draft Local Plan and identifies the OAN. The SHMA covers the boroughs of Guildford, Waverley and Woking. The NPPF highlights the Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA as a key piece of evidence in determining housing needs. Paragraph 159 in the Framework outlines that this should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures which the local population is likely to need over the plan period that:

- Meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change;
- Addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community; and
- Caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand.
The SHMA identifies across the housing market area based on the ONS 2012-based SNPP that there is a need to deliver 1,352 dwellings per annum. Specifically within Guildford there is an OAN for 517 dwellings per annum for the plan period between 2013 – 2033. Taking into account further adjustments such as economic growth, affordability and student growth, the OAN for Guildford has been increased to 693 dwellings per annum. It should be noted that this projection provides a starting point for housing need and is a minimum requirement.

The identified OAN is low for the Guildford area given the factors assessed within the SHMA, specifically with regards to the forecasted population increase which has been identified to increase by 15% by 2033 in the borough and the significant need for Guildford to increase housing to support the growing economy. Therefore the housing target prescribed in Policy H1 ‘Homes for All’ should be reviewed in light of the above and increased substantially to reflect the current need and should be set as a minimum requirement.

The OAN highlights the baseline which is considered in the Strategic LAA and the Five Year Housing Land Supply, the analysis with regards to Land at Keens Lane, Tangle Lane is detailed within the following paragraphs.

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment May 2014

Guildford Borough Council published their Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in May 2014 noting an overall target of 13,240 dwellings over the proposed plan period. The total figures of 13,420 equates to 652 dwellings per annum. The draft Local Plan cited a 5 year deliverable figure of 1,394 dwellings over the plan period which equated to 279 dwellings per annum. This was however; considerably lower than the 652 dwellings per annum projected by the SHLAA published in May 2014. As part of the evidence base for the current draft Local Plan, the SHLAA has been updated to a LAA to incorporate a number of factors which are detailed within the following paragraphs.

Land Availability Assessment May 2016

As part of the evidence base for the Local Plan (proposed submission), a Land Availability Assessment (LAA) has been published (May 2016). This provides evidence to support the ‘draft Local Plan Policy S2’ which identifies the provision of 13,860 dwellings over the plan period. This equates to 15,116 (net) taking into consideration those sites which currently have achieved planning permission. The overall provision from the 2014 figures has increased by 412 dwellings following an update to the LAA. This increase is low given the identified factors and deficit of required housing within the borough.

This LAA supersedes the SHLAA (2014) and has identified sites by the following:

- Sites and broad locations with potential for development for housing and economic development over the plan period;
- Assessment of the development potential; and
- Assessment of their suitability for development and the likelihood of development coming forward.

The LAA notes that planning permissions were granted for no significant strategic sites and of only 20 or more dwellings. This highlights the low level of both consent and delivery and the inability to meet the current housing need within the borough. Therefore, the current low level of delivery contributes towards the overall deficit within the borough and the housing target prescribed in draft policy S2 ‘Borough Wide Strategy’ should be increased to allow more homes to be delivered over the plan period and meet the OAN.

It should be noted that in the borough over 1,471 dwellings have planning permission but have not yet been built (as of February 2016), this highlights a low level of deliverability of permissions within the borough. These generally include smaller sites and the site at Ash and Tongham (398 dwellings 12/P/01973), of which conditions are being discharged for implementation. Of these the Council anticipate that only 1,408 dwellings will be delivered in the next 5 years. The council have discounted the rest and anticipate these to be delivered in the period of 11 – 15 years. It should be noted that there is a reliance on historic permissions to be delivered in the plan period, particularly within the first 5 years. We promote greater flexibility in the draft policy S2 ‘Borough Wide Strategy’ to ensure that a higher number of dwellings can be delivered over the plan period.

Five Year Housing Land Supply
The LAA confirms that the first five years of the plan that 3,583 dwellings will be delivered. This equates to 717 dwellings (net) per annum. The council have set targets for each of the years within the 5 year period from 2018 – 2023 for between 500 - 700 new dwellings per annum. It is noted that the housing numbers takes account and relies on the deliverability of a number of extant permissions. This totals 1031 dwellings over the 5 year period.

It should be noted that given the undersupply of housing during the current plan period during the first five years of the plan there will still be an overall cumulative deficit of – 912 dwellings. Furthermore, of the total 5 year housing land supply, 1,342 have already been granted planning permission but have not yet started on site. Therefore there is a reliance on the extant permissions to be implemented and delivered. The deliverability and viability of these sites and their inclusion within the 5 year housing land supply can be questioned and ultimately highlights that the 5 year land supply targets per year are low and should be increased. This follows a similar trend to the old SHLAA (May 2014) and is highlighted by the minor increase in the target from 652 to 717 dwellings to be delivered within the first 5 years per annum. This equates to a 9.9% increase in provision which is low when considered against the current poor delivery of housing and deficit In Guildford.

In summary, the council could not demonstrate an adequate 5 year housing land supply with the SHLAA (May 2014). Although there has been an update to this by way of the LAA (May 2016) and SHMA, there is still a significant shortfall and net additional dwellings required which has been confirmed through the analysis of the figures above. Therefore, there is a need to increase the provision per annum within the first 5 years by at least 20%, this is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework which states that local planning authorities should “identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years’ worth of housing against their housing requirements” plus a buffer of 5 per cent, or 20 per cent where there has been a record of persistent under delivery. This should further be reflected in draft Policy H1 ‘Homes for All’ and the housing provision increased.

Land at Keens Lane/Tangley Lane, Worplesdon

The site is assessed within the LAA as a proposed extension to an urban area which is currently within Green Belt. The assessment confirms that the provision of new homes at this site would contribute towards meeting the housing numbers in the Local Plan and contribute towards achieving sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. We fully support these conclusions of the LAA. In addition, it is identified that the provision of a nursing or residential care home (C2) would help meet the need for such accommodation within the borough. The LAA concludes that this site is available for development and development for residential dwellings and a care home can be realistically delivered within 5 years. Therefore, the subject site of these representations is deemed to be suitable, available and achievable to contribute towards the housing need within the borough. This is fully supported by GBC and our client.

Recommendation of amendments to Draft Policy S2 ‘Borough Wide Strategy’

Policy S2 ‘Borough Wide Strategy’ states that “during the plan period (2013 – 2033), we will make provision for 13,860 new homes, 37,200 – 47,200 sq m of office and research and development (B1a and b) floorspace and 4.7 – 5.3 hectares of industrial (B1c, B2 and B8) employment land to help meet the needs for new homes, support the economy and supply 3,200 additional B class jobs”.

The annual housing targets drafted within this policy are detailed below:

(see attachment)

Following a detailed review of the evidence base to support draft Policy S2 ‘Borough Wide Strategy’ we propose the following amendments to the draft text and the annual housing targets:

“During the plan period (2013 – 2033), we will make provision for a minimum of 13,860 new homes, 37,200 – 47,200 sq m of office and research and development (B1a and b) floorspace and 4.7 – 5.3 hectares of industrial (B1c, B2 and B8) employment land to help meet the needs for new homes, support the economy and supply 3,200 additional B class jobs”.

Annual Housing Target (minimum)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Housing Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Housing Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018/2019</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>2026/2027</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>2027/2028</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>2028/2029</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021/2022</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>2029/2030</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022/2023</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>2030/2031</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023/2024</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>2031/2032</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024/2025</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>2032/2033</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025/2026</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Release of the Green Belt for Development**

*Background to the Green Belt Review 2014*

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that the fundamental role of Green Belts is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, identifying the essential characteristics of Green Belts as their openness and their permanence.

The NPPF states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances such as through the preparation or review of a Local Plan. Paragraph 83 details that when reviewing green belt boundaries, local authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. Furthermore, the NPPF advises that local authorities should channel development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary.

A Green Belt review was undertaken by Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Guildford Borough Council in February 2013 and updated in 2014 to positively plan for the release of land to meet the identified housing need. This forms part of the evidence base of the draft Local Plan and supports the proposed site allocations. The Borough was categorised into various land parcels. Paragraph 84 of the NPPF advises that when defining boundaries of the Green Belt, local authorities should:

- Ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development;
- Not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open;
- Where necessary, identify in their plans areas of ‘safeguarded land’ between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period;
- Make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development;
- Satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period; and
- Define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.

The Green Belt review assessed a number of sites across the Borough for potential development sites to yield up to 9,000 dwellings over the plan period. This review tested environmental constraints, sustainability and accessibility of various
sites. Therefore it is considered necessary to release appropriate Green Belt land for housing and we support the release of the site which is subject to these representations.

Release of Land at Keens Lane/Tangley Lane, Worplesdon from the Green Belt

The site at Keens Lane and Tangley Lane formed part of the potential development area defined as J3. J3 includes the site specifically and a wider area to the north of the site. The Green Belt review confirms opportunities to accommodate appropriate development at the site without significantly comprising the purposes of the Green Belt. This wider site is highlighted on the accompanying ‘Potential Development Areas surrounding Urban Areas and Villages Plan’ as a ‘potential development area surrounding an urban area’. Furthermore Appendix 2 of the Green Belt review details the sensitivity assessment in terms of Green Belt purposes of the identified sites across the Borough.

Land at Keens Lane/Tangley Lane is identified as a ‘medium sensitivity site’ on the urban edge of Guildford. It should be noted that the parcel that this site falls into is the only medium sensitivity parcel immediately surrounding the Guildford Urban Area. The council have been advised by the Green Belt review to guide development to those sites which are ‘low sensitivity’ and ‘medium sensitivity’. It is therefore considered to be the most sustainable Green Belt release within the Borough.

We therefore support the release of Land at Keens Lane/Tangley Lane from the Green Belt to deliver housing considering its location on the edge of the urban settlement and medium classification; all other sites in Worplesdon have been assessed as high sensitivity and inappropriate to release, therefore our site is the only site identified.

Site Allocation

Worplesdon

The land north of Keens Lane is identified in the draft Local Plan (submission version) to deliver circa 150 high quality new homes and a 60 bed care home. A number of factors support this proposal which accord with paragraph 14 and paragraph 85 and 89 of the NPPF regarding sustainability and the boundaries of Green Belt land. This includes;

1. The sustainable location of the site on the northern edge of the Guildford Urban Area including its close proximity to local amenities including local shops, employment opportunities and education facilities;
2. There are no environmental constraints on the site regarding flooding and development is restricted within the 400m buffer of the SPA to the 60 bed care home is proposed. This is deemed an acceptable use within the buffer of the SPA;
3. Ecological appraisals have been undertaken for the site and have confirmed future development would not cause any significant ecological impact on the conservation status of wildlife and habitats;
4. The development of the site will not impinge on the five tests of the Green Belt as set out in paragraph 89 of the NPPF;
5. The site offers the opportunity to provide high quality residential dwellings and contribute to the housing supply;
6. There is an existing natural and defensible boundary located on the northern part of the site which would protect the Green Belt to the north;
7. The future residents that will occupy the dwellings will enhance the localised economy;
8. The proposed vehicle and pedestrian access routes are sustainable and will not have a detrimental impact on the existing highways network; and
9. The site provides a natural extension to the Guildford Urban Area.

It can therefore be concluded that the site provides a sustainable opportunity to contribute towards housing need within Guildford. The site is a natural extension to Guildford Urban Area and has the capacity to bring forward a significant number of high quality dwellings and care home and ultimately contribute to the housing supply.

This is further supported by Guildford Borough Council who have promoted the site for housing within the ‘Strategy and Sites’ allocation draft policy document in September 2014 and the site was deemed appropriate for development within the Green Belt Review. Therefore the proposal is in accordance with paragraph 14 and paragraph 89 of the NPPF to meet longer-term sustainable development needs within the Borough.
Details of the Allocation (A22 ‘Land north of Keens Lane’)

The detailed allocation and Policy ‘A22 ‘Land North of Keens Lane, Guildford’ confirms that the site is allocated for approximately 140 homes (C3) and a care home (C2) with approximately 60 beds. In addition, a number of the requirements regarding environmental constraints are detailed including, the distance of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. Whilst we generally support the allocation at the site we believe there is capacity to accommodate a minimum of 150 homes and a 60 bed care home given the surrounding residential context and the location on the edge of the urban area. Furthermore, as detailed above this site is the most sustainable for delivering housing within the first 5 years of the plan period and therefore, the draft policy should maximise on this.

In addition, given the low OAN identified in the SHMA and subsequent housing target per annum which forms part of the 5 year housing land supply, it has been confirmed that this site is viable, suitable and deliverable for housing development and therefore its capacity should be maximised within the draft local plan. The allocation notes an opportunity to provide self-build plots; however, no further justification is given within the draft local plan to support this. We note that the SHMA identifies a very low level of interest in self-build plots in the Borough and there is currently not a register publically available. Furthermore, the LAA (2016) confirms and identifies four strategic development sites to require the inclusion of self-build plots, these include the following:

- Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane, Guildford (LAA site 46)
- Blackwell Farm, Hogs Back, Guildford (LAA site 311)
- Land at former Wisley airfield, Ockham (LAA site 53 and 54)
- Land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford (LAA site 368)

Land at Keens Lane and Tangley Lane should therefore not include the requirement to provide these plots within future housing development without adequate justification. Whilst the principle of self-build plots is supported by our client, there are implications that this requirement could incur on this specific site including; maximising the number of dwellings delivered, lack of a coherent design approach and the deliverability and viability of completing the future development within the defined plan period of 5 years. We would therefore recommend that this requirement is removed from the allocation.

We note that the subject site of these representations is identified to incorporate development of a residential care/nursing home (C2) for 60 beds and this is considered to be delivered within the first 5 years of the adoption of the Local Plan. We support this allocation and the requirement for this to be located within the 400m Thames Basin SPA buffer zone.

Proposed amendments to draft site allocation (A22 ‘Land north of Keens Lane’)

Following a detailed review of the evidence base to support draft site allocation (A22 ‘Land north of Keens Lane’ we propose the following amendments to the draft text:

“The site is allocated for a minimum of 150 homes (C3) and a care home (C2) with approximately 60 beds”.

In addition the ‘self-build plots’ should be removed from the allocation ‘opportunities’.

We are generally in support of the plan and its attempt to achieve greater housing delivery, however the suggested alterations would support GBC to ensure that that the housing targets are delivered. Furthermore, through engagement with GBC and SCC, it is clear that there is support for this site to come forward in the immediate term for housing.

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

Attached documents:  attachment 1234.doc (39 KB)
Apart from exceptional circumstances which should be considered on a site by site bases being assessed against the purposes of the Green Belts view NPPF ss 80, no consideration has been given as to why the existing Green Belt boundaries are not capable of enduring beyond the plan period.

The inclusion of Gosden Hill Farm in the Guildford Urban Area undoubtedly extends the sprawl of Guildford. A58 is only separated from A25 by Nutbourne Fruit Farm, the dual carriage A3 and [unclear text], and from a43 by A247 Clandon Road and the horses along it. Virtually the whole of the land from A43 through Ripley to the gates of Ockham Park are developed apart from a small amount od land between Kiln Lane and Blore Heath off the B2215.

The development on A48 effectively extends the sprawl of the large built up area of Guildford to Ripley, Clandon and Send.

In Redhill Aerodrome [2015] 1 P&CR 3, Sullivan LJ said that 'far from there being any indication that placing the presumption in favour of sustainable development at the heart of the framework is intended to effect a change in Green Belt policy, there is a clear statement [in footnote 9] to the contrary.'

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3871</th>
<th>Respondent: 8839041 / Jon Maslin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Urban Area</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>

**ABSENCE OF POLICY ON RIVER WEY**

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

- It protects or improves the special character of the River Wey and the Guildford and Godalming Navigations, in particular their visual, setting, amenities, ecological value, architectural and historic interest;
- The special character of the landscape and townscape in the corridor is protected or improved;
- Views both within and from the corridor which contribute to this special character are protected or improved;
- Where appropriate, public access is provided to and along the River and the Navigations.
- The Nature Conservation value of the site is protected or improved.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/253</th>
<th>Respondent: 10281569 / Alison Sutherland</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Urban Area</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>
Keens Lane is currently in the Green Belt but the draft plan moves the urban boundary to exclude it from the green belt. I am extremely concerned about this for a number of practical reasons - not to mention the enormous impact it will have on the environment and the wellbeing of those who live here and enjoy the countryside and all its benefits.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1735</th>
<th>Respondent: 10685057 / J E Phillips</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Urban Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 write, in the strongest terms, to object to the council altering the Urban Boundary to incorporate the land North of Salt Box Road, Worplesdon. My reasons are: The area is currently designated Green Belt and the Council has by a Motion passed unanimously in March 2013 to undertake the preservation of the Green Belt The area is immediately adjacent to Whitmoor Common an SSSI, SPA and LNR and would have a detrimental effect on ecology and wildlife. The open nature of Worplesdon should be retained. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/781</th>
<th>Respondent: 10732161 / Anne Bowerman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Urban Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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 proposal to build 2000 houses at Gosden Hill Farm. The figures of need for this are grossly over-estimated. It extends the urban area of Guildford into the countryside and will make overcrowded roads and other facilities in the area considerably worse. I also object to the Blackwell Farm proposal as it will make the almost impossible traffic situation on the Guildford Bypass and other local roads immeasurably worse. I request that my objections are taken into account. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2444</td>
<td>Respondent: 10911137 / Tricia Chipping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Urban Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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 wish to object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan with the proposed loss of the Green Belt, particularly between Burpham and Ripley, with the proposed developments on Gosden Hill farm and in Send effectively making a continuous series of estates so that we no longer have villages. We in Burpham have already had large developments on the two farms in our village and the inevitability of further increase in traffic in the centre of our village and in Clay Lane is too much!

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4250</th>
<th>Respondent: 11009121 / William Bagnall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Urban Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 refer to the submission we made last Nov – a copy of which is attached for ease of reference. We have had no response to the points raised and having looked at the latest draft local Plan issued for consultation we can see no evidence that there has been any coherent integrated plan for traffic in the area in conjunction with Surrey County Council and in particular proposals to ease both traffic flow and traffic impact on residents of Compton. Without such plans we consider it inappropriate to proceed with large scale additional housing development in the area.

***************************************************************NOV 2015

We have registered on the MasterPlan consultation website but the questionnaire isn’t really designed to record our the feedback on specific aspects of traffic and infrastructure, so please accept this as our contribution to the public consultation process.

We have looked at the Guildford Town Centre Masterplan and welcome the general aims of enhancing the provision of commercial and residential accommodation to meet future changing needs, to substantially improve the linkage and use of the area between the town centre, the station and the river and to overcome the traffic problems. It is a much needed plan to ensure the ongoing success of this wonderful town.

Our one major concern is that all the extensive studies to alleviate the very difficult traffic problems, concentrate on the impact within the town and there is no assessment of, or weighting to, the consequential impact of each option in the surrounding area. We may be mistaken but we cannot find how these proposals fit within a plan for the wider area that addresses both traffic flow and traffic impact on residents and users of that area – as you have rightly done for the Guildford centre.

If the current preferred options for the Guildford Masterplan are adopted, through traffic will have to find alternative routes. For east/west traffic we believe this will mean yet further traffic flows along the B3000 which is the principal east/west route south of Guildford for vehicles with end destinations in Godalming, Guildford and areas to the east or west of Guildford. This is a truly frightful prospect for the village of Compton.
Compton is part of your Borough and is also your responsibility. It is far smaller than Guildford but is another precious asset of the Borough with its many listed buildings, historic church, Loseley Park, Watts Gallery and its setting in the beautiful Surrey Hills. Yet it feels that the huge damage to the village caused by the massive increase in traffic in the last 30 years is never addressed by local or county government – we suspect it just ends up on the “too difficult” pile.

The statistics are well known and recorded through the two VAS speed alert units. In the region of 6 million vehicle movements a year – one every 2.4 secs during rush hour – through a rural village! The 30 mph speed restriction is almost universally ignored except when the weight of traffic forces it or we are doing a community staffed Speedwatch session. Top speeds through the village are consistently recorded at over 50 mph.

The sum total of government help for the village over 30 years has been the laying of quiet road surface in part of the village which was then ripped up a few years later and the absurd installation of rumble bars right outside cottages in New Pond Road which had to be removed at considerable expense. The parish paid for the vehicle activated speed warning signs and data collection box.

Population levels in SE of England are estimated to increase and levels of traffic are not going to reduce. Basing a Guildford solution on an assumption that changes in modes of travel will result in a major traffic flow reduction feels illusory. In deciding on the Guildford Masterplan please do so together with a coherent integrated plan for traffic in a much wider area in conjunction with Surrey County Council. If the best long term solution is a major infrastructure project for this area of the SE, please do not discard it on the grounds of cost- rather why not present it to the new National Infrastructure Commission? Andrew Adonis has a proven track record in delivering long term education and transport projects where he can see the benefits and there must be a great case for helping Guildford and area to further build on its success as a key town in the south east whilst easing the traffic impact on villages.

It would be appreciated if you could acknowledge receipt of our consultation response.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2712  Respondent: 11031905 / Andy Papa  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Urban Area

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

Guildford Draft Local Plan 2016
I am writing to object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan, mainly because of the disproportionate impact some of these proposals will have on the residents of Burpham.

The proposed development at Gosden Hill Farm will generate a lot of additional traffic through Burpham and the proposed new 4 way junction at Burnt common will not alleviate Burpham’s traffic problems as has been claimed. There is no provision for specific infrastructure improvements to either the A3 or local roads, where there is already an acknowledged deficit. The “Highways England” review of the A3 should be completed first. As everyone seems to agree that a “tunnel” would be a good idea, the proposed route of this should be taken into account before any houses are built at Gosden Hill.

The plan, if put into practice will merge all the villages along the A3 from the Hog’s back to the M25. This will result in a significant loss of Green Belt land and generate even more traffic in Burpham (and the A3/M25 junction) which already suffer from severe delays at peak times.

Has any thought been given to the existing water/drain infrastructure, which is in a precarious state? If Gosden Hill goes ahead, where will waste and foul water go, as the present sewage system cannot cope now?

The proposed new housing site allocations at Wisley, Slyfield, The Horsleys, Gosden Hill, Garlick’s Arch and Send will generate 6,000 homes, over 40% of the total number proposed. As these are all within a few miles of Burpham, this is
disproportionate and unacceptable to the residents of Burpham. There is a lack of evidence for the alleged housing need numbers – 693 a year, more than double the previous figure of 322. Also, in light of the recent “Brexit” vote I think this definitely needs to be looked at again. I also think that the local plan consultation period has been

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2630  Respondent: 13713825 / Barry Williams  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Urban Area

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

River Wey Pedestrian Bridge by the rowing club

• If this had ramps on both sides then cyclists could use it as an extension of NCN22.
• This ramp / cycleway extension might allow a separate cycle route into Millmead and then continue under the gyratory along the western side of the river past The Billings

Wheelchair users, mums with pushchairs could also use it and avoid the A 281

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4548  Respondent: 14143265 / Robert MacAndrew  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Urban Area

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

Increased housing / retail / office development in Guildford will only increase the traffic congestion in and around the town. The plan should include proposals to resolve the present issues, and not be proposing changes which will only make matters worse.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/339  Respondent: 15186753 / michael hoyle  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Urban Area

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

Having been a resident of Burpham for 34 years I am amazed that the local plan is even being considered when all one needs to do is look at the general traffic chaos that occurs most mornings and evenings in and around the Burpham area, added to this the general traffic going to and from the Aldi store only adds to the general gridlock. To add to this
already chaotic traffic situation the proposed Gosden Hill development would really be the height of madness in an already overpopulated area of Guildford. Please, please think what you are committing a wonderful part of Surrey to, i.e. constant traffic congestion and added pollution. This area is already at saturation point, do not make it worse.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/528  Respondent: 15233953 / Susan and Leslie Rush  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Urban Area

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

We strongly object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan.

We are concerned that there will be a significant loss of areas currently designated as green belt particularly in Burpham. It seems that you want to merge local villages along the A3 into one, this will be detrimental to the area.

It appears that you plan to build 693 new homes a year. I believe this is more than double the figure given in 2012. Where is the justification for this. Burpham, Gosden Hill, seems likely to get a disproportionate amount of new housing/ development and yet there is no provision for improving the road links and amenities. Burpham is already burdened with high levels of traffic, if your plan went ahead we would come to a standstill!

I believe there has been some discussion about building a tunnel to serve the Gosden Hill development, this would improve the traffic situation but we still feel that the Gosden Hill development is too large and is not in keeping with the area.

It also appears that the consultation time on such a complex development is rather short.

Is this draft plan still viable given the current political and financial situation?

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/688  Respondent: 15265185 / Mike Pocock  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Urban Area

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

I am particularly concerned at the huge increase in housing proposed for the part of the borough near where I live (Burpham) and the loss of Green Belt as a consequence.

Of particular concern is the lack of attention to the necessary infrastructure given the very large increase in demand it would create, particularly in relation to highways. The already seriously overstretched roads in Burpham where there are frequent major traffic problems already need much greater attention including enhancement of the Burpham junction with the A3 to 4 way if there is to be any significant development in the area. An enhanced junction at Burnt Common will not overcome this problem.

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

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/700  **Respondent:** 15267425 / Amanda Cowan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Urban Area

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 2016 Draft Local Plan. Burpham already struggles with traffic issues on a normal day and by increasing the number of houses and cars, the area won't be able to cope. Also the local schools are over subscribed at the moment so will new schools be built or increased in size to accommodate the increased children. What is the point of a green belt if not to protect the environment and wildlife if you build on it and destroy it. The green areas are what make Guildford so attractive. Also burpham has no south access to the A3 so there will be even more traffic trying to get through. Let's keep Guildford it own town and not merge it with all the surrounding ones.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4105  **Respondent:** 15276385 / Anna Szyniszewska  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Urban Area

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

As a member of Guildford community I would like to voice my strong objection to the proposed Guildford Borough Development Plan. Across town center and Guildford urban area there are proposals to build a total of 6,900 new homes, as outlined in the document.

Our city has currently about 66k residents. Adding nearly 7,000 new homes would provide stress on our already stretched infrastructure and would have a hugely detrimental effect on the quality of life. To mention a few: congested roads (decreased productivity, adverse health impact), difficulty to accommodate pupils (esp. in secondary schools) and elimination of the green belt and recreation spaces. Our bus system is already delivering poor service due to significant delays caused by downtown congestion. In the light of lack of alternatives and very poor bike-lanes network, I believe the quality of life in Guildford will hugely deteriorate and the plan to expand Guildford by well over 30% in population is highly irresponsible.

I would like to therefore demand sharp reduction in the number of proposed homes to be built in Guildford and provide residents with strategic plans related to enhanced infrastructure with consideration to current and foreseen population number.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/727  **Respondent:** 15278433 / Michael Shaverin  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Guildford Urban Area

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I am writing to object strongly to the Guildford Local Plan.

I am dismayed to see the local plan for Guildford containing so many new housing sites. There appears to be a serious lack of understanding as to the impact that such quantities of new housing will have to my area, Burpham and the wider Guildford region…(afterall, just putting a new Aldi store in Burpham has generated traffic carnage at times).

- There is already a woeful lack of infrastructure (road capacity, schools, shops, doctors surgeries etc)
- No doubt you will again not prescribe decent levels of parking per household which will again blight the existing and new areas
- All the green spaces will be sucked out of the area, causing more car journeys to get out of the 'town', plus untold damage to wildlife and flood risk etc
- Do you really need all of the housing now, afterall the economy is going to slide off a cliff now the Tories have allowed a Brexit vote…
- Where will the people come from to buy such houses, if T.May gets to be PM and is negotiating on the residency status of 2million+ EU citizens and they end up leaving won’t we have too many unoccupied houses already that could be used?
- This is massively over developing the area – a total of 14,000 new homes are proposed, a whole new town effectively!

There are many more concerns, this appears to be a whole bucket list of crazy plans on one document. I am all for development and new houses, but really, 14,000!

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

Attached documents:
There doesn’t seem to be a plan to address congestion, especially in the centre and the RSCH/research park area. Until there is, the local plan is not ready to be inspected.

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

Attached documents:

---

I wish to object very strongly to GBC’s draft local plan June 2016.

The plan is flawed and unsound and yet again it would appear GBC has not and does not listen to local people’s fears of the sheer decimation of the green belt let alone the utter gridlock such a plan will have on Burpham and surrounding villages. GBC went ahead and allowed Aldi to build a store even though local people objected to the plan and it is causing havoc on the already congested London road. We didn’t need the store and the site would have served a better purpose if kept as a family pub/restaurant. I have lived in Burpham for over 30 years and have witnessed the building of several housing developments in the area. This has had an impact on the volume of traffic through Burpham from Guildford direction and from the exit slip road from the A3 either heading for Woking and beyond or Guildford.

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

Attached documents:

---

Burpham has had excessive development over the last half century. Any development should be spread more evenly across the Guildford borough.

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

Attached documents:
Please close Walnut Tree close road for the following reasons -

It has a long history of flooding, it floods completely at 3.08 metres, we watched the river level rise over 1 metre in an hour. If it flash floods faster as it did in 1968 there is no access for emergency services, cars will become submerged with the people in it. On 24th Dec 2013 it took over an hour to get gridlocked cars out of the road. Please review the photos attached and google Walnut Tree Close 1969 flood which has a view of GU1 4UI in the foreground (closest to the station).

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

Attached documents:

- Bedford Rd flooded Dec 2013.jpg (987 KB)
- photo.JPG (755 KB)
- Cinema flooded.jpg (829 KB)
- Road flooded first around bridge.jpg (75 KB)
- GU1 4UL flooded.jpg (617 KB)
- Cinema & buildings flooded.jpg (898 KB)
- Aquatico car park flooded.jpg (712 KB)
- photo (2).JPG (919 KB)

Total records: 25.
No representations received for this section.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - HM Prison Ripley

No representations received for this section.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Holmbury St. Mary
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4192</th>
<th>Respondent: 8563233 / Shere Parish Council (Joy Millett)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Holmbury St Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 term ‘Identified Boundary of the Village’ is misleading, as it fails to clarify the significance for infill development.

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: Appendix H: Maps - Home Farm, Effingham

No representations received for this section.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
**Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPA16/829  Respondent:</th>
<th>8555041 / Adrian Platt  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 object to the specific plan relating to my village, West Horsley. It seems utterly incredible that GBC could propose such a plan for a village which is probably the most rural village after East Clandon. Not only is the proposed increase of 385 houses over four sites unbelievable but it is also an increase of 35% which is more than any other location. Whilst I understand that any Neighbourhood Plan has to fit into the Borough Local Plan, a recent survey of the whole village showed that residents felt that only 40 houses were needed [or could be coped with sustainably- no shop, no Post Office, difficult parking in East Horsley, railway station parking at capacity and limited Bus Service] in the same period. Even allowing for the GBC needs, this shows just how distorted the numbers are in Local Plan.

- I object to the unacceptable density of the proposed housing for West Horsley. This is far higher than the current density and it is likely to lead to houses totally out of character with the existing village and no sustainability in terms of schooling, drainage, roads capacity, shops and public transport.

- I object to the early exhibition of a SANG in Longreach, West Horsley by a Company, Greenreach Ltd, which is totally owned by developers. How dare the GBC support the concept of this exhibition when we have many wonderful areas of country for recreation? To put this artificial plan forward before the Local Plan has completed its consultation is disgraceful, especially since it has been created by Developers who clearly expect the GBC to favour them.

**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>PSLPA16/3056  Respondent:</th>
<th>8555073 / Adrian Bathurst  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>

Development of these four sites is expected to put 445 new homes in a relatively small area of East and West Horsley, this is excessive and disproportionate, the density is inappropriate for the villages and I object to these policies.

Paragraph 2.22 of the draft Local Plan (Key Facts about the Borough: infrastructure) acknowledges that road and rail networks and local facilities in village settlements are facing increasing pressure. It is anticipated that smaller allocated sites will provide the majority of housing supply in the first five years so it can be expected that planning work will start immediately following the implementation of the Local Plan. An East and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme is listed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) for delivery by Surrey County Council (SCC) between 2019 and 2023 but no details are given. Comprehensive information is needed now to explain how the Council intends to deal with the consequences of additional development so that residents can make informed comments.

Paragraph 1.23 of the IDP states that new or improved infrastructure to support development should be available when it is first needed; paragraph 5.25 states that the Horsleys are likely to be impacted by new housing planned for the first five years of the Plan and that primary school places will be available in Clandon and Ripley, SCC officers consider it most suitable to fill those schools before looking at expansions at other primary schools in the area; when the strategic aim is
that primary schools should be within walking distance this statement will be a disappointment to the community and it does not inspire confidence in the Council’s ability to deliver other pledges in the Plan.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/77  Respondent: 8558369 / A W Hutchins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

PLANNING POLICY EAST & WEST HORSLEY

This is to lodge my objections to the proposed future development of East & West Horsley.

Whilst I accept more housing is needed in the country I do not think we should have this much in East & West Horsley. A lot of people worked very hard in years gone by to obtain Green Belt status for this area and now it would appear to be taken away. We who have lived here for many years and do not want our villages turned into Surbiton.

Many of the green fields proposed are water logged in the winter, With housing built on them where will the water go ?. The local roads get flooded now due to the building that has happened in the last forty years.

Any development that takes place will need the infrastructure to be in place before building. In the past the infrastructure has not been developed enough. The Medical Centre is not big enough, to obtain an appointment with a doctor of your choice in less than a week is very difficult. The car park is often full. The East Horsley Village Hall car park has a notice to say only parking if on Village Hall business.

Yesterday I tried to park at the doctors, the car park was full, two ladies were on duty at the village hall stopping parking if you were not attending the village hall. I therefore could not go to the doctors. The parking at the East Horsley shops is very difficult. There is not enough at the present time, when the camp site is occupied in the Spring and Summer months it is worse. All this is now, what will it be like if this development is allowed?

I notice in the proposed housing there will be Affordable Housing. Can you tell me what is affordable ? If the housing are more than £300,00 young local people working locally would not be able to afford them and this surely is what the idea is and what the developer would hope to get the local people on his side.

The local schools are already over subscribed. The nursery school at the Raleigh School is full until the end of 2014. The Raleigh and the Howard of Effingham Schools is full and not everybody who applies can get in.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/912  Respondent: 8562081 / C Scarlett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I would like to place on record my comments and concerns regarding the New Local Plan.
Over 60% of the proposed new houses are to be built in the Metropolitan Green Belt. In my view this represents a massive incursion into the Green Belt within the borough which is completely contrary to its whole concept. It was of course established by law to be the lungs of London and to prevent urban sprawl. It should be open and permanent and not subject to inappropriate development except in very special circumstances. I understand that Government advice is quite clear that housing need alone is not an adequate ground for building in the Green Belt. I therefore object to this proposed invasion of the Green Belt.

I also object to the proposed removal of East and West Horsley from the Green Belt. One result of this would no doubt be to make back garden development easier. This would lead to a creeping urbanisation of the two villages from within which would eventually destroy or severely harm their existing semi-rural nature. This characteristic is one reason why many residents chose to live here in the first place. No exceptional circumstances have been put forward to justify the insetting and the adjustment of the settlement boundaries.

It seems to me that West Horsley has been singled out for special attention and I object to the proposals for our village. The main development site proposals (all in the Green Belt and outside the existing settlement boundary) if agreed and implemented would add up to 385 new dwellings in the village, an increase of 35% on the current number. The resulting housing density would be drastically higher than the current level and would fundamentally alter the character of the village for the worse. Policy D4 stated that proposals for new development within an inset village will have particular regard to the distinctive settlement pattern of the village and the important relationship between the built environment and the surrounding landscape. What is being proposed for West Horsley, a small semi-rural village with 43 listed buildings seems to me to be quite contrary to this policy. It would be completely overwhelmed by development on the proposed scale and its existing character significantly damaged. There were a very large number of objections to similar proposals in the 2014 draft plan and these appear to have been almost completely ignored in drawing up the latest proposals.

Another key issue here is that the local infrastructure is already under considerable strain. 385 new dwellings could mean an increase in village population of over 1000 people and one has to ask where the extra children would go to school or where any of them would obtain medical care. The primary school is full and the medical centre struggles to cope with existing demand. The draft plan does contain a proposal to expand the medical centre in East Horsley, but only within a 5 to 15 year time scale. This could be long after the new houses have been built.

Local public transport is very limited and the residents of these new dwellings would be heavily dependent on the use of private cars. The local roads are already in places in distinctly poor condition. One example is East Lane which carries a considerable volume of both through, school and local traffic and Northcote Road which leads to the Raleigh primary school. I have reported the badly broken surface of East Lane to SCC Highways, but little so far seems to have been done to improve matters. I also regularly have to report large potholes in Northcote Road (which do usually get patched up, but open up again within months). I question whether the local road network could realistically cope with the increased traffic levels.

Some of the new inhabitants would no doubt want to commute towards or into London by rail. It is doubtful whether the existing service could accommodate many more commuters, as trains in the rush hours are already very crowded. In addition the car park at Horsley station is close to full on weekdays. Furthermore car parking for the Station Parade shops is quite often full or close to capacity.

I was surprised and dismayed to note that the proposed 2000 dwelling development of the Wisley Airfield site has been included in the draft plan. This has of course already been refused planning permission by the Borough Council. Many of the transport infrastructure factors in the Horsleys mentioned above would be considerably exacerbated if this were to go ahead. Inevitably the numbers using Horsley Station would increase and traffic levels would rise still further as the inhabitants and those providing services to them drove to and from the new settlement through the two villages. I therefore wish to object to the inclusion of the Wisley Airfield in the draft plan.

Site A38 (Land to the west of West Horsley) is designated for 135 new houses. This would load both East Lane and Long Reach with considerably more traffic than at present. As mentioned above East Lane is already a busy road in poor surface condition in places. Long Reach is a narrow unclassified road with some sharp blind bends towards its northern end and is not well suited to significantly to increased traffic volumes. Almost every Saturday in the season there are a large number of cars parked on the verge by those using Horsley Football Club grounds and Tom’s Field. This reduces it to a single lane.
The map for this site shows its eastern boundary as the end of the back gardens of the houses on the western side of Northcote Road. It needs to be noted that Bens Wood, which I understand is likely to be proposed as a SANG, extends to the south along the back of some of these houses. Permissive access is available to Bens Wood from all properties backing onto it and this is a valuable local feature. This part of the Wood would be destroyed and access lost to the rest if the entire site were to be built up. Bens Wood is also an important wildlife habitat as well as being an asset to the village and the development of Site A38 would inevitably have an adverse impact on this natural environment. I therefore object specifically to the inclusion of this site in the draft plan.

In conclusion I readily accept that the borough needs more housing, but I fell very strongly that this should be provided in a far more sensitive, measured, balanced and sustainable way than proposed in the draft plan.

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

Attached documents:
The presence of the Bens Wood nature reserve and its pond has improved the environment and the amount and variety of wildlife species has increased greatly. There are now far more animals and especially birds including migrants, woodpeckers, owls, buzzards and red kites which give interest and pleasure to local residents who walk in the area. The noise and disturbance caused by large scale building works nearby will frighten away this wildlife from the whole of the wood.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/518</th>
<th>Respondent: 8562081 / C Scarlett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 amendments made in the latest draft unfortunately do nothing to allay my concerns and I must therefore maintain my objections. The proposed scale of new building still does not in my view represent sustainable development for the Horsleys and would irretrievably change the semi rural nature of the villages. I also have little confidence in Surrey County Council’s ability or willingness to provide a suitable road system – I refer particularly to East Lane West Horsley whose surface is badly damaged in several places and which would have to carry a considerably increased volume of traffic if the proposed developments were to go ahead.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4268</th>
<th>Respondent: 8563201 / West Horsley Parish Council (Sam Pinder)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan: strategies and sites June 2016 Submission from West Horsley Parish Council to Consultation (Regulation 19)


West Horsley Parish Council, in response to Question 5 of Guildford Borough’s Consultation Questionnaire wishes to be represented at the Examination in Public regarding:

1. Green Belt boundary changes and proposed ‘inserting’ of villages from the Green Belt.
2. The use of an unconstrained OAN figure of 693 homes per annum throughout the Plan Period.
3. The non-sustainability of the proposed development sites A37 to A41.
4. The unsoundness of the Local Plan.

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

Attached documents: [WHPC Draft Local Plan response letter July 2016.pdf](#) (240 KB)
WHPC OBJECTS to the Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan: strategies and sites June 2016

West Horsley Parish Council (WHPC) has reviewed the Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan: strategies and sites, published by Guildford Borough Council (GBC) for a 6 weeks public consultation to 18th July.

WHPC requests that the objections and comments contained in this Submission are put to the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to review the Guildford Borough Submission Draft Local Plan: strategies and sites following this Regulation 19 Consultation. The Parish Council will appoint and retain a representative to speak on its behalf at the Examination in Public on the following issues:

1. Proposals for new Green Belt boundaries and the ‘insetting’ of villages from the Green Belt.
2. The use of an unconstrained OAN figure of 693 homes per annum throughout the Plan Period
3. The unsustainable characteristics of proposed development sites A37, A38, A39, A40 and A41.
4. The unsoundness of the Local Plan..

Part 1 of this Report sets out the Parish Council’s comments and objections to the proposed Policies.

Part 2 presents the Planning Assessment Relating to Sites A37, A38, A39, A40 and A41 prepared by the Parish Council’s planning consultant ADN Planning Ltd. WHPC endorses the Planning assessment conclusion that all five sites should be removed from the Draft Local Plan. The proposals to bring in new Green Belt boundaries within the village must be withdrawn as no ‘Exceptional or very special circumstances’ have been presented by the Borough to justify their removal from the Green Belt

The Appendix section includes 3 other documents referred to within this Submission.

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

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

Settlement Boundary changes in West Horsley

Report page: 13

WHPC view: Objects Strongly

In brief: Development sites A37 to A41 have been determined unsustainable. Thus there is no justification for the proposed new boundaries of which many are not defensible.

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

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

SITES POLICIES (referenced A1 to A67)

The proposed West Horsley development sites A37 to A41 are reviewed in Part 2: Planning Assessment Relating to Sites A37, A38, A39, A40 and A41 prepared by ADN Planning Ltd, the Parish Council’s appointed consultant.

CONCLUSIONS

West Horsley is a rural village with some 1120 homes and just under 3,000 residents, whose Parish Council and residents do not share the same vision for the future of the Borough, as put forward in the Draft Local Plan by Guildford Council.

GBC’s desire to pursue a ‘Forced Growth’ policy results in highly aggressive, poorly justified and questionable targets being set for economic growth and housing development in the Borough. The excessive targets – particularly the proposed 25% increase in housing stock – will add to the current heavy strain on overloaded infrastructure in the already over-stretched county of Surrey.

Guildford is a constrained borough by the reality of having 89% of its land classified as permanent Green Belt and an out-of-date road network already suffering over capacity at peak times.

The Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan, if approved, particularly in respect of the excessive housing growth proposed (more than any other Surrey Borough by a considerable margin) will have a permanently damaging impact on the Metropolitan Green Belt across the Borough, particularly on the eastern side where West and East Horsley are located. The test of “exceptional circumstances” that might justify allocating Green Belt land, thereby creating new Green Belt boundaries, for development in a Local Plan has not been rigorously and transparently applied at a strategic level. In reviewing the proposals to put forward new Green Belt boundaries and locate new development on unsustainable sites, it appears to this Parish Council, Guildford Borough decided, at some point, not to be guided by and observe the National Planning Policy Framework. Local Plan Policy P2 which starts with, “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt…against inappropriate development” does not fool any of the parishes in the Borough.

Additionally the Sustainability Appraisal does not seem to fit with the concept of Sustainable Development as written in the National Planning Policy Framework, to the extent that it is questioned whether it complies with those requirements.

WHPC submits that it is quite achievable for realistically prepared and identified development needs to be accommodated in Guildford’s urban areas and villages. The NPPF Plan Making - Local Plans paras 150 to 157, sets out clear advice on objectives and procedures a Local Authority should adopt. WHPC was not asked by Guildford Borough to take part in “Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbouring, local organisations…is essential” (NPPF 155). WHPC believes no parish council was invited to engage in early essential collaboration - a serious flaw for a Borough with 23 Parish Councils.

West Horsley totally rejects the housing proposals to add 385 more dwellings to the village housing stock (a grossly disproportionate 35% growth) on unsustainable sites in the first 5 years of the Plan Period.

WHPC is concerned that GBC have, without proper scrutiny, adopted an inflated OAN of 13,860 homes as a housing target for the Plan Period without any application of constraints as required by the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance. The Parish Council subscribed, with other parish and residents organisations, to funding A Review of the West Surrey SHMA as it relates to the Objectively Assessed Housing Needs of ‘Guildford”, June 2016 prepared by Neil McDonald. This Review, included in Appendix 1, found significant errors in the OAN West Surrey SHMA, the effect of which, if accepted as correct, would lower the OAN to 510 homes per year from the 693 homes per year adopted, without constraint, by Guildford Borough. The findings of Neil McDonald’s thorough and substantive Review, if correct, mean the Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan 2016 is UNSOUND.

West Horsley Parish Council on behalf of all its residents calls upon Guildford Borough Council to:
1. have the West Surrey SHMA completely checked either by a joint working party comprising Neil McDonald (for parishes and residents groups), 4 Borough Councillors (one from each political group), under the chairmanship of a retired judge or similar independent professional or by an appointed independent expert who is accepted by all the interested parties.

2. review and re-assess its growth and housing policy objectives rather than force through the Council a Local Plan which unequivocally does not have the support of the majority of residents in Guildford Borough.

3. remove all five West Horsley Sites A37 to A41 from the Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan and re-assess proposals to create new Green Belt boundaries, the effect of which would remove the village from being ‘washed over’ by the Metropolitan Green Belt.

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

Attached documents:
- WHPC Draft Local Plan response July 2016.pdf (2.2 MB)
- WHPC Draft Local Plan response letter July 2016.pdf (240 KB)
- GRA Report FINAL.pdf (1.6 MB)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4400  Respondent: 8565217 / Cobham Conservation and Heritage Trust (David Bellchamber)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Sites in East and West Horsley

There is considerable concern locally that Effingham, the Horsleys, Ripley, Wisley and the Ockham and Hatchford areas are protected from unwarranted development. But the changes to settlements that would have most effect on the Cobham area in terms of increased traffic and call for amenities, if the draft Local Plan were implemented, would be the Horsleys. Implementing proposals for Sites A36-41 would destroy the nature of the villages that make up the Horsleys. The new building suggested for these villages is excessive and disproportionate relative to the rest of the borough. It has to be asked why it is suggested that the Green Belt is sacrificed here where the protection of the Metropolitan Green Belt is highly relevant when on the other side of the borough in the Ash and Tongham areas the draft Local Plan looks to expand the Green Belt.

The reclassification of East Horsely to a Rural District Centre would allow less desirable uses such as factory outlets, warehouses, clubs etc. to be the subject of applications for planning permission. Development in these villages should not be other than from small windfall sites

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/774  Respondent: 8569793 / Mr E R Mostyn  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

As a resident in both West and then East Horsley for many years I wish to record my Strong OBJECTIONS to the current Plan for the area as a whole and my Villages in particular.
My main reasons are as follows:-

1) The vast increase in houses proposed, of various types, bears no relationship to the very modest needs of this virtually rural area.

2) The proposal to adjust the Green Belt area, attacks the original grand concept in its development as a “breathing space” for London.

3) The Horsleys have an important heritage status and lie within the Surrey Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

4) The Villages already suffer from the overload of their Schools, Shops, Doctors Surgeries, Roads and Parking. It is ALWAYS the case that such vital facilities are the very last to be increased within Housing Developments of the scale proposed.

Any change to aspects such as these would affect the everyday life of current and potential new members to an unacceptable degree, in my view.

Please give my opinion consideration in your proposed study of Plan

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1665</th>
<th>Respondent: 8575617 / Effingham Parish Council (Ian Symes)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

A39 East Horsley
A38, A40, A41 West Horsley

Object

EPC objects to the over-development of our neighbouring parishes of East and West Horsley. These four proposed site selections will add approximately 445 housing units in what is presently Green Belt. We see this as over-development of these two neighbouring villages. There is also the impression that land is being inset from the Green Belt for the sole purpose of meeting housing targets, and not for the reasons allowable for insetting set out in the NPPF. If development of
these areas of land is permitted it will lead to the increasing erosion of the Green Belt between the Effingham/Bookham boundary and Guildford.

There are over 120 Effingham residents who live within the East Horsley settlement area and these residents will be particularly impacted by the increased traffic these site selections will generate. Many residents believe the narrow rural roads in the area are inadequate to support, safely, the construction traffic that will use these roads over many years.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1858  Respondent: 8587937 / Mair L Davis  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

When I heard you were producing a further Local Plan I had hoped you might at least reduce the number of houses to be built. But no, the number of houses planned in my area has increased horribly. This seems a far cry from democracy and more like a war of attrition. These are my objections and deep concerns:

1. Potential influx of people on such a grand scale. I live five minutes’ walk from Effingham Junction Station and crossing the roads in the morning rush hour with my dogs is hazardous enough as it is. These people will need cars to get around and to park.
2. Our side road is used as a traffic overflow for commuters who already have crowded trains and insufficient spaces in the stations car park. Car parking itself will be a problem beside Horsleys shops, medical centre etc.
3. We also have many potholed and old roads are liable to flooding from overflowed drains. Increased traffic will do no favours to the state of these roads which were never constructed to deal with such an increased volume of traffic. One-way systems generated by the Wisley Airfields loathsome development or any widening of the roads will spoil the environment of those who live here.
4. How can our Horsley Medical Centre cope with added patients and Guildford Hospital too?
5. Health itself will be affected. Air pollution from traffic is already above the legal limit on Junction 10 of the M25
6. You take no account of where incoming children are going to be educated in the Horsleys.
7. You propose to use our precious Green Belt to accommodate 65% of new houses here. Our population value our green areas for recreational purpose and it is part of the charm of this locality

I understand that Sadiy Khan, the new mayor of London, has instructed his planners not to approve development and green belt land within the M25. I do wish you had a more sensitive approach to Guildford’s planning. We already have housing stretching from here to Central London. Surely you do not need to extend this plague of concentrated development to beautiful Guildford? I would have thought it worthwhile to preserve green space in our area for Londons enjoyment too.

I wholeheartedly OBJECT to your local plan more STRONGLY than ever. You are violating the area totally failing to protect your current population from being overcrowded and suffering the consequent effects of pollution and distress. Cramming Wisley Airfield with a concentration of housing worthy of tower Hamlets is VILE. Perhaps when Brexit comes into full force we wont need so many new homes on this crowded island. Frankly you need to think again before your votes seek to have more Green Belt protection on the council.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPA16/2458  Respondent: 8589345 / Ms Mary Symes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I write to comment on your local plan for the Horsleys. I know that you have spent time, money and energy preparing the plan. Once built on, the soil, plants and wildlife large and small will be destroyed, perhaps for ever.

We need green spaces for plants to photosynthesise and keep the air that we breathe free from pollution.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/439  Respondent: 8591169 / Michael Bruton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Specifically within West Horsley I object as follows to:

1. Manor Farm – A38
2. Bell and Colvill – A37 – already rejected by GBC’s Planning Committee earlier in 2016
3. Land at Ockham Road North – A40
4. Land at East Lane – A41

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/844  Respondent: 8592001 / Mr Michael Trower  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am writing to make a formal objection to the Guildford Local Plan 2016 under the public consultation.

The whole consultation appears to be based on figures which have been kept secret from the public, so how can there be any transparency in the whole process? The first line of Policy P2 states “we will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt against inappropriate development” and then the policy looks at totally changing the green belt boundaries and a massive and inappropriate development therein, so there is an initial and gross contradiction in the plan.

Much use is made of the word sustainable in the local plan. My Oxford English Dictionary gives the meaning as “which conserves an ecological balance by avoiding depletion of natural resources or that can be sustained” Please advise how once green belt land is built upon, how it can be sustained? Answer is it can’t – once the green belt is gone it’s gone for ever. If there is going to be a massive growth in population how is the increased population going to be fed if agricultural land is built upon? Besides the recent referendum vote for Brexit from the EU must cast doubt on many of the assumptions made for population and employment forecasts.
I object to the removal of West Horsley from the green belt by the extension of the 2003 Local Plan Settlement boundaries – there is no justification for this extension.

The alteration of the green belt is only allowed under “exceptional circumstances” and these have not been demonstrated in the plan – the inclusion of more housing to meet an unproven need is not an exceptional circumstance – I therefore object to this alteration.

There is no expansion of many local facilities and infrastructure commensurate with the proposed addition to the total housing numbers. The roads in West (& East) Horsley are already very busy, very badly maintained, mostly unlit and with very poor drainage, again with little or no maintenance. There is a drain in School Lane which is full of silt and has been for the 8 years I have lived in West Horsley. The building of more homes with drives and paved areas will only exacerbate the problem and result in greater water run off every time there is rain. Ripley Lane is impassable except by boat after any heavy rain, so how is more traffic in the area going to be able to use it?

The expanded village will not have the infrastructure to support it. There is now no Newsagent or Post Office, and the only other village shop is due to close in the autumn. There is a very limited bus service through the village on weekdays only. The medical centre is in East Horsley and is already at capacity. Existing residents must perforce use their cars to travel to East Horsley for the shops or railway station. This is without the massive increase in housing numbers planned. The village schools are again full and there is no mention in the local plan about new schools to cater for the likely increased demand.

The proposed housing developments are at a much greater density than the existing housing. Current small scale developments have to be in keeping with the area & street scene, so why are new ones on such a higher density?

What West Horsley does need, and has been proven is about 20 affordable homes. This was proven by The West Horsley Parish Council Housing survey and local plan in 2014. All that does get built in the area are 4 and 5 bedroom executive homes, usually following the demolition of a perfectly useable smaller home, which brings in a 2 (or more) car family placing extras strain on the village infrastructure. The WHPC survey indicated that there is little scope for older people to downsize, or for starter homes for children born and brought up in the village.

The whole process is very undemocratic and GBC are simply ignoring the wishes of the local population. The plan has been re-issued in virtually the same format as the previous one, and all previous objections have been ignored in the current consultation. It appears to be a copy of the strategy of the remain camp from the Brexit or Scottish Independence referenda – if you don’t achieve your desired result, try again until you do.

I therefore strongly object to the 2016 Local Plan

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

Attached documents:
Green Belt is not argued. If implemented it will destroy the character of the villages, the infrastructure is already overloaded and there are no plans for improvement in line with the proposed increase in housing. The inflated number of houses has been generated by a mathematical model which has not been made available by the sub-contractor, consultant and Guildford Borough Council and cannot therefore be justified.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/575  **Respondent:** 8597761 / Mrs Pippa Fleming  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I object to all sites in West Horsley for over 5 homes. The proposed sites will merge the villages of Ockham, West and East Horsley creating urban sprawl.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1377  **Respondent:** 8597825 / Mr P J Colborne-Baber  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Beyond the Horsleys. Around the Horsley boundaries there are other sites such as Wisley where huge developments are also proposed. Understand that this Wisely proposal was turned down by the Council unanimously about six weeks before this latest plan was published. Then why is it still in the plan? The council was absolutely right to refuse it there being so many reasons apart from why do we need all these houses? The total lack of infrastructure being another big reason. Horsley and Effingham stations could not cope and that is if they could get to the stations on the roads that can't cope. We have no desire to see traffic lights in our villages either. Move south along the totally overcrowded A3 to Gosden Farm and another huge proposal. They are talking about a new station but will there be the trains to service it? The A3 will not be able to cope, of that there is no doubt because almost every day now there are jams trying to get through Guildford, and if you are in Guildford trying to join in the A3 going south it's a nightmare! All these infrastructure problems for any development must be in place before a development can proceed, but they do not have to proceed as with the Horsley Plan and the incorrect housing numbers, that probably applies to the other Parishes as well.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/936  **Respondent:** 8599105 / Edwin Road Residents Association (Rhys Beynon)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ()
I write to express my objection to the proposed new Local Plan.

I object, in the strongest possible terms, to the principle of removing West Horsley from the Metropolitan Green Belt. This suggestion above all must be withdrawn from the local Plan. Future generations would see this proposal as a dereliction of Surrey’s duty to protect the health and well-being of the London area and its population.

Having lived in the West Horsley area since 1979 and worked locally I feel I have enough experience of the surrounding area to appreciate the serious detrimental effect the proposed developments would have.

• Our local “infrastructure” is already overstretched.
• Our roads cannot cope with even a small fraction of the likely increase in vehicular movements.
• Our parking areas within the current villages (East and West Horsley) are strictly limited.
• Our population is made up of a high percentage of “retired” folk for whom the car is often the only method they have for getting around the villages so competition for parking places would affect their social mobility with disastrous effect.
• Our local primary school is heavily oversubscribed and may well need to be rebuilt on a new site in an attempt to satisfy the current demand for places.
• Our water table is high in parts of the area and considerable flooding may occur in some of the proposed new developments.
• Our medical services would have to be doubled in size to cope with the likely doubling of our population. A new parking area could not be provided at the current centre in East Horsley and consulting rooms etc. for medical staff would be inadequate for the increased population.

Along with the proposed new housing developments and major infrastructure projects other areas would have to be found for improvements to pavements, road widening, improved junctions, new sewers, services and drains, new parking areas at the railway station at shops and at village halls and at churches.

Our roads cannot cope today with current population/traffic demands and have to be used as "car parks." With more vehicles trying to use the roads bottle-necks will occur at dozens of places around the villages which were never meant to cope with such numbers.

In my opinion the local plan is applying sticking plaster to try to stem the flow of blood from a major wound.

I’d like to suggest that a way forward be found which would begin with a proper comprehensive plan which begins with the infrastructure necessary to cope with the undoubted need for housing in the area. Building houses wherever one can find a piece of land is NOT the way to cope with today's housing crisis.

I cannot believe that people with professional planning skills and experience cannot see the folly of the proposed local plan.

Surely "cramming a quart into a pint pot" cannot be a serious planning proposal.

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

Attached documents:
• The removal of East and West Horsley villages from the Green Belt. The value of having the Green Belt is immense and to keep areas free of bricks and mortar. The reason we have lived in the area for so long is because we value open spaces and the freedom to walk unhindered in a green, open environment, rather than suburbia which the Horsleys would become.

• The number of properties proposed 533 (with an additional 60+ houses on smaller sites) – an increase of 35% on the current number of homes – is so out of proportion in a village community with inadequate infrastructure – that it is ludicrous and ill thought out.

• The Horsleys do not possess the infrastructure for such intense development: in fact, to date we barely cope. The state primary school in West Horsley is always oversubscribed; parents have great difficulty in getting their children into the nearest state secondary school at Effingham; the doctors’ surgery always has waiting times for appointments, drainage in the area is completely inadequate and during periods of heavy rain the system does not cope – raw sewerage is seen floating down our neighbour’s drive and into the road from overflowing drainage system. Traffic is a nightmare and parking near the station and local shops is inadequate and for the increased population proposed with an additional 533 homes and resulting cars, it would become unbearable to travel.

• I would specifically mention the proposed 120 houses at Ockham Road North. We live on this road (the B3029) which has a 40 mile speed limit – I would suggest at least 50% of traffic exceeds this limit all the way from its junction with the A3 to East Lane (where it becomes 30mph). From our driveway to proceed onto this road can prove ‘hair raising’ with bends in the road giving very limited sight lines. The likelihood is that with an additional 120 homes and the prospect of two cars (at least) per household progressing onto this road safety would be a great factor.

• I would also add from a personal viewpoint, I have lived here for almost 60 years with an open environment of trees, fields and open skies. I do not wish for a view of bricks and mortar.

• I would like to know why West Horsley is to be saturated with new building 35% in proportion to its existing number of houses, whereas those in Guildford Town equates to 11% and the Ash/Tongham region 16%.

• There should be more consideration given to building on brown field sites within the Borough and to definitely leave the Green Belt protected.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4092  Respondent: 8601345 / Mr & Mrs R Masset  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am of course more concerned with the proposed developments in the villages of east and west Horsley partly because that is where I live but equally because the proposal to combine the two and remove them from the green belt would open the door to much further construction leading eventually to a virtual new town. The Horsleys would suffer the greatest percentage increase (35%) totally out of keeping with the area and overwhelming all of the local services.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3631  Respondent: 8601793 / Roy Proctor  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/605  **Respondent:** 8606625 / Mr Tim Bennett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

**Guildford Local Plan – Strategies and Sites June 2016**

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Local Plan. I am responding by letter as there are many points which do not fit well into the sections of the questionnaire.

I am very disappointed that the views of myself and a very large number of others from the Horsley and other rural areas surrounding Guildford made during the consultation period following the ‘2014 Draft Plan’ have not been addressed. The Green Belt area of the villages surrounding the urban areas of the Guildford borough is one of its greatest assets. The current plan will destroy the nature of these villages.

I strongly object to the current plan for the following main reasons :-

‘Green belt’ and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) - The ‘Green Belt is precious. There are five legal reasons for the ‘Green Belt’ and the Surrey ‘Green Belt’ meets them all. The National Planning Policy Framework requires any change in Green Belt boundaries to demonstrate very exceptional circumstances. These ‘exceptional circumstances’ have not been demonstrated. Also I strongly object to the proposed changes in the settlement boundary and the concept of ‘insetting’. The only reason for this would be to allow even further development. This is not a valid reason to change the boundary.

Scale of development – An increase of over 385 potential new dwellings is included in the draft plan for West Horsley which currently has just over 1,100 dwellings. This represents an increase of over 35% which is totally disproportionate to the size of the village, and at a density that is significantly above the village at present. This would result in a significant detrimental change in the nature and character of the village. This increase is vastly above the increases in most other areas of the borough. The increase in the urban area of the borough is only planned to be 11%. The pressures on the infrastructure would be completely unmanageable (see further comments below).

Timing/Speed of development – I object to the plan that all of the 385 (35%) increase in proposed dwellings are planned to be built within the next 5 years and before the ‘Brown Field’ sites in the urban areas are developed. This will allow no time for any improvements in infra-structure and cause irreversible damage to the Horsleys.

Evidence Base for housing needs – The construction of the plan is conceptually flawed as it is based on a supply of land put forward by land-owners/developers. It is not based on a balanced view of the housing needs of the urban area and individual villages. It does not take into account the impact of Britain exiting the EU.

The plan would allow the continued development of large four/five bed-roomed houses on developments of twenty dwellings. However, there is also a natural ‘ratchet’ effect that results in the current stock of homes constantly getting
larger as extensions are added and we do not need any more large dwellings. The plan does not address in any detail a better way of prioritising smaller homes for first time buyers and for those downsizing.

**Sustainability and transport** - Allowing significant development in the rural areas of the borough will exacerbate the accepted transport pressures in the area as there will be few jobs in these rural areas causing additional commuting to the urban areas. This would be minimised by more effective development in the urban areas.

**Urban areas and ‘brown field’ sites** – Developments should be made in the current urban and ‘brown field’ sites first before irreversibly destroying green field sites – especially as there is such a large range and uncertainty in the projections of the number of homes needed. The current plan is to develop the easier ‘Green Belt’ areas first and then focus on the ‘Brown Field’ sites. This is the wrong way around. The plan does not effectively exploit the use of the current ‘brown-field sites’, particularly within the urban area of Guildford. For example there is significant scope to enlarge and build more multi-story car-parks in the urban areas which would allow more residential developments.

**Infrastructure** - Current infrastructure in the area is already struggling and needs to be addressed before any additional developments. This Guildford draft plan is meaningless without any Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

The increases in housing proposed in the plan would dramatically increase pressure on schools, medical facilities, roads, railways, drainage, parking etc. In particular, the state primary school is already at capacity, with no room for expansion, and the station car park is virtually full during weekdays. Car parking around the shopping areas is already very restricted, and often full, with little scope for expansion.

There is no evidence in the plan that any required changes to the infrastructure would be in place before any increase in housing/development. This should be addressed in detail within the plan.

**Flexibility** - The plan needs to have significant detail in the short term (5 years) and be very flexible, with a feedback mechanism, in the longer term (6 years and beyond) to allow for i) the uncertainty in the numbers of homes etc. needed and ii) for impact of developments made to be assessed.

For the reasons above I strongly object to the current plan and ask you to reconsider all the proposals concerning Horsley to apply constraints that relate to the very individual village characteristics of West Horsley and change the plan to incorporate a consensus of the views expressed by all Horsley residents and the West Horsley Parish Council.

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

**Attached documents:**

- **Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3252  **Respondent:** 8662689 / Richard Waple  **Agent:**
  
  **Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I have familiarised myself with the Draft Plan (CD disc version) and have attended the Council’s exhibition held at East Horsley Village Hall on Tuesday 21st June 2016. I would like to make the following representations;

1. I wish to object, most strongly, to the Council’s Green Belt policy in relation to the removal of Green Belt land for housing development. In particular I am concerned about the proposed release of the open fields known as Allocation Sites A38, A39, A40 and A41 in West Horsley. My objections are that the Council’s proposal is contrary to Government advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework 2012;
• Paragraph 79 states that “the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence”.

• Paragraph 82 states that “New Green Belts should only be established in exceptional circumstances”. Therefore if existing Green Belt land is sacrificed for housing, the quantum of Green Belt will reduce and will not be replaced.

• Paragraph 83 provides “Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The Council has not demonstrated “exceptional circumstances” but states that the shortage of available housing land is an exceptional circumstance. The problem is that Green Belt land, which is not Previously Developed Land (PDL), should be regarded as sacrosanct and should only be released as a very last resort and after the re-use of Brownfield and PDL has been exhausted. GBC has made no real attempt to survey and review the availability of Brownfield and PDL but, instead, has targeted Green Belt land predominantly in single ownership, as this is easier to deliver. Good town planning is not about easy deliverability and knee-jerk solutions. This is “lazy” planning and should be rejected.

• Paragraph 87 says “As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Insufficient “special circumstances” have been advanced by GBC to justify the release of previously undeveloped Green Belt, which still serves its original purpose as Green Belt land.

• The proposal is also contrary to paragraph 88 of the NPPF, which states that exceptional circumstances will not exist unless the harm caused to the Green Belt is outweighed by other considerations. I do not agree that a shortage of housing land is to be considered as an exceptional circumstance but, even if I am wrong, the harm to Green Belt is not outweighed by other considerations.

• Paragraph 89 states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt.

• In summary the proposal to release Green Belt land is contrary to Government advice and there are, in fact, two distinct tests. Firstly GBC has to prove “exceptional circumstances” to change the boundaries of the Green Belt and secondly it has to prove “exceptional circumstances” to justify inappropriate development.

1. There is case law concerning “special circumstances” and, in particular, whether a housing shortage is a “special circumstance” of sufficient weight to justify the release of Green Belt. I list below the relevant synopsis;

• In Hunston Properties Ltd [2013] EWCA Civ 1610; [2014] JPL 599, it was held that;

On the facts, the Inspector was obliged to find a housing shortfall. However, the weight to be given to such a housing shortfall (and whether it constituted ‘very special circumstances’ for the purposes of NPPF 87) was a matter of planning
judgment. The weight to be attached to the shortfall may, as a matter of planning judgment, be reduced where a shortfall is inevitable due to a district being subject to policies, which restrict development (such as AONBs, National Parks or Green Belts).

- Further it was held in R (Lee Valley Regional Park Authority) v Broxbourne Borough Council [2015] EWHC 185 (Admin) that;

“A shortfall in housing land supply can, as a matter of policy, be a very special circumstance, although the occasions when it is likely to suffice by itself to warrant the grant of permission for housing development in the Green Belt are expected to be few and far between”.

- The case of R (Luton Borough Council) v Central Bedfordshire Council [2015] EWCA Civ 537 it was stated that;

…”paras. 87-88 of the NPPF provide guidance regarding the approach to be adopted if there is a proposal for development of an area within the Green Belt set out in a local plan: “very special circumstances” have to be shown. This is a stricter test than that in para. 83 in respect of changing the boundaries of the Green Belt in the local plan.”

As can be seen none of the case law to date supports the development of new housing in the Green Belt.

1. The proposal to build 385 new houses will swamp the small village of West Horsley, which in 2011 had 1,111 homes in the Parish. This is a 35% increase. There is insufficient infrastructure in terms of roads, parking, public transport, medical provision, education and schooling, drainage and sewerage. This is contrary to paragraph 47 of the NPPF, which requires local planning authorities set out their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances.

1. The Council has not done enough to encourage the re-use of Brownfield and Previously Developed Land (PDL). For example, application 16/P/00783 relating to Oldfields Field Yard concerns the proposed re-development of a builder’s yard and buildings for residential housing in the Green Belt. The property benefits from an Established Use Certificate for B1, B2 and B8 and sui generis uses to include scaffolding yard, car servicing, restoration, motor repairs and storage. Consequently, the Green Belt use has already been lost and the aim of providing permanent open land to prevent urban sprawl can no longer be maintained. Notwithstanding GBC’s alleged housing land crisis, this application was refused. One of the reasons for refusal was that the applicant had not demonstrated any “special circumstances” to justify the inappropriate development.

It seems to me to be inconsistent and inappropriate to refuse the re-use and redevelopment of PDL in the Green Belt and to propose the release of Green Belt in the Local Plan, which is open in character and has never previously been developed.
1. There is no precedent for releasing existing Green Belt land where its original aims and functions are still being met. The original Green Belt legislation and particularly circular 42/55 only envisaged and to a limited scale the “infilling” and “rounding off” within the Green Belt and existing towns and villages should not be allowed to expand any further.

1. I would like to challenge the Council’s Evidence Base as paragraph 47 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should provide sites sufficient for 5 years supply of housing land with an additional 5% buffer to allow for choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been persistent under delivery this buffer should be increased to 20% This means that GBC is required to identify deliverable housing land for the next 6 years and not for the whole Local Plan period to 2032. LPAs are then required to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites.

1. I would like to write in support of GBC’s proposal for “insetting” (i.e. removing from the Green Belt) the existing settlement areas. I do not agree that the village boundary should be enlarged but I do think that it serves no planning purpose for the established built environment to be retained in the Green Belt.

Where the function and purpose of Green Belt has already been lost it makes no sense to determine planning applications by reference to Green Belt policy. A case example is planning reference 14/P/00484 in Mount Pleasant where the surrounding area was a linear pattern of development either side of the road but located in the Green Belt.

The Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 allows for limited infilling within identified settlements where the land is substantially surrounded by existing development. This is only partly consistent with the NPPF. The main distinction being that the NPPF does not support the restriction of development to land that is “substantially surrounded by development”.

Further paragraph 85 of the NPPF states that when defining boundaries, local planning authorities should not include land, which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open. Here the land in question cannot be kept permanently open because it is already developed.

In paragraph 86 the NPPF sets out that a village should be included in the Green Belt if its open character makes an important contribution towards the openness of the Green Belt. However, if the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons such as conservation or development management policies, then it should be excluded from the Green Belt.

The removal of the Green Belt designation from the existing settlements (without their extension) would comply with the Central Government advice contained in the NPPF and would allow sensible brownfield redevelopment to help alleviate the housing land shortage.

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? ( )

Policies A37, 38, 40, 42, 44 & 45 – My Objections

Some 295 houses in various smaller developments in West Horsley, 100 in Send and 15 in Ripley. These will generate traffic on the A 247 to access the A3.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/502  Respondent: 8671969 / Valerie Thompson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

2 West and East Horsley

I object to the over-development of West Horsley in particular.

We feel we are being punished for exposing the illegal activities of GBC’s former Planning Officer, Monika Juneja.

GBC’s Leader and Chief Executive never apologised for their support of this former Councillor, neither did she apologise for the threats she sent in emails and in the local paper, when she knew she had broken the law. Indeed she still continued to protest her innocence even after conviction.

Her legacy has left the Borough with HER megalomaniac intent to ruin our environment.

West Horsley does not want to be a dormitory town.

Sites A36-41 will completely change the feel of the village, ruining what is at present a large natural green break between houses.

The planned number is far too great for a small village.

The planned number is far greater than anywhere else in the Borough

The wastewater(sewerage) system will not be able to cope.

The surgery is full and would be very difficult to enlarge

The carparks are full

Schools are full
Children cannot walk to Ripley or Effingham for alternative schools and there is no bus service to Ripley, neither are the roads safe for cycling.

There are no proposals for improving the roads.

If the Wisley site is also developed there will be a further 2000+ houses using the same facilities.

The proposal to build 120 houses at Waterloo farm will make the present Camping Site unusable as a rural facility.

Flooding is a regular problem down Ripley lane and Ockham Road North, both of which have been closed several times during the past year.

Traffic travels on The Street in West Horsley and Ockham Road North (both 30mph zones) at up to 80mph, and regularly travels at recorded speeds of 52mph. Traffic has doubled on these roads in the last 15 years. There are no speed cameras or traffic calming measures. Pavements are narrow and impossible to widen. Both roads are narrow and cannot reasonably be expected to regularly accommodate a further 1500 cars.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/723  Respondent: 8671969 / Valerie Thompson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

2 West and East Horsley

I object to the over-development of West Horsley in particular.

We feel we are being punished for exposing the illegal activities of GBC’s former Planning Officer, Monika Juneja.

GBC, s Leader and Chief Executive never apologised for their support of this former Councillor, neither did she apologise for the threats she sent in emails and in the local paper, when she knew she had broken the law. Indeed she still continued to protest her innocence even after conviction.

Her legacy has left the Borough with HER megalomaniac intent to ruin our environment.

West Horsley does not want to be a dormitory town.

Sites A36-41 will completely change the feel of the village, ruining what is at present a large natural green break between houses.

The planned number is far too great for a small village.

The planned number is far greater than anywhere else in the Borough

The wastewater(sewerage) system will not be able to cope.
The surgery is full and would be very difficult to enlarge

The carparks are full

Schools are full

Children cannot walk to Ripley or Effingham for alternative schools and there is no bus service to Ripley, neither are the roads safe for cycling.

There are no proposals for improving the roads.

If the Wisley site is also developed there will be a further 2000+ houses using the same facilities.

The proposal to build 120 houses at Waterloo farm will make the present Camping Site unusable as a rural facility.

Flooding is a regular problem down Ripley lane and Ockham Road North, both of which have been closed several times during the past year.

Traffic travels on The Street in West Horsley and Ockham Road North (both 30mph zones) at up to 80mph, and regularly travels at recorded speeds of 52mph. Traffic has doubled on these roads in the last 15 years. There are no speed cameras or traffic calming measures. Pavements are narrow and impossible to widen. Both roads are narrow and cannot reasonably be expected to regularly accommodate a further 1500 cars.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/364</th>
<th>Respondent: 8687265 / Dagero Ltd (David Roberts)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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. Sites in East and West Horsley

I OBJECT in particular to including Sites A36-41 (East and West Horsley). This is a back-door way to create a mega-village – essentially, a soulless new dormitory town. The Horsleys feel victimised by this plan, which has been masterminded by Council leaders representing Ash and Tongham at the other end of the borough, where (in a flagrant case of political double standards) the Green Belt is actually being extended under Policy P3.15

Whatever their merits as development sites, the 6 Horsley sites should not be considered individually but for their cumulative impact on the contiguous villages of East and West Horsley.

Building 533 new houses on these 6 sites, plus at least another 90 on small sites is (a) excessive in absolute terms and (b) disproportionate relative to the rest of the borough. It will destroy the rural character of these communities.16

Under the plan, rural West Horsley will take 35% of new homes, urban Ash and Tongham 16% and Guildford urban area only 11%. The total number of homes in West Horsley will increase by 35%, which is disproportionate when measured against the overall increase in housing across the borough and particularly in Guildford town. If the Council have justifiable reasons to transform a particular community so radically, the plan should present a case rather than putting forward site proposals as a fait accompli.

These sites will put unsustainable strain on local facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops. For instance:
• Thames Water have advised the Council that the current wastewater network will not cope and that the foul drainage system all the way to the treatment works North of Ripley will need to be upgraded.

• Guildford Council’s Education Review says “expansion options may need to be considered for primary” education in the Horsley area within the first 5 years of the plan, but Surrey County Council have no plans to do so. The Raleigh School is already full. The private Glensk and Cranmore schools are also at or near to full capacity. The suggestion that schools in Ripley can be used contradicts the plan’s stated intention to reduce traffic on the A3 and strategic aim that primary schools should be within walking distance.

• The plan’s Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C) imagines an “East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme between 2019 and 2023 by Surrey CC” but gives no details. This scheme is just wishful thinking. The proposed housing can only harm the local environment, not “improve”

The harmful impact of these sites is magnified by the proximity of the so-called Wisley Airfield site (Three Farms Meadow), with over 2,000 new homes only 2 miles away (see below).

The density of new housing on the 6 Horsley sites is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the locality at present.

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

Collectively, these 6 sites militate against NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been a success story in the Horsleys, with the creation of an amenity wood and community garden, the purchase of adjacent fields (on the eastern side of Ockham Road North) by local residents in order to preserve their open aspect, well-maintained pitches for local football and cricket clubs, public tennis courts, open space for a high-quality campsite (at Waterloo Farm) used by many foreign tourists and the approval of plans for a “Theatre in the Woods” – making West Horsley the only village in Surrey with an opera house. The open nature of West Horsley determined that a long portion of the 2012 Olympic cycle races passed through the village. This route has since been adopted by cyclists as a permanent asset, including the annual

2. Councillor Paul Spooner and his predecessor, Councillor Stephen Mansbridge
3. Even some property developers complain about the Council’s bias in favour of oversized developments, g. Dandara, whose relatively small Green Belt site on the A245 (Epsom Road) in West Horsley is not considered in the plan.

Prudential cycle race. These and future examples of “positive planning” depend on protecting the Green Belt to maintain the openness and attractiveness of the local landscape and avoiding the urbanisation and traffic congestion that Sites A36-41 will bring.

By surrounding Waterloo Farm campsite with 120 new houses, Policy A40 on land to the North of West Horsley will make this rural tourism amenity unviable. This may accord with developers’ plans, since the site would then be vulnerable to infilling with yet more housing.

Site A40 is subject to an unacceptable flood risk from a combination of a high groundwater table and the lack of surface water run-off. This is flat, clay land on the downhill side of the Horsleys where floodwater from new development will accumulate and back up onto existing properties nearby. I can provide photographs proving how badly these fields already flood at present. These problems will only get worse with the increase in extreme weather events associated with climate change. The “appropriate mitigation” suggested in Policy A40 exists only as an abstract notion. It should not overrule the need for Green Belt “exceptional circumstances”.

Policy A40 underestimates the problems of safe access and egress. Firstly, Ockham Road North was closed for several weeks in 2014 because of flooding, and still floods regularly. Secondly, access problems are not confined to flooding and are not addressed by the proposal to extend the existing 30mph zone past the site entrance. Repeated attempts made by Ockham Road North residents to extend this zone have been turned down by the local authorities, Highways England and Surrey Police, even though data collected in 2015 show that traffic has doubled over the last 15 years and that the average speed in the 40mph section of this road is 52mph, with maximum recorded speeds of over 80mph. No traffic calming measures have so far been achieved. Additional housing will add to several hazards along this stretch of road, including:

- Its use by pedestrians, especially children (using the Raleigh and Glenesk schools and catching school buses to Guildford and Howard of Effingham), pensioners living in the string of bungalows at the northern end of the road, and visitors from the Waterloo campsite who are unfamiliar with the area.
- The existence of a narrow footpath on only one side of the road in any one spo The layout means that walking half a mile between Green Land and East Lane requires crossing the road twice.
- The road’s increasing use by recreational cyclists (see above).
- Its winding nature, poor sight lines (especially when interrupted by summer vegetation) and dangerous, concealed driveways. Most of these were built in the 1930s. Some have been widened but many are too narrow for modern traffic. Since a deep ditch runs along most of the road, vehicles have to swing out dangerously when entering or leaving.
- The prospect of additional traffic, including 19,000 HGV movements (90 a day over a long period) if Surrey County Council approves the Drift Golf Course’s planning application to re-landscape its site using bulk waste transported from London.

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

Attached documents:

---

I am writing to express my objections to the new Guildford Local Plan with regard to East and West Horsley on the following points:

I object to the proposed removal of the Horsleys from the Green Belt, I do not believe that 'exceptional circumstances' have been demonstrated. I also believe that all Green Belt areas should be conserved at all costs. To allow the Green Belt to be eroded is a slippery slope and we should be looking to conserve all of the Green Belt for our future generations; In light of the above, I also object to the proposed extension of the boundaries of the settlement areas of the Horsleys, since it would enable developments on currently undeveloped 'green' sites.

The proposed housing numbers are unrealistic and would place a severe burden on the existing infrastructure to the Horsleys. These are rural narrow roads that are already unable to cope with current traffic. I have to regularly wait 2 weeks for an available doctor's appointment, increasing the population density would inevitably lead to an even longer wait time.

I therefore also object to the proposed development at Wisley airfield, since local infrastructure is ill-equipped to cope with this scale of development, including local schools, medical facilities, road quality, transport links and local drainage.

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: A36, A37, A38, A39, A40, A41

I wish to object to the 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan for the following reasons:

1. Failure of the Local Plan to properly represent local needs or the needs of the Borough generally

A questionnaire produced by West Horsley Parish Council identified a local need for only 20 No. affordable homes.

The effect of these proposed developments will be only to draw in more people from outside the area and impoverish the quality of life for those of us who already live here.

The number of houses being put forward has been assessed purely on empiric calculation and the Local Plan is being driven by a biased GBC planning executive committee, which puts its own members’ self interest before the interest of those who elected them. Furthermore, the figures cannot possibly be representative of accurate projected demand, not least because of the likely reduction of immigration following Brexit. The assessment is flawed and must be rejected.

2. Unauthorised removal of West Horsley from the Green Belt

By the guidelines set down by central government, and restated by successive government ministers, there should be no relaxation of Green Belt boundaries unless there are exceptional circumstances.

This condition is not being satisfied for any of the proposed development sites (A36, A37, A38, A39, A40, A41).

The use of brown field sites is also a stated intention of central government - an option not fully explored by GBC.

For these reasons, the proposed West Horsley development sites must be rejected.

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

Attached documents:

I wish to OBJECT to the proposed local development plan.

The plan does not site any required exceptional circumstance or other justification to alter the existing Green Belt boundaries.

The Horsleys have a rich & varied mix of established LOW housing density settlements, with a considerable number of historic buildings.

The proposed development would introduce an element of HIGH density development, which would alter the character & outlook of the villages.
No allowance appears to have been made for the impact of these developments on the existing infrastructure. The infrastructure is already "creaking at the seams" without increased development.

This plan in it's existing form is totally inadequate & includes far too many houses. It really should be reconsidered.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/239</th>
<th>Respondent: 8706561 / Carolyn Pritchard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 refer to the New Local Plan dated 6th June 2016. Once again, I write on behalf of myself and others who feel VERY strongly about this. My family have lived in the Horsleys for 4 generations and we have owned many houses over the years. The reason why we have made this area our home is simply because we enjoy living here, it offers green spaces and a friendly safe environment. We cannot understand why GBC wise to completely change the nature of these villages. To even consider building 533 new homes is just ridiculous. To take us out of the Green Belt is unthinkable. To bring in Travellers Sites criminal. The Horsleys cannot cope with this number of new homes.......we do NOT have the infrastructure. Our roads, schools, Doctors, cannot cope now! Also consider more noise, lights, damage to the natural environment, flooding, drains etc. This is on top of GBC'S favour of building 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield which is only 2 miles away!!! I ask you to please consider the future of these villages and the mess that will be created if this number of new homes are built. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2714</th>
<th>Respondent: 8708289 / Frances King</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>Sites in East and West Horsley: I OBJECT to the inclusion of Sites A36-41. These sites should not be looked at individually but at the cumulative impact they will have on the two villages, but in particular West Horsley. Under the Plan the very rural West Horsley would have its housing stock increased by 35%, this is wholly disproportionate when set against the increases proposed for urban Guildford and Ash &amp; Tongham. The infrastructure in the villages cannot support a further 593 houses, the local schools are already oversubscribed and medical centre is overstretched. The drainage already has difficulty coping with the roads regularly flooding and being impassable when there is heavy rainfall. It is noted in the site descriptions except A36 there is &quot;surface water flood risk&quot; and in the case of A39 the flood risk is “fluvial and surface water”. Building on open Green Belt agricultural will only exacerbate the problem. In the &quot;Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Availability” survey it refers to the “Horsley flood hotspot” when discussing the sites referred to. There will no shop in West Horsley from October 2016, the parking at East Horsley, to be designated a “District Centre” is already full to capacity. As is the station car park at Horsley Station, whatever the hope is to encourage cycling and walking on a cold, wet winter morning and evening people will use their cars and 593 extra households would suggest at least that number of extra cars on roads.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4316  Respondent: 8709601 / Robert Fletcher  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I live in West Horsley and I am writing with my objections to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan.

Permanent loss of greenbelt never to be retrieved for our progeny

The current green belt and surrounding policies have worked well in preserving the nature of this area. The proposed changes will turn the Horsleys into a residential area getting on for half the urban area of Guildford - by comparing the area enclosed by the proposed green belt boundary. Horsley and particularly West Horsley with it's open spaces along East Lane has a very different character from the urban spoke that runs through Ewell, Epsom, Leatherhead and out through Fetcham and the Bookhams towards Horsley. Horsley is the first place along this spur that is properly surrounded by countryside with a village and not suburban feel, This is wholly down to the restriction previous authorities have placed on development. The Horsleys serve the Surrey hills immediately to the south, an area of outstanding natural beauty. This is significant generator of tourist trade for the village. The change in character will have a huge impact. For example, we have a Camping and Caravan Club site in Horsley. Part of the proposal is to build a large area of housing to the north and east of Waterloo farm where the camp site is located. Can you imagine the change in the approach road to the site, from a drive between open fields consummate with the rural feel of the area, to a drive through a housing estate. The council have failed to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances necessary to remove the proposed sites in Horsley from the Green Belt.

Sadly the focus of the plan appears to be on green field sites as cheaper option for developers over the many brown field opportunities in the borough.

An unsustainable growth in the population of the Horsleys

The proposed plan, is grossly disproportionate both in the proportion of Guildford's housing allocation landing on the Horsley area, and in the size of increase in housing numbers in West Horsley (35% in West Horsley). To the residents this looks like a piece of exploitative opportunism on the part of developers and councillors - many sites already being under option.

I am very concerned about the infrastructure in the area and it's ability to cope with the population we have now.

Inadequate Junior Schools Provision

The schools have no capacity left to accommodate more children and the Raleigh Primary School has not enough real estate to take on more pupils without having to build on the school field which is valuable for physical recreation, an increasingly important part of the curriculum to encourage healthy lives.

Inadequate Senior Schools Provision
We already have had the nightmare of parents being told places are not available in local senior schools and the prospect of having to take their children many miles to school - bad for the children, the community and the local transport systems. A jump in population will make this situation unmanageable.

**Inadequate Roads and Parking**

The roads in the area are already busy and often in a poor state of repair. The area around the junctions between Nightingale Avenue, East Lane and Ockham Road are seriously congested in the morning as children are being dropped at both the Raleigh and Glensesk Schools. The proportionate increase in cars and traffic in the village would be unsustainable and completely out of character with the current rural nature of the village. Many of the residents would catch the train to work. Horsley station car park is already full on week days and would need expansion to support the new commuters.

Medical facilities too are stretched currently and could not cope with the extra population. The car park is often full and people use the few extra spaces available at the village hall. More people would again dictate the provision of extra facilities.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1199  **Respondent:** 8711841 / Rosmarie Roberts-Kunz  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?**

( ), **is Sound?**

( ), **is Legally Compliant?**

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

- Amount of new housing far exceeds local need.
- Housing density excessive when compared with existing development.
- It would transform the Horsleys into a sizable town, something for which no case is made.
- Collective impact of these 6 sites on a small part of the borough not considered. Should not be treated as isolated, separate sites.
- Total amount of building involved disproportionate with the amount of planned development elsewhere the borough, especially less sensitive urban areas not protected by Green Belt.
- Sites unsustainable, since key infrastructure is lacking and no adequate provision is made to increase it – e.g. poor wastewater capacity, lack of schools, absence of traffic management plan, flooding.
- No account taken of additional impact of Wisley Airfield site on Horsleys.
- Extension of settlement boundaries too permissive. The Horsleys are characterised by streets with development along only one side of the road. Policies allow too many adjacent green fields to be developed by squaring off boundaries and claiming they don’t contribute to Green Belt “openness”.
- Green Belt gap with neighbouring settlements hugely narrowed, especially if Wisley Airfield is built on.
- Policies 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?**
1. I consider removal of Horsleys from Green Belt both immoral & possibly illegal.

2. No provision has been made for new wider roads to carry extra traffic.

3. No plans for extra schools, doctors surgeries

4. Parking is already difficult - where are the plans/ideas for possibly 500-1000 more spaces

5. The young cannot afford housing now - what plans for affordable NON EXPANDABLE houses

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

Attached documents:

I object to all sites in West Horsley for over 5 homes. There is insufficient infrastructure planned. It is impossible to deliver sustainable housing sites of this size in the countryside.

I object to the insetting of West Horsley

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

Attached documents:

Sites A36-41 (East and West Horsley). This is a back-door way to create a mega-village – essentially, a soulless new dormitory town. The Horsleys feel victimised by this plan, which has been masterminded by Council leaders representing Ash and Tongham at the other end of the borough, where (in a flagrant case of political double standards) the Green Belt is actually being extended under Policy P3.15

Whatever their merits as development sites, the 6 Horsley sites should not be considered individually but for their cumulative impact on the contiguous villages of East and West Horsley, the green belt is meant to stop villages from
conjoining.

Under the plan, rural West Horsley will take 35% of new homes, urban Ash and Tongham 16% and Guildford urban area only 11%. The total number of homes in West Horsley will increase by 35%, which is disproportionate when measured against the overall increase in housing across the borough and particularly in Guildford town.

These sites will put unsustainable strain on local facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops.

By surrounding Waterloo Farm campsite with 120 new houses, Policy A40 on land to the North of West Horsley will make this rural tourism amenity unviable. This may accord with developers’ plans, since the site would then be vulnerable to infilling with yet more housing.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4042  Respondent: 8727105 / Emma Pernet  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

If East & West Horsley are taken out of the Green Belt then I believe it would be much easier for developers to build new homes which would very quickly destroy the quality of living in Horsley. The existing infrastructure in Horsley cannot cope with the existing number of residents so any increase in housing would again be detrimental to the community.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/904  Respondent: 8728577 / Peter Williams  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 local plan for the following reasons:

1. **Green Belt and the Countryside (Policy P2) and Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) (Policy P1)**
   1. Policy P2 states that the Metropolitan Green Belt will continue to be protected against inappropriate development. I object to the village’s removal from the Green Belt by insetting and extending the 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area boundaries.
   2. No exceptional circumstances are made for the new boundaries.
   3. The Green Belt study and Countryside Study is flawed. Wet Horsley’s defined settlement boundaries (2003 Plan) do not need to be extended.
   4. The parish has a rich and varied mix of low density housing and a good number of historic buildings. It sits on the north side or the North Downs (partly within the Surrey Hills AONB) and is a magnet for visitors, particularly walkers and cyclists, throughout the year.
5. The key evidence document (Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2031) makes no case for the large increase in housing in West and East Horsley, nor for that matter, in the neighbouring villages.
6. The proposed new economic development sites are proposed for the opposite side of the borough. Any increase in housing should be close to them.

2. Presumption in favour of sustainable development (Policy 1), Borough-Wide Strategy (Policy S2), Homes for all and affordable homes (policy H1, H2)

1. Policy S2 calls for 13,800 new houses to be built during the plan period of 2013-2033. This number is excessive and unsustainable in the villages surrounding Guildford, particularly in West Horsley.
2. Substantial expansion of the village is not sustainable. There is a single small shop, no post office, and a very restricted bus service. This is inadequate for the proposed increase in housing.
3. The density of development proposed is much higher than the current level and will be out of character with the varied mix of type and layout in the village.
4. There is already a deficiency in the local infrastructure; there is a lack of schools and shops; drainage is overloaded; parking is in short supply and the station car park in East Horsley is often full.
5. The need for the proposed number of homes to be constructed during the first 5 years is completely unproven. The West Horsley Parish Council and Surrey Community Action Housing Survey: May 2014 identified a need for some 20 additional affordable homes to cater for young people and local elderly people who wished to remain in the village by down-sizing to smaller homes.

3. Sustainable Transport for new development (Policy i3)

1. The practicalities of delivering secure travel plans have not been properly considered. The elderly, disabled, or those with small children, are best served by developments in towns and close to extensive amenities, including health care. The Policy states that developers ‘will be expected’ to propose and secure travel plans; this is a far cry from ‘be required to deliver’.
2. Access to essential facilities (this is not mentioned in the written policies, although there are vague references in the infrastructure policies section)
3. The green grocer may retire this year leaving the village with no shop. Plus parking outside the shop is, in any case, very limited.
4. Parking is very limited in East Horsley where most residents go to use the library and the shops. The proposed increase in population will make movement through, and parking in, the village much more difficult.

4. Schools (schools are mentioned in the definition under Policy I1)

1. There is already a shortage of state primary school places in the village. The Raleigh School has been oversubscribed for several years.
2. Secondary school places at the Howard of Effingham School amongst others are limited and necessitate a significant bus or car journey to attend.
3. The private schools of Glenesk and Cranmore are busy and generate significant traffic from other parts of the county for parents to deliver and collect their children. There is heavy traffic on the A246 and Ockham Road North as a result at the start and end of each day.

5. Medical facilities (Infrastructure Delivery Plan refers to a possible extension of Kingston Avenue Medical Centre)

1. The doctors’ surgery is already busy and it is difficult get appointments now. An increase in patients will adversely affect the level of service.
2. A major extension of the Royal Surrey Hospital will be needed to deal with the increase of population (which is in excess of the Government ONS forecasts).

6. Roads and transport infrastructure (mentioned in the definitions of Policy I1)
There are frequent trains to London and Guildford, but the station car park is normally full on weekdays. There is no scope of extension of the car park.

The large increase in population planned will overload the station and the roads serving it.

Because of the village’s location and the distant location of jobs and amenities, most households have at least 2 cars. The proposed housing will increase traffic on the already inadequate roads, prolonging journey times, increasing local air and noise pollution, and increasing risk of traffic accidents.

The road surfaces and drainage are already in a very poor state of repair and will deteriorate even more rapidly.

7. Waste water infrastructure (mentioned in Reasoned Justification under Policy I1)

1. Sewage is known to overflow in the Ockham Road and Green Lane areas
2. Guildford Council has been advised by Thames Water that drainage network is unlikely to be able to cope with the increased demand of the proposed population increase. The foul water drainage system connecting West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley will require upgrading, for which Thames Water advises 2-3 years lead-in subsequent to any planning permission.

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

Attacked documents:
This is a substantial number of homes for a small village to absorb and will change the character of the village significantly.

West Horsley’s Neighbourhood Plan survey estimated that we might require as many as 20 new homes.

A37 Bell & Colville site being on the main road with public transport links could meet the village requirement by limiting to 20 homes not 40.

Regarding the other plots of land under consideration, I believe that either plot A38 at Manor Farm or Plot A40 Waterloo Farm would have the least impact. However the number of houses proposed is excessive.

Consideration could perhaps be given to relocating the village hall to Manor Farm area where the public tennis courts and football club are situated.

Long Reach Sang Area Object

Why do we need a public park in this area of rolling acres of beautiful countryside? An extension of public footpaths and bridleways would be far more beneficial.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/300  Respondent: 8729569 / Carolyn Kimpton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

It is with relief that the number of new homes proposed in the Green Belt

In West Horsley has been reduced. However, I strongly object to the following proposals in the current plan:-

1. Insetting West Horsley from the Green Belt The historic village of West Horsley with 41 listed buildings and set in glorious open countryside is in danger from the proposed development plan and insetting of becoming linked with East Horsley and creating Town Horsley. The character of West Horsley would be destroyed and should be preserved for future generations to enjoy. The West side of West Horsley is extraordinarily beautiful with rolling acres, copses, natural springs and streams meandering through the quintessential English open countryside and should be preserved at all costs. We are grateful to you and your team for removing the land between the back of Silkmore lane and Ripley Lane. This area should be considered for inclusion in the Surrey Hills area of outstanding natural beauty and be within the village's conservation area. The open countryside is not only valued and enjoyed by locals but by visitors from nearby towns and cities and overseas.

2. Village Boundary West Horsley

We object to the straightening up of the village boundary at the back of Silkmore Lane/Ripley Lane (image left) to allow building on this land would be of huge detriment to the character of the village and the pastoral scene enjoyed by all residents and visitors alike for the sake of lining the pockets of a property developer. The open fields are enjoyed by so many with the public footpath leading across the fields beyond to Ripley Lane and visitors to Hatchtands House and parkland.

Orchard Cottage is a prime example of how ruthless property developers can be in putting their own interests before t hose of the whole community. See image below of the house that replaced the pretty Victorian cottage- an absolute monstrosity which blights the countryside and is seen for miles and of a size and architectural style totally inappropriate for the village, partic larly given its open location. Why was this ever allowed? This could happen to the acres of land
that you propose to include into the village settlement area by straightening the village boundary. Please seriously reconsider extending out the village boundary. Thank you.

3. Sustainability for West Horsley
It appears that nothing has been put forward since last year's consultation to improve the sustainability of West Horsley development sites and thus meet national policy requirements.

4 New Homes - these should be built in the towns where there is work not in the countryside. Apartments and social Housing is required particularly in Guildford. Shopping space is not a priority for Guildford town centre with the increasing trend for shopping online etc. Housing is.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/386  Respondent: 8731297 / Roger Bathurst  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

This email registers my strong objection to the proposed Local Plan, particularly as respect to the Horsleys. I note in horror that you propose to withdraw the villages from the Green Belt and, entirely wrongly and as a “flag of convenience” for your Plan, redefine them as semi urban. I am sure you are well aware of the Planning Practice Guide but, since your Plan seems to ignore at least part of them, they are set out below for your convenience.

Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances,

When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight 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.

I recognise that there is a housing need in the Borough. I also recognise that Guildford has to respect the NPPF. Further, I recognise that certain of the brown field sites proposed in the Horsleys - Thatcher’s Hotel and Bell and Colvill - have some measure of rationality in terms of size and scope.

However, I totally disagree that destruction of Green Belt and extraordinary levels of proposed development in two villages (which would indeed become semi urban if your ill thought out Plan is executed) is in any way necessary at this juncture.

You make it plain in your presentation that your considerations were first for urban development, then for brownfield sites, then for areas of infill and finally for Green Belt. This again makes sense.

It is, however, at this point, that it stops making sense because it was represented clearly to me by the planning officer that this is, of course, a whole Plan. In other words, you are seeking to pass the Plan in its entirety. Once accepted, you will be seeking quick wins. What will be quicker than building on green fields?! So much easier than an urban development. When challenged, the planning officer agreed with my assessment. In other words, the nonsense about Green Belt being the last to be considered is totally misleading. In fact, it will likely be the FIRST to be developed. That is a travesty.

It may well be that we need the number of houses in the Borough by 2033 that we envisage today, but equally it may well not. Such is the political uncertainty that realistic projections are well nigh impossible. To build on Green Belt way, way ahead of any necessity to do so is borderline criminal vandalism. The Council is perfectly well aware that, once the Horsleys are removed from the Green Belt, there will be a deluge of planning applications which, given the extraordinary
scale of your awful current Plan, will be almost impossible to resist. The utter ruination of two wonderful VILLAGES (that is what they are) would be an appalling misuse of your power.

I urge the Council to think again. The Plan absolutely MUST be altered to a structure whereby housing is built in the same order as was assessed: urban, brown field, infill and finally, and only when absolutely necessary AT THAT TIME AND NOT BEFORE, 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: PSLPA16/3157</th>
<th>Respondent: 8732737 / G McCourt</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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? ( )

wish to register objections to the local plan job 13,860 new proposed houses, as not sustainable.

>>> There will be damage to local communities, these will not be villages any more.

>>> We need to check unrestricted sprawl of large buildup areas, We need

>>> to protect our Green Belt land and fields.

>>> We live here because it is a village and surrounded by green fields and farmland.

>>> We like the village atmosphere, knowing our neighbours and meeting them in our villages, being part of a small community.

97% of comments are against this policy, and the damage to local communities, there will not be any villages any more, an unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.

We need to encourage development of urban land.

Leave some of our villages in Green Belt areas, we must preserve our countryside for future generations.

>>> I OBJECT

>>> To the huge influx of traffic this planning will cause.

>>> Our little country roads cannot cope with the traffic as it is. The condition of our local roads is Appalling! Pot holes everywhere, causing dangerous driving, trying to avoid the holes, damaging cars.

>>> We have narrow country roads, not suitable for hundreds more ‘large family cars’.

>>> We don’t want yellow/white lines all over our village and road signs, which are quite unnecessary, which will only increase with your planning proposals.

The footpaths are few and far between, and narrow. We don’t want huge expansion of roads and paths to accommodate thousands more people just because they will have thousands more cars!

>>> I OBJECT

>>> To the lack of facilities suitable for thousands more people using our Doctors Surgery.
We cannot get an appointment within a week as it is, there is nowhere to expand the Surgery, are you planning to build another?

The local hospital The Royal Surrey is overcrowded already, there is nowhere else for us in our villages fro go To the influx of thousands more families with school age children, when our local junior school, The Raleigh, is full and they want to move to a larger site now! If they took one of your sites and you took over their 2 sites, at least the planners would have a few hundred more houses and the school would be able to accommodate more new children, but only a few! Not the hundreds you propose to bring into our little villages.

We cannot accommodate these new children into the local Senior schools either. Where do you propose to build these new schools?

We are villages, people want to move here, as we did because of the quiet, the fields, the village atmosphere, and the safety of a village.

I OBJECT

there is no infrastructure which has been confirmed.

The flood plans in these areas get flooded every winter. West Horsley is known for being a flood plain area, totally unsuitable for hundreds more houses.

Thames Water has advised that the current wastewater network is unlikely to support the demand from all these developments!

I OBJECT

To the overcrowding at our shops, we have two little parades of shops for the use of the two villages, not thousands more people using them. There is only limited parking, only one little supermarket, Budgens, and no access to any larger Supermarket.

The train does not take us into Cobham centre, only Stoke D’Abernen, miles away from the Cobham town centre, how do all these new people get to ships?

We have no bus which has a regular timetable to Cobham, our nearest town, there would have to be in place public transport regularly into Cobham and Guildford.

I OBJECT

To the state of our roads when thousands more people will be using them. The Drift, which is a narrow lane from West Horsley to Effingham, is already used by lorries, coaches from the schools, and many local businesses, it is full job potholes from constant use, how is that going to cope?

All our roads are narrow, we are a village, the drainage is already a problem through the village every winter.

BROWNFIELD ARE BEING IGNORED

We need more houses in the centre of towns, not out in our villages, therefore using more cars, more pollution, more congestion on our already crowded roads.

Recycle derelict and urban land.

No exceptional circumstances have been disclosed to Green Belt boundaries should not be changed through the planning process

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3966  **Respondent:** 8734785 / Bill Houghton  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I object to all the above plans as they are an attack on the local green belt and are based on unsubstantiated housing needs.

I also object on the grounds that they are a disproportionate development in our area of the borough.

They do not take into consideration the lack of schools and medical facilities but above all they will have a devastating effect on the A247. Plans already agreed – ie the Send Marina, and the additional houses on the Vision Engineering plot will be more than enough to bring this road to rush hour standstill and the Tannery Lane crossroads, already difficult for large commercial vehicles will become an even more hazardous accident spot. Plan A42, the Clockbarn Nursery development will be especially detrimental at that spot.

The short section of the A247 between the Burnt Common roundabout and the new north & south A3 slip roads will have to absorb all this new local traffic but it will also attract those who currently go through Ripley.

A traffic survey of current levels would surely confirm that there are certain times of the day when we can take several minutes to gain access to the road.

I most strongly object to the inevitable increase in air pollution and noise.

It is sad to think that we would have to endure even higher levels of both when in our gardens, any further increase will be a threat to health and too much to bear.

To me it is transparently obvious that all the developments are blatant attempts to make money at others expense. The people behind them will make money by making all the local residents’ lives less enjoyable. Traffic problems are already bad. It is difficult to leave the house and turn left in the morning. Turning right would be unthinkable.

If the plans are allowed to go ahead this will be a triumph of greed and conspiracy of greedy people against the common good.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/288  **Respondent:** 8734977 / E Chamberlain  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

As an elderly person I am sad to read of the over development of these green villages! I have lived here for many years and it is an oasis in what I thought was Green Belt. I have put up With very poor drainage even flooding and so without a huge infrastructure more houses are going to cause much flooding. The pressure on these roads and and villages will change the area into another Woking,
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPA16/482  Respondent: 8740321 / J McClellan  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

DISPROPORTIONATE NUMBERS OF NEW HOUSING IN EAST HORSLEY I OBJECT to 533 new houses. This is a disproportionate number for this part of the borough. 23% of the Plan's new housing is in the area of the Horsleys, Ockham, Ripley and Send, a rural area that has only 0.3% of GBC population. The infrastructure will collapse under the strain and chaos will ensue.

SITES

1. SITES IN EAST AND WEST HORSLEY

I OBJECT to Sites A36 to 41 inclusive. They will effectively destroy these historic villages. New housing will put an intolerable strain on facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewerage and surface drainage to name but a few. The housing density is inappropriate and far greater than anywhere in the locale at present.

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

Comment ID: PSLPA16/394  Respondent: 8744097 / Nick Discombe  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Dear Sir, I write in connection with the consultation period which I understand ends on Mon 18 July. I am open to new housing in the Horsley villages but would like to register my strong objection to a number of changes the proposed Local Plan sets out…

1. I cannot understand the value to anyone in extending the boundary of the village. I called Guildford Borough Council Planning Department today to make sure I could understand the logic behind this but nothing material was forthcoming & so I strongly object to this change.
2. Overall the proposed combination of Thatcher’s, Bell & Colvill, Manor Farm, Ockham Road & East Lane developments anticipates more than 500 new homes. Without new infrastructure (schools, roads etc) this is simply too many for the local infrastructure to absorb.
3. The Thatcher’s proposal is simply dangerous for the local community – there is already a congested junction here & adding 40+ residents here will be a real danger for the community.

I would be happy to discuss my comments with an officer from Guildford Borough Council,

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

Attached documents:
Site References A36, A37, A38, A39, A40, A41 (The Horsleys) and A35 (Wisley Airfield) I object to the proposal to build some 2,600 homes at these locations for the reasons stated above.

I support those aspects of the Plan in favour of genuine Sustainable Development (S1), strong protection of Surrey Hills AONB (P1), and protection of the Green Belt (P2, provided it is protected in both the letter and spirit of the law)

However, I maintain my objections to the aspects of the revised plan that I believe are inaccurate, unnecessary and unwelcome. I urge the independent Planning Inspectorate to challenge the assumptions and proposals in the draft plan, and to insist on its revision which I consider to be in both the local and national interest,

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

Attached documents:
Please record my objection.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/886  Respondent: 8749697 / Chris Tailby  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Re: Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (“Draft Local Plan”) – reply to consultation

I am writing to OBJECT to the Draft Local Plan (DLP). I OBJECT to many of the proposals in the latest Plan but the fact that I have not specifically objected to a policy set out in the Plan should not be taken as my agreement to that policy.

General observations

As a resident of West Horsley my over-arching objection to the DLP is the fact that if the DLP is adopted it will result in houses being built on land which is part of the Green Belt. In my view this negates all that the Green Belt represents, namely an area around London designed to prevent over development. The Green Belt was instituted precisely to prevent the kind of development being proposed by the DLP.

I draw your attention to the letter dated 18th June 2014 from Nick Boles MP (Parliamentary Under Secretary of State (Planning) to our MP, Sir Paul Beresford, in which the Minister states that the Government has an on-going commitment to national Green Belt protection, reflecting what Ministers have regularly told Parliament. The letter states that the national policy on the Green Belt is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF makes clear that “most development in the Green Belt is inappropriate and should be approved only in very special circumstances. Planning guidance, updated in March 2014, also states that “unmet housing need (including traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt to constitute the very special circumstances justifying inappropriate development in the Green Belt”.

I also commend to your attention the paragraphs from the NPPF referred to in that letter which state that when plan-making, Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, unless specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted; these policies include the Green Belt and AONB. My emphasis.

Furthermore Paragraph 17 of the NPPF notes that “the core planning principles that underpin plan-making include both protecting the Green Belts and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside”.

There are other paragraphs referred to in the letter which point to the need to retain the Green Belt as currently defined. Paragraph 80 notes the various purposes of the Green Belt in particular assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

I am happy to provide a copy of this letter in the (unlikely) event you have not had the opportunity to peruse it.

Insofar as the DLP proposals involve building additional houses on greenfield sites within the Green Belt they drive a coach and horses through the objectives of the Green Belt.

OBJECTION: Insetting of villages and moving of greenbelt boundaries
The removal of the village of West Horsley from the protection of the greenbelt is to be deplored and I OBJECT to this proposed action. Furthermore I object to the moving of the existing green belt boundaries to take land outside the greenbelt when currently it enjoys green belt protection. In my view the latter proposal borders on deceitful being intended to facilitate development in the existing greenbelt as it frees what is currently protected greenbelt land from protection. I can see that in some limited cases it is sensible to move the boundary to ensure that part of a person’s garden is either wholly inside or wholly outside the boundary but I do not agree that whole fields should be taken outside the greenbelt boundary as they then become targets for developers. Accordingly, if one takes Silkmore Lane as an example, the existing greenbelt boundary protects all the green fields to the west of the Lane but if the greenbelt boundary is moved as proposed, a large area of the fields will lose their greenbelt protection. That is also the case behind allocated site A37 where the effect of moving the greenbelt boundary is to open up more of site A37 to development.

**OBJECTION:** The GLP Housing proposals lack proportionality.

Research by West Horsley Parish Council indicates that the majority (about 75%) of housebuilding proposed by GBC will take place on Greenbelt land in the Eastern and Western rural areas of the Borough. The remaining 25% of building will take place on brownfield and urban land in Ash and Tongham together with Guildford town centre. This use of greenfield land instead of using brownfield land is disproportionate. I object to this “skewing” of building on previously greenfield sites when it is not clear that brownfield sites in rural areas have been given sufficient prominence. It is well known that developers prefer to build on greenfield land and I suggest that GBC are deliberately choosing greenfield sites (in the greenbelt) in order to facilitate developers at the expense of the lives of residents.

A further **OBJECTION on the grounds of proportionality** is that the proposals from GBC will involve an increase of 35% of new homes in the village of West Horsley. A huge increase in itself but again disproportionate when compared with the much smaller increase in housing in Ash & Tongham (16%) and Guildford Town (11%). Putting those percentages into figures, it is worth noting the enormity of GBC’s plan – 533 houses on large sites in the Horsleys, 60 houses on small sites in the Horsleys, 2000 houses on Wisley Airfield, 400 houses on Burnt Common and 2000 houses at Gosden Hill Farm (on the A3 this side of Burpham).

This makes a total of 4,993 houses within a 5-mile radius of Horsley, not including many smaller sites in nearby villages!!! At the moment there are 2808 houses in the Horsleys (EH 1697, WH 1111). The implications of these numbers are staggering and in my view show the lack of proportionality in the proposals. As a former lawyer I suggest that these numbers alone make the proposals in the plan capable of being challenged in Court.

**OBJECTION:** The housing numbers put forward by GBC are not accurate and are far in excess of what may be required, especially in a “post-Brexit” environment.

It seems to me that the starting point for deciding how many houses should be built is the figure determined by the objectively agreed housing need (OAN). Work carried out by GL Hearn on behalf of GBC to calculate the OAN came up with a figure of a housing need of 693 houses per annum over the period of the Plan. However the work by the Consultancy, NMSS, commissioned by the Guildford Residents Association has come up with a figure of 510 houses per annum. This figure is significantly less than the figure advanced by GBC. If the NMSS figure is more robust than the GL Hearn figure, I suggest that further work needs to be done by GBC to arrive at a figure for OAN on which we can all agree.

The housing figures being used by GBC have never been the subject of proper debate by Councillors nor “stress-tested” by other independent consultants. The Leader of the Council does not appear to countenance the fact that the GL Hearn figure is wrong or indeed needs review.

Such work that has been done (see Councillor David Reeves letter with attached report) to Councillor Paul Spooner of 4th July 2016, indicates that a much lower figure for new houses than GBC propose, is required. This work is consistent with the work done by NMSS.
OBJECTION: Roads and Transport Infrastructure: Sustainable transport for new developments

The expansion of the houses in the village of West Horsley by a figure of 35% is not sustainable. There is only one shop, no post office and a very limited bus service through the village on weekdays only – the village cannot accept high volumes of new housing development of the scale of that proposed.

Even with the present levels of housing there is excessive traffic travelling through the village at peak times. The areas around the schools (Raleigh, Glenesk and Cranmore) are particularly busy with the “school run”. The proposed increase in development will put even more pressure on schools and medical services which are already stretched.

There is no mention of the provision of additional schools, roads and transport for West Horsley which development on the scale proposed requires.

Whilst Horsley station has frequent trains to London and Guildford 7 days a week there is an inadequate number of parking spaces at the station with the car park often being full during the week. An increase of housing in the villages of East and West Horsley will increase pressure on station parking and traffic movements to and from the station. Getting to the station is difficult at the best of times as Glenesk school is on the main road leading to the station and people dropping off children at the school frequently block the road thereby adding to the traffic congestion. An increase in development will only make this situation worse.

The number of extra cars on the roads which would result also means an increase in undesirable exhaust emissions.

Affordable homes

The proposed development of 385 homes on the allocated Green Belt sites at much higher densities than currently exist in the village settlement would be totally out of character with the existing mix of different housing styles and layout of the village.

The so-called need for new houses in West Horsley is not proven – the 2014 Housing Survey carried out by the West Horsley Parish Council showed a limited need for up to 20 affordable homes for local people who want to remain in the village. Those are young people and also older people who want to downsize to a smaller property. The definition of “affordable housing” is that the price of an “affordable house” should be 80% of the market value. Given that the average price for houses in the Horsleys must be close to £1 million, it is difficult to see how building even “affordable housing” in the Horsleys is going to solve the housing shortage.

Where are the jobs?

I note that GBC has not identified any jobs for West Horsley. When I looked at GBC’s maps at the Horsley Cricket Club event in 2014, I noticed that the jobs were west of Guildford. It seems to me that housing should be concentrated in the areas where there are jobs. Building houses in West Horsley will exacerbate the traffic congestion and pollution as workers will need to drive from the villages to get to work. Furthermore, residents who work away from their homes will create dormitory clusters which will be of little value to the village.

Jobs – chicken and egg

As I understand the reasoning behind the need for more housing and what drives the housing numbers, is the quest for more economic growth. But there is a fundamental flaw in the GBC thinking which is that a proportion of the jobs identified by GBC comes from the construction of the new houses. And it is these jobs which are responsible for increasing the figures quoted as Objectively Assessed Housing Need. A true “chicken and egg” situation.

Who gets the benefit of these proposals?

It is not clear to me why this plan has been drawn up in the way it has. It is difficult to see a more destructive approach to our countryside. I suggest that the only people who will benefit from the developments proposed by GBC are the developers!
No one in the villages will benefit one iota! Quite the contrary – our lives will be made a misery both while the development takes place and when it is finished. There is nothing in the DLP which gives me or my family any benefit whatsoever. I am left with the clear impression that this whole exercise is being done for the glorification of the Council and to help developers make money. Indeed, the whole thrust of the Council’s policy is wrong – we should be developing business and jobs in areas of the country which require regeneration and whose infrastructure can handle increased development.

**Conclusion**

I very much hope that you will take my objections into account when you consider why and whether it is necessary to build on green field sites which will break up the Green Belt as it is currently drawn.

I am not opposed to all development but I feel strongly that if you build on the countryside as we know it, future generations will no longer have it to enjoy. Once it is built on it is gone forever.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/433</th>
<th>Respondent: 8749697 / Chris Tailby</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>It is proposed that the village of West Horsley will be inset into the Green Belt thereby leading to development within the village which will affect the character of the village and mean more building within what is presently Green Belt. Such developments are unlikely to lead to homes which young people will be able to afford to buy as builders want to build “executive” homes. Such houses will simply encourage more overspill from London.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the village of West Horsley being inset in the way proposed by the draft Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I also object to the “straightening” of the boundary behind the houses on the west side of Silkmore Lane. This will take out of the protection of the Green Belt all the paddocks behind the houses on the west side of Silkmore Lane and open up this area for development. Such development will spoil the rural character of the area and impinge on the environs of Hatchlands, a National Trust property. It will have a deleterious effect on the view from Ripley Road and ruin the landscape for no good and valid reason.</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: PSLPA16/2035</th>
<th>Respondent: 8751169 / Nicholas Howe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 have lived in Horsley for 20 years and I write to strongly object to the above proposed new local plan and in particular to the proposals to take land out of the green belt for future housing development in the villages East and West of Horsley.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is completely unacceptable to everyone that lives in East and West Horsley, we treasure our village environment and it is completely unnecessary to seek to increase our village, by over 500 residential units against an existing supply of circa 1,000 residential units.

I have not met anyone in these villages who are in agreement with amending the green belt and it is simply unacceptable that this is even being considered.

It will have a devastating effect on our homes and our lives. Any consultations on these plans and the objection of local people should not be ignored.

You will be quite aware that the Horsley villages do not have the infrastructure or facilities for its population to be doubled. The one school is oversubscribed and it is already impossible to get an appointment at the medical centre.

The identification of the various sites has been undertaken in an incredibly unprofessional way with little thought to access/egress, topography or risks of flooding.

I therefore strongly object to your proposals. I would also stress the following:-

- Exceptional circumstances are required for any changes to Green Belt boundaries;
- Unmet housing need is not such a circumstance;
- Green Belt and AONB are reasons for not meeting objectively assessed housing need;
- These issues have been drawn to the Planning Inspectorate's attention.

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

Attached documents:

---

I am writing to express the strongest opposition to the proposals, set out in the recent Guildford Borough Council Draft Local Plan document, to support development of 533 new houses in Horsley, of which 385 will be within West Horsley. Additionally, I oppose the extension of the village boundaries for East and West Horsley, and removal of the village areas within these boundaries from the protection of the Green Belt. In addition, I object to the inclusion of the Wisley Airfield site as a potential development site.

I believe that the proposals are extremely misguided, and would be highly damaging to the existing communities of East and West Horsley. In addition, they are strongly opposed by the residents of the area, and therefore the plans are at odds with the localism agenda.

I am a Chartered Surveyor with 15 years experience in commercial real estate and over 4 years experience working in urban regeneration. As such, I have a clear professional understanding of the issues involved and also of the economics of development. I have lived in West Horsley for over six years and intend to be a long term resident, and therefore am deeply concerned about the proposals set out in the draft plan.

My opposition can be summarised under the following headings, which I will consider in turn:

1. Concern over overall level of housing development for Guildford Borough.
2. Disproportionate housing development for West Horsley, compared with other settlements in the Borough.

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2453  Respondent: 8768161 / Adam Johnson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. Effect of the Proposals on West Horsley.
2. Effect of the Proposals on the Green Belt.

1. Effect of the Proposals on the Surrey Hills AONB
2. Specific Comments on Potential Development Area at Waterloo Farm/Ockham Road North.
3. Views of the Local Community in West Horsley.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Disproportionate Level of Housing Development in West Horsley.**

Not only do I oppose the level of green field housing development for the Borough as a whole, I also feel that the levels of housing proposed for West Horsley are disproportionate. The draft plan proposes 385 houses in major sites at West Horsley, with another 148 in close proximity within East Horsley. Additional "infill" developments are also proposed. West Horsley is a parish of 1,111 homes, but there are only 723 houses within the main settlement area of West Horsley (ie within the village boundaries). Therefore, the proposals for major sites alone would add 53% to the housing stock of the village, and 35% to the housing stock of the parish as a whole.

This is grossly disproportionate and beyond the level proposed for other settlements around the Borough- and particularly for Guildford itself, which does not seem to be taking its fair share of the proposed development.

West Horsley Parish Council has carried out a Housing Need Assessment, which showed a requirement for just 20 affordable homes. The proposals are therefore totally out of line with the requirements of the local community.

**Effect of the Proposals on West Horsley.**

I believe that the plans would have a severely detrimental effect on the character of the village. Given the profits to be made by housing development within Surrey, once sites are designated for future development, that development will surely be brought forward quickly, and to the maximum density permitted.

Specific comments are as follows:

- Several of the proposed development sites (particularly Manor Farm, ref A3 8/ID 15 and East Lane, ref A41/ID 2063) would have the effect of contributing to a merged settlement of East and West Horsley, when I believe that the open character of the countryside here should be protected by safeguarding the countryside along East Lane, Long Reach and Green Lane which continues to separate the two settlements and which contributes to the rural character of West Horsley. I understand that there is a proposal for the Raleigh School to develop a new site on the East Lane site, which again I object to for the same reason of impact on rural character.

- The suggested density of housing is totally out of character with the rest of West Horsley. Building to this increased density is partly inappropriate in the peripheral locations which are planned for development.

- The proposed development sites are on the outer edge of the village and so would reasonably be expected to generate considerable additional traffic, as the development will be some distance from the station and the centre of the village. Anyone who has spent any time in and around the village could tell you that the network of rural roads and lanes which surround the village simply do not have the capacity to serve this level of...
proposed additional development, and any extension of the road network would not only destroy the character of the village, but also the surrounding roads which would continue to pass through Green Belt land.

- I have strong concerns over the capacity of infrastructure such as drainage and sewerage.

- Localised flooding and poor surface water drainage is already a significant problem in the Since moving to the area I have witnessed first-hand flooding along Ockham Road North, Green Lane and Ripley Lane. This has occurred on one or more occasions each winter in recent years and therefore is clearly not a ‘once in a decade’ or ‘once in a lifetime’ event. The fields planned for development must play a role at present in helping to drain this area, and additional development would both remove this drainage capacity and create additional issues of surface drainage.

- Additional development of any significant scale will cause significant strain on the village school and doctors surgery (the later located in East Horsley), which are running close to capacity. Adding extra capacity to these services cannot easily be resolved, even if possible through entirely developer funded schemes, without fundamentally altering the geographic make-up of the village as there is little or no land in the core of the village to accommodate any additional services. Developing these facilities on the periphery of the village (which as noted above is now proposed for a potential extension of the Raleigh School) would once again fundamentally alter its character and position in its rural context.

- East and West Horsley are thriving villages, which do not need artificial support through rapid expansion of population.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2472</th>
<th>Respondent: 8768161 / Adam Johnson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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? ( )

**Views of the Local Community in West Horsley.**

The strength of feeling throughout the village against the proposed relaxation of the planning guidance is considerable. This opposition is shared by all of the local residents that I have spoken to, as well as by the West Horsley Parish Council.

I believe that the views of those who have chosen to make their homes within the community should be paramount when making decisions which will have such a radical and irreversible impact on the village.

Indeed my view is supported by recent planning guidance which supports greater involvement of local communities in the planning process. If localism is to mean anything, Guildford Borough Council should be listening to the views of the local community whose lives and wellbeing would be so adversely affected by the plans.

Removing East and West Horsley from the Green Belt, and encouraging additional development on such a scale would exclude and ignore the strong feelings of the local community.

**Conclusion.**

In summary, I strongly oppose the current drafting of the Guildford Borough Council Local Plan in relation to West and East Horsley. In particular, I oppose the removal of West Horsley and East Horsley from the Green Belt, the extension of the village boundaries beyond their current extent, and plans for 533 houses across the two villages (of which 385 are planned for West Horsley), all of which are at unsuitably high densities, out of keeping with the current character of the villages.
So far as I am aware, no 'exceptional circumstances' have been put forward, let alone proved, in order to justify this development in the Green Belt.

I feel that the plans for West and East Horsley contained within the Local Plan are inappropriate, and ill-considered and would be deeply damaging to our community.

I urge you to listen to the views of the local community and also to place more value on the exceptional quality of the rural spaces and villages of the Borough.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: pslp173/652   Respondent: 8768161 / Adam Johnson   Agent:
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**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the level of housing development proposed for West Horsley. Not only do I oppose the level of green field housing development for the Borough as a whole, I also feel that the levels of housing proposed for West Horsley are disproportionate. The draft plan proposes 295 houses in major sites at West Horsley, with another 100 in close proximity within East Horsley. Additional "infill" developments are also proposed. West Horsley is a parish of 1,111 homes, but there are only 723 houses within the main settlement area of West Horsley (ie within the village boundaries). Therefore, the proposals for major sites alone would add over 40% to the housing stock of the village, and 26% to the housing stock of the parish as a whole. This is grossly disproportionate and beyond the level proposed for other settlements around the Borough - and particularly for Guildford itself, which does not seem to be taking its fair share of the proposed development.

West Horsley Parish Council has carried out a Housing Need Assessment, which showed a requirement for just 29 affordable homes. The proposals are therefore totally out of line with the requirements of local residents.

I object to the plans which would have a severely detrimental effect on the character of the village.

Specific comments are as follows:

- I continue to object to West and East Horsley being inset from the Green Belt. This proposal has not changed since the 2016 consultation.
- The suggested density of housing is totally out of character with the rest of West Horsley. Building to this increased density is particularly inappropriate in the peripheral locations which are planned for development.
- The proposed development sites are on the outer edge of the village and so would generate considerable additional traffic, as the development will be some distance from the station and the centre of the villages. The network of rural roads and lanes which surrounds the village simply do not have the capacity to serve this level of proposed additional development, and any extension of the road network would not only destroy the character of the village, but also the surrounding roads which would continue to pass through Green Belt land.

- The proposed development site at Manor Farm (ref A38) would have the effect of contributing to a merged settlement of East and West Horsley. I believe that the open character of the countryside here should be protected by safeguarding the countryside along East Lane, Long Reach and Green Lane which continues to separate the two settlements and which contributes to the rural character of West Horsley.
- I have strong concerns over the capacity of infrastructure such as drainage and sewerage.
- Localised flooding and poor surface water drainage is already a significant problem in the area. Since moving to the area I have witnessed first hand flooding along Ockham Road North, Green Lane and Ripley Lane. This has occurred on one or more occasions each winter in recent years and therefore is clearly not a "once in a decade" or "once in a lifetime" event. The fields planned for development must play a role in helping to drain this area, and additional development would both remove this drainage capacity and create additional issues of surface drainage.
- Additional development of any significant scale will cause significant strain on the village school and doctors surgery
(the later located in East Horsley), which are running close to capacity. Adding extra capacity to these services cannot easily be resolved, as there is little or no land in the core of the village to accommodate any additional services. Developing these facilities on the periphery of the village would once again fundamentally alter its character and position in its rural context.

• East and West Horsley are thriving villages, which do not need artificial support through rapid expansion of population.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/212  Respondent: 8771233 / Ranald Mackinnon  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Policies A37, 38, 40, 42, 44 & 45 – My Objections

Some 295 houses in various smaller developments in West Horsley, 100 in Send and 15 in Ripley. These will generate traffic on the A 247 to access the A3.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/641  Respondent: 8772289 / Sheila Mellstrom  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 heartfelt objection to your "new local plan" for East and West Horsley.

1) Our 2 villages are over crowded already. We have congestion on our narrow roads through the villages especially at certain times of the day when schools open and close. With the 533 proposed new houses we could have at least 1000 more cars trying to use the Ockham Road, East Lane and The Street, as well as the A246.

2) Commuters cannot find parking spaces at the station already and it is often difficult to park at the shops.

3) Our medical centre is already over stretched with several weeks waiting time to see a doctor

4) Our 2 local state schools are full to capacity - where are all the poor children going to find school places and how, as our Borough Council, can you sort that out?

5) In addition to all this there is a proposal to build 2000 houses on Wisley airfield.

6) Have any of the planners given any thought to how all this could cause flooding, pollution, not to mention ruin the lives of the people who already live here?

7) Finally, we were promised categorically by the Government that the Green Belt would be [text unreadable]. I was at a meeting when Paul Beresford made that promise. What has happened to that promise?
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/939  Respondent: 8773281 / Mel Beynon  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

It is with a very heavy heart that I find myself yet again having to complain and object to the most unbelievably stupid proposals featured in the current Proposed Local Plan.

We are a Green Belt village. It is then, by definition, a rural village. The idea of removing us from the Green Belt is hideous and wholly unjustified. Quite apart from the significant environmental impact of such an event, there can be no justification for it based on the flawed evidence on which this proposal has been made.

It seems there is a need, if the plan is to be believed, for huge numbers of houses to be built in our village. A recent local survey (taken in 2014) found, in fact, that we had a need for possibly no more than 20 or 30 houses (max) of one and two bedrooms. Possibly including a handful of three bedroomed homes too. I acknowledge that such development might indeed have to happen. But we might, surely, be able to find areas of brown-field sites within our village to allow such building to have minimum impact on our community.

Our need is for a small number of SMALL homes. Guildford has consistently ignored the small swelling principle which has exacerbated our local situation. Small dwellings have been allowed to be knocked down to be replaced by five bedroomed “Des Res”. Our small dwelling stock has been “raped” and with it some of our architectural history and all for greedy development of which we have no need.

Given that we are situated at a convenient distance from London, ANY housing would be instantly swallowed up by those who wish to move out of the city to live in a quieter, more rural environment. Of course, the rural environment would be gradually whittled away and within the six years in which it is proposed to build 600+ in our village, we would no longer be rural, but distinctly urban. The proposal is ill-conceived and foolish. indeed it is environmentally criminal.

Such development, were it allowed to happen, would be change enough but given that our roads are very dangerous because of serious surface damage and too many motorists, the whole area would become a nightmare in which to move around. There is no mention of infrastructure in the plan except that it might be something that developers would be expected to contribute to in return for the right to build. No mention either of flood control. We suffer considerably from long lengths of road which become flooded and impassable with even a modest rainfall. If we have flash flooding, it is sometimes impossible to move in or out of the village.

Our schools are just about able to cope with the current population of our village and so it is with the medical centre and the car parking in the station in the adjacent village of East Horsley.

Movement through the village is difficult at peak times. Walking is not a safe option especially for unaccompanied young children because the pavements are irregular, uneven and very narrow. There is no way of widening either road or pavement and absolutely no possibility of introducing safe cycling routes.

An obvious answer would be better public transport, but that is not an option either, since subsidies to bus companies have been reduced and we have but a skeleton bus service which is absolutely useless to the work force as the buses do not in any way coincide with times when the work force needs them.

Much mention is made of the need for “Affordable Housing”. In the mind of many, this equates with cheaper housing. How can this be when affordability is based on 80% of the average house price, which in this area is somewhere in the region of £375,000/ £400,000 ?! Anyway, the rules which demand that developers should provide a percentage of
“Affordable Housing” in any development are far too flimsy and vague and left to the pleading power of greedy developers.

Despite the pages of dense prose and miles of “difficult to get your head around” statistics, there is no doubt whatever that this Local Plan is ill-considered, ill-conceived, inaccurate and flawed. It is wholly unacceptable that the very council which should be protecting the environment for its residents is now turned major facilitator of a cruel destruction of the kind of landscape and lifestyle that makes our borough desirable as a tourist and visitor destination. We stand to see our borough scarred beyond recognition, and we will also find our economic wellbeing seriously damaged.

The greatest insult of all is that this proposed plan is to be inflicted upon us by a Conservative council, whose government pledged to protect the Green Belt!!!!!!

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1916  Respondent: 8774113 / Ian Elliott  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I totally disagree for the plan to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt. There is no corresponding plan for infrastructure and this is currently over-loaded as it is. This means schools, roads including speeding cars and the lack of Surrey CC money to do anything about any of it. The rail station car park is full.

The proposals are totally out of kilter in terms of proportionate increase.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/434  Respondent: 8774689 / Penny Walker  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
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 proposals for West Horsley on the following grounds:

1. Objection to Removing West Horsley from the Green Belt

The Local Plan states the “we will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt” yet the Local Plan is taking West Horsley out of the Green Belt. West Horsley is a distinctive rural village and its green belt status is essential to ensuring the character of the village remains.

What is the exceptional circumstance for removing the village from the green belt as required under government guidelines? It cannot be justified on the basis of unfulfilled housing. There is no explanation as to why West Horsley has been chosen to be removed and no justification for doing so.

1. 2. Objection to the Number of Houses being built in the 4 Proposed Sites (Policy A41/Policy A40/Policy A38 and Policy A37)
The Local Plan has suggested a 35% increase in housing for West Horsley by 2022. What is the justification for this?

The Guildford Borough Economic Strategy document makes no case for locating large numbers of new homes in West Horsley – this is a village with no shops, no post office, no petrol station, no train station, no medical centre and a very limited bus service. It also offers no employment opportunities for residents. The National Planning Policy Framework requires that new residential development must be limited in quantity by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities – this policy has been ignored in the Local Plan.

The density of houses on the proposed sites is completely out of keeping with the rest of the village and will change the character of the village forever. The National Planning Policy Framework requires that new residential development must respect the character and density of housing in the area – this policy has been ignored in the Local Plan.

My house is currently backed by open fields and looks over open fields. If the new plan is implemented I will have 135 homes built at the bottom of my garden and 90 across the road from my front door – this will be like living in a completely different community in a different area of the country and is a step too far. It definitely will not be respecting “the character and density of housing in this area”.

1. Specific Objection to Policy A41

I am horrified that the Local Plan has included this new site with a proposal to build 90 homes on the open fields (green belt land) of West Horsley (Policy A41).

This new site – Policy A41 – is one of the most important rural aspects of the village and if allowed to continue will totally destroy the character of West Horsley. West Horsley is a rural village and one of its main features is that on the entry roads to the village (mainly Long Reach in this instance) there is a vista across fields as there is only development on one side of the road. These fields do not abut the currently defined village settlement on any side and so cannot be considered an extension of the settlement or infill at all. I cannot understand why this piece of land would have been picked for development at all as it does not satisfy any of the criteria for development. If allowed to develop 90 homes on a current site of open fields surrounded by undeveloped countryside it makes a mockery of the consultation process and the government’s guidelines on building in the green belt.

I trust you will take these objections seriously and reconsider your plans for West Horsley.

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

Attached documents:
The village of West Horsley in particular will not cater for large numbers of extra houses being added to it. There is only one over-subscribed State Primary School, a heavily over-subscribed Health Centre and youth facilities are few. The infrastructure of roads is already poorly maintained and certainly will be unable to cope with much more traffic without considerable change. Changes would be difficult since there is linear development of housing along many of the roads preventing widening.

The increase in the provision of low cost housing maybe a worthy ideal in theory but in practice it would put even greater pressure on the health and educational facilities of the village since these families would be the very ones most likely to use the educational facilities in particular. At least if the housing were of the more typical market range in Horsley the numbers would be less and the use of facilities would be less onerous.

The land in the Northern section of West Horsley (A40) is a most unsuitable site for development.

The southerly portion of it is in fact used and rented by me for my sheep and I have maintained it for the 20 years I have lived here in the house that was the former farmhouse attached to this land.

I can verify that this land is poorly drained and that the inclusion of this in Flood Zone 1 (low risk) is potentially an under assessment of the risk to it. Every year I have lived here the fields, particularly towards the northern sector of the half I use are both splashy and muddy for many winter months. I have attached photos showing a quite typical outcome of heavy rains, and these are in the southern sector where my house is.

You will note that my front drive that leads off the end of Nightingale Avenue receives the bulk of the run-off water from the road and many of the gardens. The field clearly acts as a sump and drainage area for this to soak away and infiltrate but development of the fields would aggravate that very drainage effect creating further problems for my garden, and possibly house, and ultimately others in the lower portion of the road.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4317</th>
<th>Respondent: 8791265 / Rachel McKnight</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 am writing to object to the local plan, and the proposed development in East and West Horsley.

- **Green Belt** - the proposed policy re the green belt is totally inappropriate. The Green belt forms the cornerstone of the region, and should be used a basis of planning. We should be celebrating it, it is one of the highlights of the region, not trying to destroy it. The villages are a huge part of that, and there should be no removal of the villages, particularly the Horsleys, from the Green Belt. No ‘exceptional circumstances’ concerning this have been demonstrated, and I totally oppose the plan to inset the villages.

- **Extending the boundaries of the settlement area is unjustified.** No sound, evidence-based reasons have been given for this, and this seems only to be used to earmark land for a totalement inappropriate amount fo additional development.
  - The Horsleys offer a rich and varied mix of well established low housing density settlements with a considerable number of historic buildings.
  - Positioned on the north side of the North Downs, partly in the Surrey Hills AONB, it attracts a considerable number of recreational visitors (walkers and cyclists) through the seasons each year.
  - This is also a reason why many of the residents have chosen the area in the first place, and the proposals would destroy the communities and countryside loved and nurtured by residents.
• I believe the evidence for the proposal is flawed.
  ◦ For example, the key Evidence document 'Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2031' makes no case for locating large numbers of homes in West and East Horsley or neighbouring villages.
  ◦ Station Parade is designated as a “District Centre” This classification results form a complete misreading of the character and nature of facilities in the (very small) vilage centre, and would inappropriately target the area for future urban development. I think some of the figures, eg the number of post offices used to come to this conclusion were just wrong.
  ◦ The inflated number of houses proposed, flows from a Strategic Housing Market Assessment, the modelling of which is not revealed to the public, nor I believe to GBC. The target is then further inflated by GBC to give a population growth over 2/3 higher than official national population estimates for population growth in the Borough. Can you review these numbers?

• Flooding: The site behind Ockham Road North in East Horsley is partially a level 3 flood risk area, and local residents are well aware of how much standing water there is in their gardens after rain. Building on such land will only exacerbate the problem. We already know what happens to local roads when it rains – the drains can’t cope.

• Pollution: The large increase in volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment – already a cause for concern in several areas in the Borough.

• The impact on infrastructure and facilities, which are already stretched to breaking point, does not appear to have been considered.
  ◦ Local Road Network: The impact does not appear to have been considered, for example int he case of the Wisley Airfield the SCC report states that “consequently, it indicates that further thought may have to be given to managing traffic in this area as part of a transport assessment should the development be progressed”. Surely the infrastrure and any changes need to be considered before signing off a development proposal.
  ◦ Traffic and parking: Assuming that every new house has at least 2 cars, this means potentially 6,000 more cars within a three mile radius of the villages. The impact on local roads will be tremendous. Parking at Horsley & Effingham junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the medical centre and at the village hall will all be affected.
  ◦ Schools: Local schools are already at capacity – where will newcomers go to school? No extra places are planned in the Horsleys, and the school places proposed at Wisley Airfield will not planned until many years into the project.
  ◦ Medical facilities: Similar situation to the schools.

The total number of houses proposed in the Horsleys, over 500, is on such a vast scale compared with the size of the villages currently. Surely, a reexamination of the number and proposed sites is required. If it wasn’t so sad, it would be laughable.

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

Attached documents:
This is totally unfair for everyone that lives in East and West Horsley, I love my village and it is completely unnecessary to seek to increase our village by over 500 residential homes. These proposals will have a massive detrimental effect on our homes and our lives. All the initial consultation on the strategy and the various objections appear to have been ignored.

East and West Horsley as villages do not have the facilities for their population to be doubled. Our school is oversubscribed and so is our medical centre.

I therefore strongly object to your proposals.

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

Attached documents:
I have lived in Horsley for most of my life and I am writing to object to the above proposed local plan and in particular to the proposals for future housing in West Horsley involving taking land out of the green belt.

This is unacceptable to all who live in West Horsley, we love our village environment and we are not prepared to accept an increase of potentially 400 residential homes, a massive increase in the size of our village.

No-one in the village wants this nor does anyone living locally want the village removed from the Green Belt, it is unacceptable and undemocratic that this is even being considered.

This will have a terrible effect on our homes and our lives. You need to listen to the views of local people, it is our village and we are not going to accept these proposals.

West Horsley as a village does not have the infrastructure or facilities for its population to be increased like this. The school is full and it is impossible to make an appointment at the medical centre.

The identification of the various sites has been undertaken in a cavalier unprofessional fashion with no thought to access/egress, topography or risks of flooding.

I therefore strongly object to your proposals.

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

Attached documents:

Policies A37, A38, A40 and A41. There are four policies proposed for development sites in West Horsley involving the potential construction of 405 homes in total and resulting in an increase in the village housing stock of 36%. All of these four sites are currently in the Green Belt. This proposal is totally excessive for a small rural village. It will lead to the total destruction of the character of this pretty and historic village and pose an enormous strain on local infrastructure. Accordingly, I OBJECT to these four policies.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/444  Respondent: 8796609 / Rupert Pye  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I wish to make the following comments and objections on the above-mentioned Local Plan:

1. The reduction in the proposed number of new homes in West Horsley, at 90, is an insult to all those who previously objected to the Guildford Local Plan. It does nothing to reduce the very large number of dwellings proposed on Green Belt.
2. The eastern side of the Borough is now scheduled to take an even greater proportion of new homes in the Green Belt.
3. It is totally unacceptable that Guildford is choosing not to constrain its overall housing growth, as many other Councils have done, to protect Green Belt. The objectively assessed housing target will mean that, at the end of the Plan Period, Guildford has grown by nearly 25%, nearly double the Office for National Statistics prediction for the growth of Guildford.
4. Nothing has been put forward since last year's Consultation to improve the sustainability of the West Horsley development sites and thus meet National policy requirements. The local infrastructure will not be capable of coping with the extra volume of traffic and demand for services arising from the proposed new dwellings.
5. Flawed evidence continues to be relied upon to justify overexpansion.
6. More homes are needed on brown field sites in Guildford town centre, which is where these are needed, rather than on Green Belt around our villages.
7. Finally, **I OBJECT MOST STRONGLY TO NO CHANGES BEING PROPOSED SINCE THE 2016 CONSULTATION TO INSETTING WEST AND EAST HORSLEY FROM THE GREEN BELT.**

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

Attached documents:
1. I wish to strongly object to the proposals in the Local Plan for the Horsleys, particularly West Horsley. The very slight reduction in the number of proposed houses in West Horsley is welcome but it is insignificant compared to the number still proposed in the Local Plan for Green Belt land in West Horsley.

2. Guildford Borough Council's new Local Plan doesn't address the reduction in the objectively assessed housing target as many other councils have done in order to protect Green Belt. It has not listened to the opinions of Surrey residents who object most strongly to the number of proposed houses to be built on the Green Belt.

3. The belief that local residents will adopt cycling or walking rather than their cars to travel to the local facilities is a fallacy. Cycling on many of our local roads is a risk and for many walking is not always an easy option. The Local Plan 2017 still doesn't address the problems of lack of infrastructure such a large number of proposed houses in West Horsley would necessitate.

4. I object to no changes having been proposed since the 2016 consultation to insetting West and East Horsley from the Green Belt.

*Our elected Government has continued to inform the public that our Green Belt is safe in their hands. Our Guildford Borough Council has shown us this not the case as by insetting West and East Horsley it would allow more houses to be built without objection as they wouldn't be built on Green Belt.*

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

Attached documents:

---

I again send in another request for you to think even more closely about your horrific plans for developing the horsleys. You well know these villages cant take any more houses, from the point of narrow roads, very little parking for shops, over stressed doctors and over full schools. Please do not do this to our villages.

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

Attached documents:

---

I again send in another request for you to think even more closely about your horrific plans for developing the horsleys. You well know these villages cant take any more houses, from the point of narrow roads, very little parking for shops, over stressed doctors and over full schools. Please do not do this to our villages.

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

Attached documents:
With reference to the plan for the Horsleys

I object to this new plan because the councillors promised to **protect the Green Belt**. Did the political candidates just say this to get votes and then ignore their promise once elected thinking there will be nothing the public can do? This is third world stuff and not worthy of Guildford Borough Council. Shame on you.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/753  **Respondent:** 8798689 / Julian Allen  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I wish to express my objection to the Guildford plan proposals for West and East Horsley on the following grounds:

1. The developments would require the green belt boundaries to be changed which is totally contrary to Policy P2: Green Belt and the Countryside which states that the green belt will be protected against “inappropriate development” and I argue with my points below that the development proposals are inappropriate.
2. The density of the proposed developments is totally out of character with the rest of the villages – being much higher than the existing density and the number of proposed homes would swamp and forever alter the character of the existing villages.
3. The road network cannot cope with the volume of traffic at rush hour – adding this number of houses would cause complete gridlock. In addition the state of the roads would become far worse due to the inevitable increase in traffic once the houses are built. The heavy lorries which will come during the building phase will also cause considerable further damage.
4. There is insufficient school space at nursery, primary and secondary levels. The Raleigh School is already looking for a new site as it is too small for the existing children in the village and special provision has had to be made for Horsley children to attend the Howard secondary school. Any news homes will just make a bad situation worse.
5. Medical and dental facilities: - the current provision is too small for the existing communities. It is very hard to get a Doctor’s appointment and almost impossible to get on a list for a National Health Service Dentist. Additional homes would put extra stress on the existing facilities
6. The existing bus service is barely adequate – more homes will not alleviate the issue, just compound it
7. Shops and local services – West Horsley has but one shop and no provision is made in the plans for additional shops and services alongside the hew homes. The parking for the shops and services in East Horsley could not cope with the influx of new homes/residents.
8. The waste water facilities would be unable to cope with any additional homes – it can’t cope with the number of homes that are already in the village, overflowing in Oakham Road North Green lane area.
9. Some of the proposed sites have inadequate surface water drainage – the land gets flooded. Building on land liable to flooding is frankly ridiculous.

In summary the development is inappropriate and the infrastructure would not be able to handle the additional homes / population and should therefore be rejected

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1831  **Respondent:** 8798849 / David Williams  **Agent:**

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

Please note my objection to the proposals laid out in the draft local plan.

The proposals for West Horsley where I live will have a huge impact on both the local and wider area, where there is already pressure on services and no plans for infrastructure to support the developments.

Please note my objection.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/210  Respondent: 8798849 / David Williams  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Policies A37, 38, 40, 42, 44 & 45 – My Objections

• Some 295 houses in various smaller developments in West Horsley, 100 in Send and 15 in Ripley. These will generate traffic on the A 247 to access the A3.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2934  Respondent: 8800865 / Nigel Maycock  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 local plan and specifically the plan proposed by Dandara and their proposal to place a number of homes on the field adjacent to the A246. I feel that this is wrong for the following reasons

- impact on the local schools i.e Cranmore, Raleigh and the Howard. Currently the A246 is used as a route to all of these and in the morning is heavily congested with school traffic, by allowing these houses then the traffic will be delayed making the lives of both the school children and commuters suffer.

- the area is already deemed as both a green belt and outstanding natural beauty. By allowing it then is this going to allow other people who live up Shere road to place disproportionate increases on their houses.

- this will result in the loss of the green belt and outstanding natural beauty for all of Shere road including Sheapleas.

- access onto the A246 will cause chaos as the influx of around 120 cars, assuming that each house has 3, to the already congested road will delay all commuters.

- water supply is currently provided from a tank at the top of the hill and the extra would cause an unnecessary burden on the infrastructure
- there are also slow worms on the site. As you should know these are protected and the land they are resident on is therefore protected.

General to a number of these proposals

- unsupportable burden on the current drainage which is currently creaking

- the school places, there does not seem to be any plan to increase the number of school places in either primary or secondary. As the council has already turned down the planning by the Howard what is the plan?

- the support services such as the medical facilities are inadequate and the extra houses will result in these to cease to function, currently it is difficult to get an appointment to see a doctor, about 1 week, and almost impossible to get an appointment with your registered doctor. This means that you need to explain the symptoms multiple times for those who suffering with a long term illness.

- there does not seem any reason why boundaries of the Horsleys are due to increased barring to allow further development.

- the shops in the centre of east horsley have been falsely classified as a District Centre and would be inappropriate for the development proposed, the result of this is that the inhabitants would need to go the Cobham or Burpham for shopping therefore creating extra traffic.

- there appears to be a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) with some mathematical model which we are unable to see and do not believe that the local borough knows how it produced the numbers.

- the density suggested will result in the Horsleys being of a greater than other proposals.

- there does not seem to be any mention of using brown field sites which should be the first consideration.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3478  Respondent: 8801953 / Sarah Relf  Agent:

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

Finally, I object in particular to development of sites A36 to A41 (East and West Horsley). Building 533 new houses on these sites, plus at least another 90 on small sites is excessive and disproportionate relative to plans for the rest of the borough. The total number of homes in West Horsley will increase by 35%. The rural character of both villages will be destroyed. The Horsleys feel victimised by this plan, which has been engineered by Council leaders representing Ash and Tongham, at the other end of the borough, where, in an astonishing case of political double standards, the Green Belt is actually being extended under Policy P3! Under the plan, rural West Horsley will take 35% of new homes, urban Ash and Tongham 16%, and Guildford urban area only 11%. Such an increase will put unsustainable strain on local facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, schools, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/309  Respondent: 8802433 / Caroline Russo  Agent:
I am writing to object to the planned proposal for the development of West Horsley as set out in the Guildford Plan. I have been resident in West Horsley since February 2013 and have a 9 year old daughter at The Raleigh School. West Horsley is a delightful village where residents made us feel welcome when moving here.

I grew up in Essex in an area that was within the Green Belt - it was like West Horsley a delightful village surrounded by farmland. The area was removed from the Green Belt and has over the past 15 years been developed and built on removing character, history and atmosphere. The original residents have gradually relocated as my old village is now a commercialised sprawl and extension of local Urban towns. I do not want to see this happen to West Horsley!

Looking at the planned number of homes in the proposal I cannot understand how local infrastructure of Roads, Public Transport, Doctors, Schools, Drain and Sewerage systems can support this number of houses. The roads in West Horsley are narrow and subject to frequent flooding. In several locations there are no pavements or only one side of the road is paved making walking or using a buggie dangerous. This is acceptable based on the current number of residents but should you increase the population of West Horsely as per the plans how do you intend to cater for local residents 'traffic' to the local shops, schools and station etc.

I accept there is the need for some affordable housing within the area for local residents but feel that the proposed addition of 385 houses to be build within a few square miles will make West Horsley into a 'New Town' taking away the attributes that make it special. I cannot comprehend why it would not be more suitable to build this number of houses on a site nearer to an urban town i.e. Guildford where some of the infrastructure is already in place i.e. roads, public transport etc.

I really hope that you take my objections along with the objections of all Horsely residents into consideration before taking the decision to build in our village - a decision that once made and carried out cannot be retracted.

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

Attached documents:
regenerating northern counties, making these areas more affluent and attractive to business, drawing development away from the South and alleviating the pressure around London.

There is no need for so much housing to be built in and around cities such as Guildford. The development needs to happen across the country to redress the balance between north and south and heal the seismic rift in the population which currently exists.

The proposals outlined in Guildford Borough's latest Local Plan for development on Green Belt land cannot and must not be permitted to proceed. The damage caused to villages and natural environments would be irreparable. Development should be restricted to existing brownfield sites and, as I have already stated, spread out across the country.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2439  **Respondent:** 8803073 / Elisabeth Stanford  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

As a resident of West Horsley I would like to object to the planned removal of the Horsleys from the Green belt. The "exceptional circumstances" required before taking this action have not been demonstrated.

The proposed number of houses for West Horsley is completely out of proportion with the current size of the village, with 385 new homes being built in West Horsley- a 35% increase on the current housing number of 1,111.

The whole character of the village will be completely change forever, plus the infrastructure is not present to support this number of new people and cars. Local and roads are already overloaded, schools are already full, drainage is inadequate.

Whilst agreeing that some new housing is required in West Horsley, this massive development is not the answer and I hope that you will consider the feelings of local residents.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/630  **Respondent:** 8804321 / Debbie Drury  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**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 proposal to remove West Horsley and East Horsley from the Green Belt. The Green Belt was created to form a lung for our increasingly crowded cities and to create space between villages to allow them to maintain their character; to build on it would be an entirely retrograde and irrevocable step.

West Horsley, where I live, seems to be a target for development to a far greater extent than other areas in the Guildford Plan and I can see no legitimate reason for an increase of housing in this area of at least 35%. Most of this proposed development would lie outside the current settlement areas and would have an immense and detrimental impact on what is, currently, a rural and peaceful village on the edge of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The village contains a substantial number of historic buildings, particularly in the Conservation Area, many of which are listed and have no
foundations and the inevitable increase in traffic caused by building on this scale would without doubt cause major
problems for many of these ancient buildings. Additionally, if the Wisley Airfield development goes ahead (despite
being unanimously refused I understand that this is, extraordinarily, still a serious possibility), the suggested road scheme
would inundate the Horsleys with traffic turning the area into a racetrack.

The proposed number of houses suggested for West Horsley is entirely unsustainable and will entirely change the
character of this village. Nor does there appear to be any provision for our already overstretched infrastructure: we have
a junior school which is bursting at the seams, a doctor's surgery which is totally overstretched, drains which cause
regular problems due to over capacity and flooding issues on the roads (The Street and Ripley Lane in particular are
frequently impassable in the winter), we have a derisory bus service and a station car park which is full by 9am each day.
Add to this the fact that West Horsley's Post Office has closed and the shop is shortly to follow it and you have a picture
of a village which is not suitable for non drivers and which would not in any way be able to accommodate the numbers of
new inhabitants suggested by the plan.

I have objected twice before in writing to the local plan consultations, as I know have thousands of others. There seems
to be no attempt by the planners to listen to these opinions as they just rehash with the same ideas. As I said in my
previous letter, I believe GBC planners should look more closely at the idea of 'urban regeneration' which is suggested in
the National Planning Policy Framework. Small scale development could be acceptable in the village of West Horsley -
more affordable housing is needed and some homes for the growing population of older people. What we do not need is
a high density housing which is developer driven in order to turn a large profit. Concreting over the countryside cannot
be sustainable or sensible and must not be allowed to happen.

I am absolutely opposed to the local plan with which we have been presented.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/239  Respondent: 8804929 / Helen Beckett  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I refer to the proposed planning in West Horsley, the extent of which is entirely unacceptable.

The latest plan indicates 295 new homes for The Horsleys. This level of new housing would COMPLETELY change
the character
of the village, not to mention the impact it will have on its infrastructure.

Green Belt

You seem determined not to respect the green belt. How can you possibly consider removing these villages from the
green belt??

We moved to West Horsley nearly four years ago and chose this area specifically because we wanted a village
environment to bring up our daughter.

We wanted to get away from traffic and congestion and enjoy the green belt around us.

I object to no changes being proposed since the consultation in 2016 with regards to insetting West and East Horsley from
the green belt. You appear to be ignoring the
overwhelming objections that were made last year!

The proposed development of homes on green belt sites at much higher densities than currently exist would be totally out of character with existing housing. It is **also unsustainable in terms of drainage, road capacity, schools, shops, medical facilities, parking and public transport.**

**Traffic**

**The increase in traffic in West Horsley will be intolerable** with the proposal of these new households. It is already congested during school times and this will have a massive impact on our day-to-day lives.

Many of these potential residents will be driving in and out of Horsley to use the station and shops. **We simply DO NOT have the capacity for additional parking at Horsley Station and local shops. The Station car park is currently full every weekday as it is. It will become impossible to use the train as there is no alternative parking.**

**Schools**

**There is only ONE state primary school in West Horsley and NO state secondary schools.** The Raleigh School is already oversubscribed and many children living in West Horsley were NOT offered places at their local school in the last few years. There is already a problem here with a lack of places and this already needs resolving WITHOUT increasing the number of homes. How do you propose to deal with this??

**Medical services**

It is already difficult to get an appointment at Kingston Avenue Medical Centre, **the ONLY surgery in East and West Horsley. You cannot dilute this service any more.**

**Drainage and Flooding**

There are known sewage overflow problems in Ockham Road North and Green Lane. There will be serious capacity issues with the sewer network in the village going right through to the treatment works if the large numbers of dwellings proposed are constructed.

The amount of flooding experienced a few years ago meant many main roads were closed for weeks on end. We were forced to use small lanes to exit the village. By doubling the number of cars in the village, this issue will be exacerbated.

**I am disappointed that, despite the many objections to your plans, you STILL continue to ignore the overwhelming feedback from local residents.** It is us, the current residents, who will have to live alongside these new developments and put up with the vast increase in local traffic and demand for public transport, schools, medical facilities and parking, etc.

Why don't you plan more apartment homes in Guildford Town Centre rather than additional retail units?

**Your plans will have a HUGELY negative impact on our day-to-day lives.**

I trust that you will finally listen and review your plans substantially.

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

 Attached documents:
Having read the council’s Local Plan Strategy document and seen the proposals for building up to 593 houses in The Horsley in the next 5 years, I would like to raise my strong objections and concerns.

Extension of the Horsleys Settlement Boundaries - No sound reasons are apparent in the broader document as to why the settlement boundaries should change apart from the desire to build additional housing.

Housing – My objections are based on the points below;
• The very large number of new build houses identified for West Horsley would negatively transform the village beyond recognition as it would increase the village size by over 35%. This is significantly higher than any other area in the borough.
• The housing density envisaged per site appears significantly higher than is presently the case in the village. This is totally out of keeping with the existing character and layout of the village that comprises low density housing with a considerable mix of ages and housing styles
• The need for so many houses in Guildford Borough, never mind West Horsley, has not been proved in the Consultation documents
• Why are Brownfield sites not being used ahead of taking land out of the Greenbelt for housing development? Surely this should be the more sustainable priority?

Housing number calculation - The mathematical model used by the consultants used to derive the high number of house requirements in the SHMA has not been revealed. It surely cannot be acceptable that affected areas such as the Horsleys should just accept data without being able to test that data for accuracy or applicability?

Infrastructure – My objections relating to the Horsleys’ broader infrastructure are further magnified by the proposal to build over 2000 houses on the former Wisley Airfield.
• Roads – Traffic generation from the proposed new housing would be considerable particularly as most households would have two to three cars. The present narrow lanes in and around the Horsleys would not be able to cope without major redevelopment. Additionally the private schools in the area are well supported by families living in Guildford and other villages. These private schools produces significant traffic problems on Ockham Road North and the A246
• Drainage and sewage – Road drainage is a continued concern that will be exacerbated by the runoff from the additional housing. Winter road flooding is an ongoing problem. Additionally, there may be a serious under capacity of existing sewers and the treatment works to cope with the large numbers of dwellings proposed

Village facilities
• West Horsley has very limited facilities with only a single small shop at the southern end of the village with very limited parking
• I object to the shopping parade in East Horsley being defined as a “Rural District Centre”. It presently suffers from severe parking constraints and the facilities are too limited in scope to deal with a sizable increase in the local population

Schools – My objections relate to the following;
• A lack of state primary school places in the village. The Raleigh school which serves both East and West Horsley is full every year
• Secondary school places are limited in number at the Howard of Effingham School and other secondary schools are a greater travelling distance from the village. Any rise in population will severely impact issues like road traffic
• Glenesk and Cranmore are both private schools. However the fees would be well beyond the means of many of the new homeowners putting additional pressure on schools like the Raleigh

Medical
• I object strongly that the only Doctors Medical Practice that serves all of East and West Horsley plus areas beyond the villages will be placed under even more pressure. It is always extremely busy and appointments difficulty to get

Transport – My objections in this regard surround the limited transport infrastructure
• Horsley station - parking at this station is limited and often full on a weekday. An
increase in village population will increase pressure on station parking and traffic movement to / from Horsley station. There is no land available for more parking
• West Horsley’s bus service through the village is extremely limited.
• The bus service operating from Guildford to Leatherhead travels along the A246 at the southern end of the village and really is only of use to residents living within a maximum of 8 to 10 minutes walk from the bus stops at the Bell & Colvill roundabout

Of significant concern to me is how much further land would the village have to sacrifice in terms of new road layouts, additional parking spaces and enlarged facilities such as schools, shops, medical facilities to cater for this population growth?

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/730  Respondent: 8806305 / Laurence Cook  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

2. Sites in East and West Horsley

I OBJECT in particular to including Sites A36-41 (East and West Horsley). This is a back-door way to create a mega-village – essentially, a soulless new dormitory town.

Whatever their merits as development sites, the 6 Horsley sites should not be considered individually but for their cumulative impact on the contiguous villages of East and West Horsley.

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

Under the plan, rural West Horsley will take 35% of new homes, urban Ash and Tongham 16% and Guildford urban area only 11%. The total number of homes in West Horsley will increase by 35%, which is disproportionate when measured against the overall increase in housing across the borough and particularly in Guildford town. If the Council have justifiable reasons to transform a particular community so radically, the plan should present a case rather than putting forward site proposals as a fait accompli.

These sites will put unsustainable strain on local facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops. For instance:

• Thames Water have advised the Council that the current wastewater network will not cope and that the foul drainage system all the way to the treatment works North of Ripley will need to be upgraded.
• Guildford Council’s Education Review says “expansion options may need to be considered for primary” education in the Horsley area within the first 5 years of the plan, but Surrey County Council have no plans to do so. The Raleigh School is already full. The private Glenesk and Cranmore schools are also at or near to full capacity. The suggestion that schools in Ripley can be used contradicts the plan’s stated intention to reduce traffic on the A3 and strategic aim that primary schools should be within walking distance.
• The plan’s Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C) imagines an “East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme between 2019 and 2023 by Surrey CC” but gives no details. This scheme is just wishful thinking. The proposed housing can only harm the local environment, not “improve” it.

The density of new housing on the 6 Horsley sites is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the locality at present.
Sites situated on the periphery of existing development in the Horsleys encroach on surrounding open fields and require the extension of settlement boundaries for which the plan presents no arguments. Contrary to NPPF paragraph 79, this will contribute to creeping urbanisation by attenuating the Green Belt corridors separating the Horsleys from neighbouring settlements.

Collectively, these 6 sites militate against NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been a success story in the Horsleys, with the creation of an amenity wood and community garden, the purchase of adjacent fields (on the eastern side of Ockham Road North) by local residents in order to preserve their open aspect, well-maintained pitches for local football and cricket clubs, public tennis courts, open space for a high-quality campsite (at Waterloo Farm) used by many foreign tourists and the approval of plans for a “Theatre in the Woods” – making West Horsley the only village in Surrey with an opera house. The open nature of West Horsley determined that a long portion of the 2012 Olympic cycle races passed through the village. This route has since been adopted by cyclists as a permanent asset, including the annual Prudential cycle race. These and future examples of “positive planning” depend on protecting the Green Belt to maintain the openess and attractiveness of the local landscape and avoiding the urbanisation and traffic congestion that Sites A36-41 will bring.

By surrounding Waterloo Farm campsite with 120 new houses, Policy A40 on land to the North of West Horsley will make this rural tourism amenity unviable. This may accord with developers’ plans, since the site would then be vulnerable to infilling with yet more housing.

Site A40 is subject to an unacceptable flood risk from a combination of a high groundwater table and the lack of surface water run-off. This is flat, clay land on the downhill side of the Horsleys where floodwater from new development will accumulate and back up onto existing properties nearby. I can provide photographs proving how badly these fields already flood at present. These problems will only get worse with the increase in extreme weather events associated with climate change. The “appropriate mitigation” suggested in Policy A40 exists only as an abstract notion. It should not overrule the need for Green Belt “exceptional circumstances”.

Policy A40 underestimates the problems of safe access and egress. Firstly, Ockham Road North was closed for several weeks in 2014 because of flooding, and still floods regularly. Secondly, access problems are not confined to flooding and are not addressed by the proposal to extend the existing 30mph zone past the site entrance. Repeated attempts made by Ockham Road North residents to extend this zone have been turned down by the local authorities, Highways England and Surrey Police, even though data collected in 2015 show that traffic has doubled over the last 15 years and that the average speed in the 40mph section of this road is 52mph, with maximum recorded speeds of over 80mph. No traffic calming measures have so far been achieved. Additional housing will add to several hazards along this stretch of road, including:

- Its use by pedestrians, especially children (using the Raleigh and Glenesk schools and catching school buses to Guildford and Howard of Effingham), pensioners living in the string of bungalows at the northern end of the road, and visitors from the Waterloo campsite who are unfamiliar with the area.
- The existence of a narrow footpath on only one side of the road in any one spot. The layout means that walking half a mile between Green Land and East Lane requires crossing the road twice.
- The road’s increasing use by recreational cyclists (see above).
- Its winding nature, poor sight lines (especially when interrupted by summer vegetation) and dangerous, concealed driveways. Most of these were built in the 1930s. Some have been widened but many are too narrow for modern traffic. Since a deep ditch runs along most of the road, vehicles have to swing out dangerously when entering or leaving.
- The prospect of additional traffic, including 19,000 HGV movements (90 a day over a long period) if Surrey County Council approves the Drift Golf Course’s planning application to re-landscape its site using bulk waste transported from London.

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

Attached documents:
Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategies and Sites 2016 – West Horsley

I am writing to express my very strong objections to the proposals set out for West Horsley.

First; I object to the proposal to remove any part of the village from the Green Belt.

Second; I object because the sum of all the proposals is seriously out of proportion (adding nearly 40% to the village) and will put all local amenities and infrastructure under severe pressure.

Proposals A37 to A 41 taken together would increase the number of houses in the village by nearly 50% and would alter its rural nature. The average proposed density is about 7 houses per acre which is a suburban, rather than a rural, density.

There is very limited employment in the village and the road and rail routes to employment elsewhere are already reaching capacity.

The same is true of the schools provision and the plan does not appear to include land for any new school.

Parking facilities are already inadequate. Extra demand will swamp them and lead to unwelcome, unruly and obstructive parking on the local roads and streets which will further amplify our traffic problems and sour community relations.

Is there an ‘objectively assessed’ need for so much development? Does it define the types and quantities of housing needed?

Other proposed local developments – there are major schemes proposed in Wisley, Effingham and Bookham and these are all likely to add significant extra through traffic to our already crowded roads and parking facilities.

The traffic implications of these proposals are clear - and they are clearly unacceptable.

Site A40 is remote from most village amenities and most residents will use a car to reach them – so this development would probably add another 500 – 1000 daily vehicle movements on and off busy Ockham Road North at the inadequate Green Lane junction.

Sites A38 and A41. These two sites, in particular, will seriously impact the rural nature of the village. They are also remote from most village amenities and most residents will use a car to reach them – so this development would probably add another 1000 – 2000 daily vehicle movements on and off East Lane. Much of this will use the junction with Ockham Road North. Currently traffic at this difficult junction can approach 1000 vehicle movements per hour in rush hour – and at this level it is already fully loaded and queuing occurs.

Site A39 has the advantage of proximity to shops, station and surgery but 100 new houses are still likely to generate several hundred daily vehicle movements to and from Ockham Road North – access presumably being close to the railway bridge. This is a hazardous location, particularly at rush hour, when there is a high volume of fast moving two way traffic on this relatively narrow road.

Walking from here is also hazardous because;

1. the footway is narrow and fast moving north bound traffic is often running within a few inches of the kerb line. Pedestrians have been struck by passing vehicles!
2. On wet days the road acts as an extra storm water drain and pedestrians are liable to drenching spray from vehicles passing very close to them.

A public footway running north from this development and away from Ockham Road North and through Weston Lea to East Lane and the Raleigh and Glenesk primary schools would be welcomed by many.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/247  Respondent: 8806369 / Alasdair Macmillan  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I have strong objections as follows;

- ONS predictions suggest that the proposed degree of expansion is not necessary
- The proposed number of houses to be constructed to the east of Guildford has gone up significantly since the 2016 proposal. There are also possible developments in Effingham, the Bookham area of Mole Valley DC, and at Wisley and taken together these will overload all local roads and other infrastructure.
- There is no proposed change since the 2016 Consultation to insetting East and West Horsley from the green belt. This is very unpopular and likely to change the character of the area.
- The concentration of new houses proposed for West Horsley will create significant extra traffic on East Lane and Ockham Road North. These roads are already overloaded at some times of day and walking or cycling along them is often hazardous.
- The concentration of new houses proposed for West Horsley will overload other local infrastructure – particularly schooling and the Medical Practice.

I feel that these proposals could change the character of West Horsley from rural to suburban and I object strongly to that.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/297  Respondent: 8806497 / Sandra Macmillan  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

This letter states my strong objections to the proposals set out for West Horsley.

First; I object to the proposal to remove any part of the village from the Green Belt.

Second; I object because the proposals together add nearly 40% to the number of dwellings in the village. This will overload all local amenities and infrastructure.

Proposal A39 on the fringe of West Horsley impacts further on these resources. Taken overall these proposals show a housing density of 7 per acre which is suburban and would alter the rural nature of the village.

Road and rail routes are already reaching capacity during busy times! These proposals could add several thousand further daily vehicle movements within the village.
Parking facilities are already inadequate. Extra demand will overload them and lead to unwelcome, unruly and obstructive parking on the local roads and streets which will further amplify our traffic problems and sour community relations.

Local schools are fully subscribed and the plan does not appear to include land for any new school.

There are many other proposed local developments in East Horsley, Wisley, Effingham, Bookham and Ripley which are all likely to add significant load to our already crowded schools, roads, parking facilities and other amenities.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/246  Respondent: 8806497 / Sandra Macmillan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I have strong objections as follows;

- ONS predictions suggest that the proposed degree of expansion is not necessary
- The proposed number of houses to be constructed to the east of Guildford has gone up significantly since the 2016 proposal. There are also possible developments in Effingham, the Bookham area of Mole Valley DC, and at Wisley and taken together these will overload all local roads and other infrastructure.
- There is no proposed change since the 2016 Consultation to insetting East and West Horsley from the green belt. This is very unpopular and likely to change the character of the area.
- The concentration of new houses proposed for West Horsley will create significant extra traffic on East Lane and Ockham Road North. These roads are already overloaded at some times of day and walking or cycling along them is often hazardous.
- The concentration of new houses proposed for West Horsley will overload other local infrastructure – particularly schooling and the Medical Practice.

I feel that these proposals could change the character of West Horsley from rural to suburban and I object strongly to that.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3035  Respondent: 8807041 / Alcis Ltd (Tim Buckley)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Additionally, there is not the infrastructure to support the numbers of people and cars you suggest and I very much doubt the council or the developers will do anything meaningful that will make a difference to accommodate these increases and putting traffic lights up does not count as meaningful. To expect the wonderful words such as “appropriate”, “sustainable”, “less reliant on cars” to actually happen is just naïve.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3036</th>
<th>Respondent: 8807041 / Alcis Ltd (Tim Buckley)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 have worked incredibly hard, risking my life in dangerous places to be able to afford to live here in the location and environment that I choose. It is a nice, expensive area [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature].</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>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/342</th>
<th>Respondent: 8808769 / R F Wills</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>There are NO exceptional circumstances or justification for removing much of West Horsley and other villages from the Green Belt. W. Horsley has many listed and historic bldgs. and a 'country feel' which is why most people who live in the area do so. The roads and infrastructure are already at full capacity as indeed are most of this part of the S.E.. Witness the appalling misery on the M25 and A3, &amp; Cobham roundabout. If you had a vital journey (say to the airport) you would not take the chance by using the main roads. Even the 'rat-runs' are getting impossible. This is seriously affecting the quality of life in the area, for which GBC is largely responsible. The parking in the villages is already insufficient, and there are long queues for the Surgeries. A&amp;E in G'ford is already often unable to cope. The Green Belt was sensibly devised to control urban sprawl, and it is at times like these that it should be strengthened. There is often flooding on local roads, and one sees people driving round wasting fuel etc. to cope with these problems.</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>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2504</th>
<th>Respondent: 8810241 / Helen Buttery</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 the proposed development sites A37, A38, A40, A41 &amp; A 39.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The cumulative impact on these development sites would immense. The number of houses proposed is excessive & disproportionate in relation to the rest of the borough. It will destroy the rural character of the communities.

These sites will put unsustainable strain on already stretched local facilities & infrastructure, including, public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage (already prone to flooding) & shops.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/326 **Respondent:** 8813185 / Nigel Wright  
**Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

**Draft Local Plan: Strategies and Sites June 2016**

I’m writing to set out my objections to the above plan as follows

- Here in Green Lane we have had raw sewage spewing from the manhole cover in inclement weather presenting a health risk. If the 120 extra houses off Green Lane/Ockham Road North were built this would be much worse. I note again that after last week’s rain the manhole cover in Green Lane appears to be caving in again.
- Thames Water has advised Guildford Borough that the area’s wastewater network is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all the proposed developments.
- There is a continuing lack of state primary school places in the village. The Raleigh school which serves both East and West Horsley is full every year and this has been the situation for many years. I understand Cranmore and Glensk are also nearly full (not that private education would be an option for those in “affordable” housing).
- Secondary school places are limited in number at the Howard of Effingham School and other secondary schools involve a much longer journey of time and distance from the village to reach them, indeed 11 years ago we were doubtful about getting our son into the Howard.
- Where are all these extra people going to work? There would seem few employment opportunities in the immediate area and limited transport links elsewhere – very limited parking at Horsley and Effingham station and a long, dark walk for some, particularly the proposed 120 houses at the site nearest this address.
- Shouldn’t government be concentrating on brownfield development as a priority rather than ruining the green belt and all the social, health and wildlife benefit the green belt brings. There should be no need to build on any green fields if brownfield (previously developed) land is used efficiently. (That does not mean garden-grabbing!).
- As a working man, I find it extremely difficult to get any convenient appointments at the Horsley Medical Centre – how will it cope with an even larger village population?
- Due to the lack of public transport in this area, owning a car is vital, so each new household would have at least one car which would congest the local roads (already in poor condition) even more.

All in all, this is an unsatisfactory plan for the village and representation should be made to keep East & West Horsley firmly in the Green Belt and resist this excessive housing plan.

All of the above would apply in the event of the ridiculous development at Wisley Airfield should go ahead. How can this even be considered in the Local Plan if it was recently rejected.

Perhaps Parliament should consider the effects of net migration in the UK and honour its pledge to reduce this – that would cut the need for so many houses and reducing the Green Belt!

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
I am writing to raise my concerns about the local plan for the Horsleys. The scale of new housing is disproportionate to the village, and would add to the current problems with overloaded infrastructure: roads, parking, schools, the medical centre. All of these are problems at the moment, so it is not realistic to suggest that the village can cope with a further 600 new homes.

The Horsleys are villages, with a unique village character and the plan would destroy this. Furthermore the Horsleys are currently in the green belt and I don't believe it is correct to change this status.

Finally the Wisley development would also have a huge knock on impact on our infrastructure, in particular roads and parking.

I object to the principle of loading such a high amount of additional housing into this green belt area, and I think more work should be done to reconsider whether all these homes are necessary, and to look at brownfield and urban sites.

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

BUT IF a large number of houses are still to be built in the village then I believe your current proposed sites are clearly wrong. Three of the sites in West Horsley (A37, A38 and A40) should be removed and all proposed housing should be on one large site between sites A39 to the east, A41 and Lollesworth Lane to the west, East Lane to the north and the railway line to the south. The old wood on the site should largely be removed.

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

I object very strongly to the Guildford Plan, for these reasons:-

1. a) The removal of West Horsley from the Green Belt is unlawful, and morally indefensible.
2. b) The proposed new Settlement Area for the village would considerably widen the village boundaries. This would encourage even further development in the future.

3. c) The proposals are for 385 new homes in a village of 1,111 homes, an increase of 35%.

4. d) The infrastructure in the village is already under severe strain:-
- the Raleigh primary School is already at more than full capacity and simply could not find space on its site for an additional entry form.
- the Horsley station carpark is already full on weekdays, with commuters' cars,
- the roads are choked at school times along Ockham Road North by Glenesk school,
- and it is almost impossible to turn out of the Street at the Bell & Colvill roundabout near Cranmore School,
- after heavy rain the Street in West Horsley is impassable due to floodwater under the railway bridge, and Ripley Lane runs with water like a river

1. d) We are told that there is an urgent need for new homes for key workers, for young people who wish to stay in the village where they have grown up, and for opportunities for the elderly to downsize within their village.

   BUT West Horsley house prices are much higher than the national average. How can the proposed new homes be made affordable? Is some shared ownership scheme proposed? Will there be a points system to determine who is eligible for these new homes? Will a certain percentage be reserved for key workers?

The Guildford Plan proposals for West Horsley cannot be supported by the existing infrastructure. There is absolutely no guarantee, in a free market, that the new housing would go to those for whom it is intended.

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

Attached documents:
I write with comments on the new plan.

Whilst I do appreciated the need for some new housing within the Horsleys I believe that the redefinition of the Green Belt does not recognise the limitations imposed by the access routes particularly via the already over used B2039 north/south. This is the only route to Horsley Station where new home owners are highly likely to use for employment. This area is already congested and often difficult to use.

At the recent planning application for Wisley Airfield it was clear that this and other nearby sites at Waterloo Farm, Manor Farm, East Lane and Ockham Road North are unsuited to any significant development that adds to the already limited access via the B2039.

For this reason I do not oppose the developments proposed at Bell Colville or Thatchers Hotel given their proximity to the A246.

Wisley Airfield site needs to be resolved first as a less concentrated development of say 200 homes could provide the key to the plan. Perhaps also a site for the expanded Howard of Effingham releasing their existing site adjacent to the A246 for housing?

Not a bad idea?

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

Attached documents:
Why cannot the new builds be made on brown fields.

If we build so many more houses in this area we will be losing part of England that will be beneficial to generations to come. We have many visitors from other parts of Britain and the world who come to this area and cannot believe that we will allow it to be changed forever.

Small villages must be allowed to stay in the Green Belt instead of becoming urban areas to the large towns.

I worry about the infrastructure; how will the villages cope with sewage and water, the disruption on our small roads with any building works will be dreadful for the community, forcing people to take longer routes to work and to their homes, foul noise and pollution.

I strenuously object to the Guildford Local Plan 2016 for both East and West Horsley.

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>PSLPA16/1942</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8819841 / Anne Simons</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>Guildford Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a resident of West Horsley I believe that for the following reasons the Council need to rethink its proposals for the Horsleys

Once again those responsible for the development and approval of the Local Plan have failed to demonstrate that the very clear guideline that development of Green Belt land should be restricted to exceptional circumstances has been followed. This is particularly apparent in the case of West Horsley where the proposal to build 385 new homes on the Green Belt in a community of just over 1100 existing homes is clearly inappropriate and demonstrates a blatant disregard for the guidelines and the clearly expressed wishes of the inhabitants of the village. It represents an increase 35% which is the highest percentage increase of any community in the whole of the borough and is grossly unfair when (even if the need for the number of new homes in the borough was correct) these could be more evenly distributed throughout the borough. The timescale of just 5 years in which they should be built further demonstrates the total disregard for the feelings of the village and the disruption they would cause.

The proposal document fails to give a credible explanation of how the calculation of new homes required was made. To most outside of the Council it appears to be significantly overstated, one estimate being that the proposal represents a population increase 70% in excess of official national estimates. In the case of West Horsley the Parish Council survey identified the need for less than 30 homes to meet the requirements of local residents. Given the scale of objections made to the original proposals one would have expected a much better rationale for the need for so many new homes in this particular locality which is being so heavily targeted. None has been provided.

In addition the plan proposes an additional 148 homes in East Horsley, the adjoining village where most the local community amenities are situated. This together with the planned development of Wisley Airfield, and the developments at Ripley, Send and Burpham totals over 5,000 new homes in a relatively small wedge of land between the A3 and the A246 will destroy vast sections of Green Belt and Metropolitan Belt land to the North East of the borough. This imbalance is unacceptable and should be re-examined.
Unfortunately the problem is multiplied by the inadequate reasons as to why the Settlement areas for the villages of West and East Horsley should be changed. One can only conjecture that it is a device which will allow further land for future development as housing within the extended borders.

The proposals make little reference to how the local infrastructure is to be improved to cope with this enormous percentage increase in the population. The size of the individual sites means that there will be little or no assistance available from developers and even if budgets for drainage, schooling provision, parking facilities, road improvements, medical services, shops and community buildings etc were made available this would swallow up even more of the Green Belt which only compounds the problem. This scale of development is unsustainable particularly within the very short time frame proposed.

It would appear that the Borough Council is intent on destroying the character and beauty of this ancient village. The National Panning Policy Framework requires that new residential development MUST respect the character and density of housing in the area. Guildford Council seem determined to ignore this requirement and proceed with plans that are unsupportable by the infrastructure and facilities in the village.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/435  **Respondent:** 8819969 / Colin Bell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Please take the following as my official response to the draft Guildford Plan 2016:

**Disproportional Development of West Horsley**

This plan calls for an increase of at least 35% in the number of houses in West Horsley, almost exclusively on Green Belt land. This is entirely out of proportion with all other areas and will result in West Horsley totally losing its rural character. A 35% increase will completely change the character of one of Surreys rural villages with the few remaining ancient dwellings. It will simply become another built over area. It certainly does not have the infrastructure, road system, health or schooling to cater for such an increase.

**Green Belt**

The overwhelming majority of new housing is proposed on existing Green Belt land. Brownfield sites are being reserved for retail/commercial. This is exactly the opposite of national guidelines.

**Previous plan**

The revised plan seems to have completely ignored all previous comments. the number of houses in West Horsley has actually gone up.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1801  **Respondent:** 8820417 / Simon Marshall  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RE: GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL - LOCAL PLAN: STRATEGY AND SITES.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I write further to the publication of the above document and write to express my objection to elements of its contents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principle overarching objection is the proposal to take a number of Surrey villages out of the Green Belt, and East and West Horsley in particular. This proposal in particular will have &quot;urbanisation&quot; implications far beyond those envisaged by the mantra that more houses must be built in the Borough. Whilst I fully accept the need to provide additional housing in the Borough, I do not agree with the drastic actions of removing the Green Belt status in order to be able to provide large scale developments that would otherwise be subject to far greater planning scrutiny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to your proposal to remove a number of classic Surrey villages that currently give the area its charm, beauty, character, history and overall appeal is outrageous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to your proposal to remove the 1-Iorlseys from the Green Belt. The Green Belt was established for a very defined purpose by statute. It was designed to prevent urban sprawl and to a large extent has succeeded in doing this. It is there for the benefit of not just our generation but those that succeed us. This area not only contains many areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty but also Sites of Special Scientific Interest. The Green Belt enables these areas to be protected in order that the Guildford/ Leatherhead/ Dorking area does not become a suburban sprawl such as Hersham/ Weybridge/ Walton on Thames.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Large numbers of people visit the Surrey Hills area because of its stunning beauty, villages and leisure opportunities. These visitors in turn support many businesses both large and small whose livelihood depends upon the area retaining its rural charm. You simply have to remember that these people are your citizens, your ratepayers and your electorate and changing the nature of their environment will potentially destroy the uniqueness of their businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the volume of housing, and associated density of construction, which is currently proposed in the Horsleys is completely out of keeping with their village setting. The proposal to build 180 houses in East Horsley and 411 in West Horsley is completely disproportionate to the housing stock currently in existence. There has not been any detailed study undertaken proving the need for this level of housing in these locations, the size and style of the proposed houses or the impact on the surrounding infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the proposals as many of these sites do not reflect the level of infrastructure in place to support such a volume of housing, from schools to medical facilities, shops, bus services, train station parking and drainage. We have seen how many villages in the area have been blighted by the bolt on Council Estates of the post war years - dumped on village back land with no regard to the architectural merits of the development, the local amenities on offer or the employment of the proposed residents. Each site should be considered on its own individual merits under the existing planning regime which has been designed to protect the environment of our rural life and given its particular circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the proposal to build 100 houses on site A39 in East Horsley as it is fundamentally flawed. The plan already recognises that the site is in a flood plain and notes that the flood risk needs to be reduced and that accordingly there is to be no greater flood risk to anywhere. Surely by interfering with the flood plain in this location can only transfer the flood plain impact somewhere else? That may be downstream of the site or onto adjoining properties. If there is no interference with the flood plain at the site doesn't become viable for 100 houses. The existing proposal by Cateby Land to develop 100 affordable homes here simply does not sit comfortably with any sustainable, accessible or employment rationale. It is building the wrong types of houses in the wrong place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I also do not believe that the Council has given sufficient regard to where all these new inhabitants are going to work. There is little or no employment in these villages, there is very little bus transport, the railways are currently crammed in rush hour with no room for extra capacity and the station car parks are not big enough to cater for more cars. And yet how are people meant to get to work in Guildford, Woking and London as the primary employment centres? The answer will be by car, whether this be by way of a short journey to the station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(where they will end up parking on the streets) or a full journey into Guildford (which is already rammed in rush hour). I cannot see how this can sit comfortably with the Council’s Green agenda. The Council certainly will not be able to force the bus and train companies to extend their services as these are now privately owned businesses operating for profit.

1. I object to the Council’s failure to unlock the development potential of brownfield sites and the volume of currently unoccupied residential properties in the Borough should be given a greater priority in the search for developable land and before ruining the environment, livelihood and well-being of a unique area of Britain.

Remember, there will be no opportunity to undo any development resulting from these proposals. You will not be able to wind back time.

I re-iterate my unreserved objection to the proposals as set out in the above document.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1129  **Respondent:** 8821025 / Karen McQuaid  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Allocation A36-A41 – East and West Horsley

I **OBJECT** to the inclusion of these sites. It seems that the plan is to create a mega-village and residents of the Horsleys feel victimized. The 6 sites should not be considered individually but for their cumulative impact on the villages which are closely connected.

Building 533 new houses on these 6 sites is excessive in and disproportionate relative to the rest of the borough. It will destroy the rural character of the villages.

These sites will put unsustainable strain on local facilities including public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, surface draining and shops. The proposed housing can only harm the local environment and not improve it.

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

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1598  **Respondent:** 8821377 / Marion Garrett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**
I object to boundary changes in the Horselys.

1) No reason for this

2) Some areas eg Kingston meadows are essential to our community for sport an recreation.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1929  Respondent: 8824513 / Ken MacIntyre  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 entire draft local plan, particularly as it affects West Horsley, its residents and countryside. It is extremely frustrating and disappointing that the overwhelming objections to the previous draft plan, not only from residents but also from our elected representatives, have been ignored, with just 66 houses removed from the previous proposal. No evidence has been produced to support the increase in housing and population which underpins the proposals. The methodology of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment on which the plan is based is a secret, not known apparently even to the Council and has resulted in a population forecast 70% higher than national forecasts.

It is unacceptable that public policy be shrouded in commercial secrecy and therefore the SHMA should be categorically rejected. Proposals with profound long term consequences for our village should not be produced without the ability to challenge and scrutinise them in detail. This lack of transparency means that residents are fully justified in being suspicious about the motivations and interests behind the draft plan.

No ‘exceptional circumstances’ as national planning policy requires have been found to justify removing West Horsley from the Green Belt and building on Green Belt land. The proposed sites closest to where I live cover all but 40 of the proposed houses at a density much greater than the existing settlement and are out of character with the area. We face the prospect of 5 years’ of living in the middle of a building site without evidence or justification for such a massive change. It feels like we are being besieged by greedy developers.

Other reasons in support of my objection include:

- The existing infrastructure of roads (which were designed for the age of the horse and cart) parking, transport, water, drainage and sanitation are inadequate for the population as it is now so would not cope with a 35% increase in the population.
- The local medical centre, shops and schools are already stretched.
- The car park at Horsley railway station is already full on weekdays with no capacity to increase the number of spaces. The station entrance is always congested at peak times with cars collecting and dropping off rail passengers.
- Expansion of the peripheral areas of the Borough would have a detrimental effect on Guildford town centre adding to the congestion and pressure already experienced in a centre designed for a population of 8,000.
- Housing and population expansion which ignore water supply and consumption cannot be sustainable given that the South East is an area of severe water stress.

My objection includes the other large proposals such as the 2,000 house development at Wisley Airfield which despite being rejected by the Planning Committee only this year is included in the draft plan. This makes no sense.

The draft plan must be withdrawn and replaced by transparent plan based on sustainability and national planning guidelines.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1624  Respondent: 8826145 / William Hewlett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Comments on: Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan – Strategy and Sites June-July 2016 Consultation

I wish to comment on the strategy set out in the revised consultation document and the potential development proposals for the sites in East and West Horsley. I STRONGLY OBJECT to the proposals, which would:

- take East and West Horsley out of the Green Belt - Major Development Sites in West Horsley are all on current Green Belt Land.
- Increase housing in West Horsley by up to 385 extra homes in the next 5 years, resulting in a housing density significantly higher than the present – infrastructure to support this is inadequate, and it will completely change the character of the village
- considerably enlarge the two village Settlement Areas – without justification, and potentially leading to further, unsustainable, future expansion of housing.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1625  Respondent: 8826145 / William Hewlett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

8. I object in detail to the application of the policies to Site Allocations: A36, A37, A38, A39, A40 & A41:

- The amount of new housing far exceeds local need, and the housing density is excessive when compared with existing development.
- The proposed building would transform the Horsleys into a sizable town, and no case for this is made.
- There is no support for this in the local area, and the collective impact of these 6 sites on a small part of the borough are not considered – the six should not be treated as isolated, separate sites.
- The total amount of new building is out of scale with the planned development elsewhere in the borough, especially less sensitive urban areas not protected by Green Belt.
- The sites are unsustainable: key infrastructure is lacking, and there is no adequate provision is made to increase it – e.g. poor wastewater capacity, lack of schools, absence of traffic management plan, flooding.
- The extension of settlement boundaries is too permissive, allowing possible claims that the area does not meet Green Belt “openness”.
- The Green Belt gap with neighbouring settlements is hugely narrowed.
- Site allocation A40 is especially unviable because of high water table and poor drainage, leading to regular winter flooding. Safe access and egress at Site A40 is 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.

9. Summary

The above summarises some of my concerns about the basis and assumptions of the Local Plan, specific objections about the Green Belt, and the approach being taken for East and West Horsley (and other villages). Please would you ensure that all these aspects are considered in your finalisation of 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: PSLPA16/3042</th>
<th>Respondent: 8826305 / Marion Hartland</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix I: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

My Major Objections

We must not lose the green belt it was made for a purpose that has not changed I have not seen any “EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES” demonstrated that are required before taking this action

I do not object in principle to affordable housing in reasonable numbers but the scale of this proposal is alarming

There is no infrastructure planned----- our schools are full the medical centre is full the water companies have already said they will not cope

Where will all these extra people work there is no local work

How will they get to any work we have no transport to speak of and the train car park is full at times and no room to expand

The roads are inadequate they are village roads and already full especially at weekends with many cyclists making them dangerous How many of these cyclists need to be injured or killed

The number of pot holes and bad surfaces on most of the local roads already will only increase with extra pressure of traffic

All these extra house holds would have an enormous impact on our village

I have already objected once to this proposal but it seems no-one is listening and all we are doing is making way for greedy developers

There is also the development proposed for wisely airport which would completely ruin the villages and the environment and strand a number of housed holds without cars as there is no transport that end of the villages and the roads too narrow for double traffic

All the above objections apply

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. When I look at the map identifying the proposed developments in the North-West periphery of Guildford ie sites 60, 61, 62, 63, 64 and 65 it is clear that you are allowing Guildford to sprawl outwards thereby substantially diminishing the green space separating Guildford from the outlying villages. This is precisely what the Green Belt was designed to prevent. With the exception of site 63 (Slyfield) I therefore object to all these developments.

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

Secondly I object to the proposal to remove the villages of East and West Horsley from the Green Belt and the relaxation of the rules to allow this. The Green Belt was put in place to limit the growth of London and where it still exists, as around these villages, it has achieved that aim. It has also protected important countryside which if built on will be lost forever. I do not believe the “exceptional circumstance” required to remove the villages from the Green Belt have been demonstrated. Proposing to build on Green Belt land will not provide affordable housing for those that need it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object most strongly to the proposed developments within the Local Plan, in particular in and around East and West Horsley.

1. The existing Green Belt policy has been completely ignored, with no apparent discussion with local groups.

1. The amount of additional housing proposed is far in excess to that which would blend in with the present environment. The roads in this area are narrow and in poor condition and will not be able to cope with the increased traffic which any development will inevitably produce. Parking near the shops will be impossible and Schools will not be able to cope with the additional pupils. Over development on this scale will damage local communities forever. The attraction of these villages will be replaced by congestion and pollution.

1. I understand Brown Field Sites are available within the Guildford area and should be used for housing in preference to the Green Field Sites.

In conclusion, I ask you to revise the housing numbers, and to amend the Local Plan to maintain the existing character of the Horsley’s.

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

Attached documents:

I again object to this new Plan insofar as it affects West Horsley:

Although the number of new houses has been modified the new number is still far too many to reasonably maintain the village character.

The density of new houses is about twice the density that exists and will totally transform the nature of West Horsley. Your planning objectives require you to maintain the general character of villages so planned new housing density should be halved to bring it more into line with existing

Halving the density will also reduce the pressure on existing infrastructure and amenities which are already at capacity. The current Plan is therefore not sustainable but halving the number of new houses MAY be sustainable. To my mind it is a question of balance.

I also object to the removal of West Horsley from the Green Belt, the logic for so doing is flawed.

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

Attached documents:
In regard to the proposed extension of the West Horsley village boundary into green belt land on the West side, **I would like to register my strong disapproval.**

If allowed, this extension would potentially allow development onto agricultural land that would seriously encroach onto the open outlook over a designated conservation area and National Trust land.

It is also an area susceptible to water flooding and so would adversely affect all existing houses in this immediate area.

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

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2715  **Respondent:** 8830753 / Graham Thorpe  **Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I write to express my total opposition to the Horsleys and surrounding villages being removed from the Green Belt at a time when pollution is as high if not higher than seventy years ago when the Green Belt was conceived to act as the "lungs" for London. Traffic on the M25 and A3 is frequently at a standstill with diesel and petrol fumes pumping out and similarly on local roads at peak times. Now is not a time to be surrendering our wonderful green spaces so carefully protected over the years.

Irrespective of concerns over pollution it is irresponsible to plan such major housing development without proper consideration for improved infrastructure to support this growth. As things stand I see no evidence to suggest that such essential supporting planning has been considered. The Horsleys and surrounding villages cannot possibly cope with such large scale as that proposed.

With the Government now having a re-think about population growth post Brexit should GBC not be doing the same?

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

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1760  **Respondent:** 8830817 / Graham Haynes  **Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The village of West Horsley fined Settlement Area boundaries (ref. 2003 Local Plan) DO NOT need to be
- The Green Belt and Countryside Study is
- I oppose the village's removal from the Green Belt by insetting and extending the 2003 local Plan Settlement Area
- The key evidence document "Guildford Borough Council Economic Strategy 2013 - 2031" makes no case for locating large numbers of homes in West or East Horsley.
- Any village expansion is unsuitable as there is only one small shop, no post office and a very limited weekday only bus servi
The homes building proposals are totally unsuitable in terms of schooling, medical services, water supply, drainage, roads capacity, shops parking in East Horsley and public

There are no more school places left in the State Primary School which serves both West and East Horsley and this has been the situation for the past few The Raleigh School is now seeking to move to larger premises in order to expand and lose the twice daily school run with parking clogging up a small residential road when even the parents have parking difficulties let alone the residents

The private schools in Horsley are well attended with many pupils travelling in by car which only adds to the worsening traffic situation.

The Medical Centre is always very busy with residents experiencing difficulties in obtaining their preferred appointments and a car parking

Car parking at East Horsley shops, Station, Library, Post Office and the Medical Centre is now becoming more and more Any increase in the area, particularly the large population addition proposed will make parking and movement into and through the village a real problem which has not been given any consideration under this plan.

The entire infrastructure is already at bursting point and no details of any proposals for West Horsley have been found in any of 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: PSLPA16/1761</th>
<th>Respondent: 8830881 / Susan Haynes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 am writing to object to the above Guildford Local plan proposed home building sites on Green Belt land in West Horsley for the following reasons:-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Green Belt status of the proposed sites cannot be changed or altered to suit the whims of a Council or developers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Guildford Plan does not make any provision for much needed extra School places. The local Raleigh School is operating at full capacity with waiting lists for available spaces as and when they are able to be provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Guildford Plan will impose an unsupportable burden on the roads network, medical services and the existing drainage infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/4163</th>
<th>Respondent: 8831521 / Denis Coulon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 disproportionate allocation of housing in this part of the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the threat the Local Plan poses to the historic rural village of Ockham, currently made up of 159 residences, to be subsumed into a 2000+ dwelling programme.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1893  Respondent: 8832417 / Stephen Knox  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Dear Sirs, we were very surprised and disappointed despite the council having unanimously rejected building 2000 houses on Wisley Airfield, the draft plan still includes the Airfield and Three Farm Meadows as a strategic site.

1. We object to building on Green Belt
2. We object to an enormous increase in traffic
   1. To an enormous increase of children needing school places
   2. To pressure on doctors surgery
   3. To consequential lack of preventing pollution and possible flooding to pressure on 2 train stations
3. We object to the ruining of the lives of existing residents.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/994  Respondent: 8832513 / Richard Russell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I OBJECT to 4 of the 6 proposed development sites numbered included in A36-41 which either intentionally or inadvertently will create a town at the cost of losing two separate villages. Quite why GBC should have selected West & East Horsley in this way, as compared with the exceptionally generous treatment of most other areas is, at best, exceptionally disappointing.

Whatever their merits as development sites, the 6 Horsley sites should not only be considered individually but for their cumulative impact on the contiguous villages of East and West Horsley.

Building 533 new houses on these 6 sites, plus at least another 90 on small sites is (a) excessive in absolute terms and (b) disproportionate relative to the rest of the Borough. It will destroy the rural character of these communities and put unsustainable strain on local facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops. The open nature of West Horsley was a significant factor that led to the 2012 Olympic cycle races passing through the village and this same route has since been adopted by the annual Prudential Ride 100 Cycle Ride. Furthermore, the housing NEED in both West & East Horsley (per recent research) is for SMALL houses / FLATS so that (a) young people can get onto the housing ladder and (b) older residents can downsize.

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

Attached documents:
Specific Sites in East and West Horsley

I OBJECT to 4 of the 6 proposed development sites numbered included in A36-41 which either intentionally or inadvertently will create a town at the cost of losing two separate villages. Quite why GBC should have selected West & East Horsley in this way, as compared with the exceptionally generous treatment of most other areas is, at best, exceptionally disappointing.

Whatever their merits as development sites, the 6 Horsley sites should not only be considered individually but for their cumulative impact on the contiguous villages of East and West Horsley.

Building 533 new houses on these 6 sites, plus at least another 90 on small sites is (a) excessive in absolute terms and (b) disproportionate relative to the rest of the Borough. It will destroy the rural character of these communities and put unsustainable strain on local facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops. The open nature of West Horsley was a significant factor that led to the 2012 Olympic cycle races passing through the village and this same route has since been adopted by the annual Prudential Ride 100 Cycle Ride. Furthermore, the housing NEED in both West & East Horsley (per recent research) is for SMALL houses / FLATS so that (a) young people can get onto the housing ladder and (b) older residents can downsize.

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

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/115  **Respondent:** 8834049 / Dana-Leigh Strauss  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am writing to voice my objections to the Local Plan. I live in West Horsley.

**OBJECTION 1: REMOVAL OF WEST AND EAST HORSLEY SETTLEMENT AREAS FROM THE METROPOLITAN GREEN BELT**

I strongly object and am horrified that the revised draft Local Plan proposes to remove West and East Horsley from the Metropolitan Green Belt. Building on the Green Belt will have a devastating impact on the environment, beauty and well-being of wildlife and people who live in the area. The Green Belt is sacrosanct and if building is allowed, the Green Belt and quality of life in this area will be forever compromised.

**OBJECTION 2: FLOODING**

In the storms two years ago, there was flooding in West Horsley. Roads were impassable for weeks for pedestrians, cyclists and cars. Further building in the area will only exacerbate the problem especially as more impermeable surfaces are constructed that impede water from soaking into the ground and the current drain system cannot cope with the existing housing population.

**OBJECTION 3: PARKING**

Parking is already constrained in the village. Currently, builders, visitors, people making deliveries, etc., park on pavements, obstructing the use of pavements by pedestrians and cyclists. This creates creating potential dangers because pedestrians and cyclists are having to go onto the road as the pavements are blocked by cars and trucks.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1345  **Respondent:** 8834753 / Barry Warren  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

As a West Horsley resident for the last thirty years I am writing to you as I am very disturbed by the proposal to take the Horsleys out of the Green Belt. In addition the proposals to infill parts of the village look unsustainable.

I believe West Horsley currently has approximately 1110 homes and the proposal is to use Green Belt areas and to increase the size of West Horsley by 35%. This will transform Horsley from a traditional village to a town stretching its current infrastructure to intolerable limits. Also some of the proposals seem to suggest housing developments different in character to the rest of the village.

Essential facilities such as shops, medical centre etc will not be able to cope with the additional volumes. Roads, especially the A246, are in a poor state of repair and are subject to heavy congestion at peak times.

I urge you to seriously consider the implications for the current residents before proceeding with the proposal to increase the size of the village so dramatically.

**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 am writing with regard to the proposal to remove the villages of East and West Horsley from the Green Belt which I strongly disagree with. This sets a dangerous precedent and leaves the surrounding countryside in a vulnerable situation for the future development.

The plans for the development of East and particularly West Horsley have not been thought through. It appears no thought has been given to the existing infrastructure when deciding almost 500 homes can be built increasing the population by at least another 2000. If this development is allowed plus the Wisley development is adopted this increases this area by a few thousand and one can hardly believe this is to fulfil the needs of local people.

1. The existing schools cannot cope at present without the increase in future children needing education.
2. There is no mention of how the existing health centre could cope with such a large influx in the population when it is not always easy to get an appointment. An extra burden will also be placed on the already over-burdened Royal Surrey Hospital.
3. The trains during commuting times are already busy and neither would the parking facilities at the station be able to cope with extra cars. Parking in the village is already difficult for shoppers, and visiting the library, without the extra traffic being increased.
4. The local roads were never intended to cope with today’s heavy traffic. I first complained about the state of East Lane, in particular the entrance which is a disgrace, in March of last year and little if anything has been done.
5. We also suffer from flooding in wet weather and neither the drains or sewers can cope now without the increase in population envisaged.

It is far easier and more profitable for developers to build on green fields rather than brownfield sites. Development on the scale envisaged will destroy these two villages forever as well as losing valuable countryside I do hope careful consideration will be given to the above points before development on the scale proposed is allowed to go ahead.

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

SITE ALLOCATION

At present there are four sites in West Horsley included as sites allocated for development within the Proposed Local Plan. Two further sites are being proposed for East Horsley, one of which immediately abuts the West Horsley parish boundary, which will no doubt primarily utilise the same local resources and infrastructure.

The four sites allocated within West Horsley are:
1. Policy A37 – Land at and to the rear of Bell & Colvill, Epsom Road, WH (40 homes / 1.4 hectare / 28.6 dwellings per hectare)
2. Policy A38 - Land to the west of West Horsley (Manor Farm, between East Lane and Long Reach) (135 homes / 8.4 hectare / 16.1 dwellings per hectare).
3. Policy A40 - Land to the north of West Horsley (Waterloo Farm at rear of Ockham Road North) (120 homes / 8 hectare / 15 dwellings per hectare).
4. Policy A41 - Land to the south of West Horsley (on East Lane) (90 homes / 4.8 hectare / 18.8 per hectare).

This is a total of 385 homes on 22.6 hectares, at an average density of 17 per hectare.

Furthermore, Policy A39 - Land near Horsley Railway Station (off Ockham Road North and at rear of Heatherdene) (100 homes / 5.7 hectare / 17.5 per hectare) is immediately abutting the West Horsley Parish boundary, however it is not in West Horsley (as referred to incorrectly on page 125 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan) but is actually in East Horsley.

I would reiterate that I am not opposed to new housing in West Horsley per se; however this scale of potential development in and around West Horsley is, in my opinion, excessive. I would strongly question the need for the inclusion of all four sites and certainly not at the densities proposed.

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

**Attached documents:**

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2153  Respondent: 8836257 / Nicola Smith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 strongest possible objection to the Draft Local Plan proposed by Guildford Borough Council. This includes proposed development of an estimated 533 new houses in the current Green Belt designated villages of East & West Horsley.

I also strongly oppose the potential loss of the Green Belt designated status for the Horsleys.

I would like to remind the Councillors that during the previous election campaign in 2015 - it was explicitly stated by the Conservative Party that any development in the Green Belt should only happen under "exceptional circumstances", none of which appear to have been met in this case, especially with brownfield sites in Guildford still available for development.

This scattergun development proposed on the Green Belt agricultural land within the Horsleys includes extension of the village envelope, development in a conservation area and excessive numbers of houses that the local infrastructure simply cannot support, as well as a loss of the fundamental character of the Horsleys which are currently small villages and not designed to cope with these increases in population.

Whilst I understand there is increased pressure on Guildford local council to provide more local housing (to meet an ever changing target), the sheer number of houses proposed across multiple sites in the Horsleys is too high.

Where are the impact assessments and surveys of potential expected road traffic increase (the local roads and pavements are already in poor condition - how will they cope with the additional number of cars, not to mention the traffic delays which are already bad during rush hour?); local schooling (already oversubscribed), doctor's surgery and parking requirements; increased water-usage and power consumption estimates; additional parking space needs at the train station (which is already full); increased noise and reduced air-quality; and environmental considerations that would
support such a large development. They have not been provided because they do not exist - increasing housing numbers on such a large scale would create far more problems for the village than would be solved by just housing people.

Squeezing clusters of houses on open land which makes up part of the landscape in and around the Horsleys is a poorly masked plan to maximise house development numbers with minimal consideration on the impact of the infrastructure, local community and the environment.

Considerably smaller clusters of housing have been integrated carefully and over time with success, without overburdening the infrastructure, such as Frenchlands Gate.

In conclusion, I strongly object to the local plan.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/687  **Respondent:** 8837505 / Annie Gilbert  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I wish to object strongly against the proposed plan to build houses in West and East Horsley.

The sites are in green belt.

Infrastructure is totally inadequate: drainage, parking, roads, shopping, schools, medical centre if all already full.

No way can we accommodate extra cars in East Lane or in the village.

I want the green fields around Greta Bank to remain green fields and not converted in housing estates. I want my peaceful surroundings to remain and country field.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1904  **Respondent:** 8838497 / Laurie & Rosemary Tribe  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

What the ……… is so special about Ash and Tongham?

I object to the Guildford Local plan 2016

I object to the fact that Ash and Tongham have 16% of the proposed new homes compared to 35% in West Horsley – why?

At the moment the congestion caused in our little road is horrendous created by the Raleigh school.
In the Winter the amount of surface water from East Lane causes our ditch to fill to capacity when we have all these new homes – where are the cars going – our whole village will be completely overwhelmed.

The loss of our green belt status is critical.

We do not want more homes, people, cars on this place – 435 homes to the north of the railway line compared to 40 to the south.

I have lived here for 66 years – nearly all my life – I have seen a new small housing estate built on what was rough land – the cuckoos used to sing all day – beautiful – now cars, school and people.

We pay high prices to live in West Horsley – the area attracts Londoners for the countryside and attractive homes. We pay for the beauty of the Green Belt, the attractive homes and the countryside – keep it that way.

Once gone, gone forever.

Get your act together.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3357  **Respondent:** 8839297 / David Mackay  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**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 Draft Local Plan: Strategies and Sites June 2016 for the following reasons:

**Policy P2 Green Belt**

I **object to the removal of East and West Horsley from the Green Belt** as this will permit developments which will not be in the character of the existing villages and adversely impact on their rural and peaceful nature, particularly:

- Increased density of housing
- Town centre style facilities eg bars and pubs, night clubs and large retail developments

The additional facilities and additions that the villages require such as improved schooling, infrastructure and medical facilities together with a controlled expansion of housing can be provided without the loss of Green Belt status.

**Sites A38, A39, A40 and A41 - Development Sites in West Horsley (North)**

The Plan is proposing the addition of 533 homes in East and West Horsley, 445 will be in West Horsley (North) on the above sites. Of these sites, I would like to see sites A38 and A41 removed from the plan for the following reasons:

- The addition of this number of homes will constitute a rapid and excessive increase within a small area and will over-load the infrastructure and facilities in the area. In particular:
  1. Local primary and secondary schools which are over-subscribed
  2. Medical facilities – there is only one medical practice serving both East and West Horsley
  3. Existing roads which have limited capacity and are already congested in peak periods. In particular, East Lane narrows at Waterloo Farm Cottage to a single track road.
4. Horsley station car park usage has increased in recent years and it is close to full Monday – Thursdays. There is certainly not the spare capacity to accommodate additional vehicles from the proposed new housing.

5. Sites A38, A40 and A41 are located further than walking distance from shops, railway station and medical facilities. Residents from these developments will cause a significant increase in traffic levels in the area.

   - They will not satisfy Policy S1 by providing “a sustainable development improving the economic, social and environmental condition in the area”.
   - Development of A41 will result in the loss of rural views along East Lane and Lollesworth Lane and create a dangerous precedent for further infilling. The Plan describes the site as “visually enclosed by hedgerows”. This is misleading as the hedgerows are intermittent and there are fine views from both roads of the enclosed field and surrounding woods over and through the hedgerows. The views from Lollesworth Lane are particularly important to me as this road is the start of a number of countryside walks. Loss of these views is wholly unwarranted and unjustified.
   - The construction of such a large number of properties (relative to the number of existing houses) will not meet Policy H1 which requires housing density to “respond to local character, context and distinctiveness”. Inevitably the new housing would have a different architectural style and, as required by the plan, have a much higher density to existing housing which would adversely affect the existing, semi-rural appearance and character of the village. The reason that West Horsley is attractive is precisely because of the current density of housing.

To sum up, I object to the following aspects of the Draft Local Plan: Strategies and Sites June 2016:

   - Policy P2 - Loss of green belt status for East and West Horsley
   - A38 and A41 - Development on these sites should be removed from the plan.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/213  Respondent: 8840033 / Jimmy Daboo  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Policies A37, 38, 40, 42, 44 & 45 – My Objections

Some 295 houses in various smaller developments in West Horsley, 100 in Send and 15 in Ripley. These will generate traffic on the A 247 to access the A3.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/269  Respondent: 8840353 / Brendan McWilliams  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

B.vii. Policies A37, 38, 40, 44 & 45 – My Objections
I am writing to express my concern at and objections to the Council's latest proposals for housing development in East and West Horsley.

Unacceptable density, strains on local services and necessary improvements to infrastructure to support such overdevelopment seem once again to have been ignored by the Council.

The plan does not appear to explain how the figure of an additional 385 homes in West Horsley and a further 100 homes in East Horsley has been arrived at; one must therefore assume that this is an arbitrary target set by the Council which is not supported by any particular study or data analysis. It certainly cannot be extrapolated from information supplied by local residents in answer to a local survey. This density of additional housing is completely out of proportion to the current number of dwellings and it seems that West Horsley in particular has been singled out for a percentage increase in housing far higher than anywhere else in the borough.

The Green Belt appears to have fallen victim to supposed housing needs even though GBC policy states "We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt against inappropriate development". This is surely a case of GBC flouting their own key policies and extending the 2003 Local Settlement Plan Area Boundaries at will. I strongly object to the Horsleys being removed from the Green Belt; this would be the thin end of the wedge with further encroachment becoming a certainty once the precedent has been set. Once lost, what hope is there of Green Belt being restored? Brownfield sites seem somehow to have been overlooked by GBC in their quest to fulfill whatever housing quota has been imposed by central government.

With just one shop, West Horsley relies on the shops, station and services in East Horsley which will mean huge pressure on East Lane/ Ockham Road South, stretches of road which already suffer gridlock at certain times of day. Our local roads are in appalling condition, the Raleigh School is overflowing with pupils, Horsley station car park is full every weekday and the doctors' surgery is struggling to cope with the current number of patients. The Council has apparently been advised by Thames Water that the area's wastewater network is unlikely to be able to support the demand from all the proposed extra development. Despite all of this the Council's plan makes no specific reference to policies for addressing these most basic requirements and how they will be improved / funded to deal with the massive extra demand. Or will that mean a resort to hefty rises in future council tax?

Considered development with low density / low numbers of new homes is understood as a requirement for many areas in the borough; what is proposed for the Horsleys does not meet any of those criteria.

I object most strongly to the current proposal.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I am writing to express my concerns at the Borough's latest plan as it affects West and East Horsley. I refer also to East Horsley since, while I am resident in West Horsley, my nearest shops and doctors' surgery are in East Horsley, I pass through East Horsley daily on the way to work and regularly use the facilities in East Horsley.

I support the idea that new homes are needed in the borough but I am very concerned over a number of factors within the current Borough plan.

1. The number of planned homes in West Horsley.

1.1 The 35% increase, some 385 homes, particularly being built over a short period (5 years), is disproportionate to the Borough as a whole (eg Tongham 16% and Guildford 11%).

1.2 The number of homes does not reflect the actual needs of local people - currently local people have suggested that an increase of 20 or more homes would be useful. However I acknowledge that perhaps 100 homes, split between sites, would be appropriate overall.

1.3 It appears that the plan has not fully considered all brownfield sites in the area before proposing to build on the Green Belt. I understood this to be a requirement of government policy.

1.4 While the number and percentage of proposed new homes are themselves excessive, the proposed concentration of homes on the plots is also excessive (eg 19dph), nearly double the typical current concentration and therefore out of character with the rest of the village.

1.5 Smaller potential sites have not been taken into consideration or have been left out of the plan.

1. The removal from the Green Belt

2.1 The plan proposes that West Horsley is removed from the Green Belt. This appears to be contrary to or a means to circumvent the Borough’s own policy “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt against inappropriate development”.

2.2 There is no justification given to the proposed removal in relation to the National Planning Policy Framework which requires that development on the Green Belt should only be carried out under very special circumstances.

2.3 The Borough plan does not show that all other reasonable alternatives have been considered.

1. The infrastructure

3.1 The current road infrastructure is insufficient, taking into account the use of the local roads as ‘short cuts’, the number of state schools (noting that the Raleigh School is planning to expand and relocate) and public schools, with many roads in poor condition (eg East Lane, The Drift). The current increase in traffic, some due to current small scale building, plus the extensive proposed building work will further damage the roads. There is no indication that there will be major investment in road schemes to coincide with the proposed development.

3.2 The plan appears not to have referenced any traffic survey carried out to establish the current situation or what the effects of the new populace and associated services required (eg delivery lorries, rubbish collection etc) would be. No consideration appears to have made in the plan of the 40% plus increase in traffic in the area to the roads, pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists.

3.3 Particular pinch points such as the junction of East Lane/ Ockham Road, Shere Road junction with A246 and East Lane single lane section, appear not to have been considered.
3.4 While flood risks of the proposed housing plots have been considered, the current regular flooding of roads in the area and appears not to have been considered in any detail or the likely increase due to run off from new properties and inadequate drainage systems.

3.4 There appears to have been limited consideration of the need for additional sewage treatment facilities.

3.5 There has been some consideration of the need to extend the current doctors surgeries but this is vague and makes no reference to improving access and parking which is already insufficient.

3.6 There appears to have been no consideration of the current pressure on local hospitals, and A & E departments in particular.

3.7 There appears to have been no consideration of the current limitations of shops and associated parking in West Horsley.

3.8 There appears to have been no consideration of parking or access at Horsley station.

I urge the Council to take the above points, and the various points raised by other residents, into account and to modify the plan. The plan should provide for some new homes, but a proportionate number in suitable locations, spread out, on small plots, at appropriate concentrations, and with details provided of the plans for investment in the infrastructure before the homes are completed.

Surely, if this process was followed there should be no need to remove West Horsley from the Green Belt.

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

Attached documents:
Thatcher’s Hotel site could be a possibility for a small development for the same reasons. I would be strongly against the East Lane, Waterloo Farm and Manor Farm sites being developed as these are clear visible green belt areas. The Ockham Road North site near the Station could be an infilling possibility as it is so near the railway and the shops. These are the absolute maximum for the two separate villages of East and West Horsley, as schools, village parking, medical services are already very full. I hope that you will grant approval for the Opera House at West Horsley Place as this will be an added amenity to the Borough and will help ensure the survival of West Horsley Place and its Garden. It is important to preserve what is left of the green field area to the south of the A246.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2141  Respondent: 8846209 / S M Philp  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am writing to object strongly to the new local plan published by Guildford Borough Council.

I object to the change in the Green Belt status which brings in a newly identified “village boundary”. Our little villages of East and West Horsley will become very large villages, almost towns, if your proposals for over 500 new houses on Wisley Airfield go ahead. These villages are in the Green Belt to prevent them growing and becoming part of outer London. There does not seem to be any plan for additional schools and doctors surgeries

The Raleigh School, the only state primary school in the 2 villages is full to capacity. Where are all the extra children going to be schooled?

There is only one doctors surgery, where are the new people going to be registered? Our surgery is already full to capacity.

Our little lanes in the area cannot support extra traffic. The roads are full of pot holes and there is no pavement in some areas.

We do not have the infrastructure for over 500 new dwellings, let alone over 2000 on the Wisley airfield site.

There is no room for cars to park at the stations. There are already cars parking in local streets because the car park at Effingham junction is full.

In short, East and West Horsley cannot cope with over 500 new dwellings nor over 2000 at Wisley Airfield. These villages area in the Green Belt and need to remain in it to preserve our open spaces for generations to come.

I sincerely hope that Guildford Borough Council will re-assess it’s own policy objectives rather than force through the council a local plan which clearly does not have the wider support of the residents of Guildford Borough.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1453  Respondent: 8846465 / Celia Chapman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I am writing to oppose the proposed plans of removal E + W Horsely villages from the Green Belt.

Also against the proposed 4 sites for building 385 houses.

My reasons are:

The Horsleys have a rural feel and if taken out of the green belt will become urban and alter the village feel.

The density of housing will only add to the road congestion and the infrastructure is already stretched.

Schooling is not adequate even now.

There are drainage issue even now but extra housing will exasperate the situation.

There are other areas, like Guildford town who only have proposed 11% increase as opposed to horsley 35%. This isn't fair!

Having just spent the weekend in Norfolk I see no reason why should have a changed environment dramatically when there is ample space for a new town in Norfolk.

So I am opposed vehemently to the proposed local plan for W+ E Horsley.

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

Attached documents:
I want to object in the strongest possible way to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategies and Sites.

The Green Belt was introduced to protect villages like East and West Horsley to ensure the urban sprawl of London and surrounding towns had an outer limit and green ‘lungs’ surrounding. I have lived in Horsley all my life and want to continue to live here and raise my family in the semi rural environment we love. I am totally opposed to removing the village from the Green Belt and do not believe there is ANY justification for doing so – indeed the plan does not even include any ‘exception circumstances’ which would support such a change.

West Horsley is characterised by mixed housing all at low density with many historic buildings (including the one I live in which is over 100 years old and used to be the doctors surgery) and should be maintained with very limited in-fill development to preserve the character of the village and ensure the population can be adequately serviced by the local amenities.

The proposal to build 385 new high density homes is madness – the schools, road infrastructure, medical facilities are already at capacity. There are no local jobs so people moving here would need to commute and we are already the last station to Waterloo where you are (almost) guaranteed a seat – it’s a very long stand for 45 minutes to London with no seat from here and adding more people will make the commute unbearable for many of us.

The key evidence document ‘Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2031’ makes no case for locating large numbers of homes in West and East Horsley – back to my point about jobs – as we strive to reduce our impact on the environment it seems totally counter intuitive to site lots more families away from towns (with jobs) and away from robust and accessible transportation lines. The local survey on the need for homes identified the need for 20 affordable homes to enable local people to stay in the village – this should absolutely be prioritised.

As mentioned, I feel am perfectly placed to give a view having lived in Horsley all my life (baring a short spell in Burpham!) – I have chosen to bring my family up in this lovely village. Villages such as East and West Horsley are what England is rightly famous for and should be protected and loved for future generations. Once spoilt with over development you can never re-create/turn back the time to restore.

Please, please do not destroy my village by taking it out of the greenbelt and building high density housing.

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

Attached documents:

I have been a resident of West Horsley for the last 18 years and have lived in the Horsleys all my life. Horsley is a village that is recognised nationally as being one of the best places to live in this country due to it’s heritage, open spaces and for the style of living it affords the lucky folk that live here. I am extremely concerned and very strongly object to the fact that Guildford Borough Council propose to inset West and East Horsley from the Green Belt, and that there have been no MEANINGFUL changes to their proposals since the 2016 consultation.
The council has ignored the mass objections from over 30,000 residents. This is totally unacceptable. Local views must be considered and the heritage of Great Britain, renown internationally for having quaint villages, must be maintained for future generations. The whole of the South East cannot be allowed to be slowly merged into one enormous conurbation with no clear boundaries or communities.

Nothing to my knowledge has been put forward since last year’s Consultation to improve the sustainability of the West Horsley development sites. Every home on the proposed West Horsley development sites will need a minimum of one car, and in reality will most likely have at least 2 cars per household. The village and current infrastructure is full!

To reiterate, I strongly object to the fact that Guildford Borough Council propose to inset West and East Horsley from the Green Belt, and that there have been no changes to their proposals since the 2016 consultation regarding proposed developments and supporting infrastructure.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/933  Respondent: 8847169 / Kelly Chandler  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Similarly, the near 600 proposed homes on farmland in West Horsley is not necessary. I am not anti development per se and we all have to do our bit ( I don't object to the plans for Thatchers Hotel or the Post office site) but ask for sensible and responsible actions from our Council by removing such a huge threat to this beautiful part of the country.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/211  Respondent: 8847393 / Tony Pratt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

In relation to my own area, the Horsleys, the boundaries of the villages would be extended and the area within those boundaries removed from the green belt. In addition, the proposed development of 2000 houses at Wisley two miles away has been retained. At the same time it is claimed that the villages would retain their rural character. This flies in the face of common sense.

I don’t doubt that more housing is needed and that achieving this while balancing the needs of the population and the interests of residents is a difficult task. The plan as it stands might satisfy developers and the Government Inspector but it is a pedestrian document which fails to achieve a satisfactory balance for residents, actual and prospective, and displays little in the way of the innovative ideas and lateral thinking which are needed.

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

Attached documents:
Guildford Boroughs new 2016 - Proposal to remove green belt status from East and West Horsley

I write to OBJECT IN THE STRONGEST POSSIBLE TERMS to the above proposals, for the following reasons:

The purposes of a green belt are:

Prevent development

Allow homes and corridors for wildlife

Protect the natural environment

Improve air and water quality

Protect the unique character of rural communities

Ensure people have access for educational and recreational purposes.

The validity of these purposes remains and no proposals have been made to offset each of these requirements in the event that the green belt is stolen.

The present nature of these villages is green and rural I do not believe that drastic changes should be made.

The proposal to create development potential for an additional 533 properties would be an overwhelming change to the nature of the villages in terms of land use and population. Effectively this would be infill on a huge scale, quite out of keeping with the traditional nature of English villages.

The current infrastructure can barely cope with the needs of the existing community.

Power, water and sewage services can only just about cope.

The GP service is running at full capacity

There are no spare school places.

There are virtually no employment vacancies for such a large number of additional newcomers within the villages, leading either to unemployment or additional commuting requirements. The present bus service (passing through East Lane) is not adequate to provide a timely commuter service, and it doesn't run at weekends

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

Attached documents:
Having looked at available information and reading the Local Plan I would like to make the following comments:-

The proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt would be a detrimental step and damaging to the local environment, leaving the whole area at risk of even more development than that currently proposed and put the current facilities of nature walks and recreation ground also at risk. Plus I do not believe that the "exceptional circumstances" needed to remove the area from the Green Belt have been demonstrated.

Station Parade being classified as a District Centre is puzzling and I can only surmise that the facilities on offer have been totally misunderstood for this classification to have been even considered, leading me wonder if this is being done in order that it will allow for further urbanisation.

I can find no sound reasons from the proposed plans as to why the settlement area boundaries need extending, unless this is a bid to make future development easier and I object strongly to this proposal.

Local infrastructure is already at breaking point - schools over subscribed, GP Surgery over stretched, drainage insufficient and roads unable to cope with current traffic and continually needing repair. Residents in Kingston Avenue already experience problems with cars parking all day, often by commuters, making it difficult if not impossible to either park outside their own homes or to get in or out of their driveways. If one then adds to this the gridlock that is the A3/M25 junction which has for years now been unable to cope with the volume of traffic either entering the M25 at Junction 10, but also the motorway itself is daily unable to cope with the volume traffic. Any further development can only have a further catastrophic negative impact. The argument that there are several local train stations does not hold water as passengers need to be able to drive to the stations, be able to park for the day, let alone find space on the already over-crowed trains. All this infrastructure also faces greater pressure still from other proposed developments, not only in this borough, but those in neighbouring boroughs that feed into the A3/M25 and that use the same train routes into London.

To plan an increase in households in this village by what seems to amount to 30%+ seems totally out of proportion to other areas. Surely this is more than the estimated population growth - and where are the jobs that these increased householders will need in order to afford these new houses?

In conclusion, whilst accepting there is a need for some expansion of housing, any proposed development should be small and in keeping with the character of the rural village that is the Horsleys - possibly on sites such as Bell and Colvill, OR the Thatcher's.

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

Attached documents:
Sites and Policies A35 to A41

Although none of the five East Horsley sites that are identified in the Borough’s Land Availability Assessment affect me directly, the indirect effect will be substantial since development of all, or any, of them will have an immediate and adverse effect on the items listed by the East Horsley Parish Council in its comments on Policies I1, I2 and I3.

I, therefore, strongly support and endorse the objections raised by East Horsley Parish Council to these Policies.

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

1) I strongly object to no changes being proposed since the 2016 Consultation to Insetting East and West Horsley from the Green Belt. The logic in attempting to effectively remove East and West Horsley from Green Belt is seriously flawed.

2) The eastern side of the Borough is now scheduled to take an even greater proportion of new homes in the Green Belt.

3) It is totally unacceptable that Guildford is choosing not to constrain its overall housing growth, as many other Councils have done to protect Green Belt. The objectively assessed housing target, though reduced since 2016 to 12,466 homes, will by 2034 (the end of the Plan Period) mean that Guildford has grown by nearly 25%. This is nearly double the Office for National Statistics prediction for the growth of Guildford.

4) Flawed evidence continues to be relied upon to justify overexpansion.

5) The reduction in the number of new homes proposed in the Green Belt after the 2016 Consultation, is welcomed (90 in West Horsley, 1100 in Normandy and Flexford) but does not go far enough in reducing the still very large number of new dwellings proposed on Green Belt.

6) Guildford town centre needs more apartment homes NOT more shopping space. Online retailing is driving major change in ways of shopping – many reports published stating this.

7) Nothing has been put forward since last year’s Consultation to improve the sustainability of the West Horsley development sites and thus meet National policy requirements. Every home on the West Horsley sites will need a minimum of one car to enable residents to get to shops, medical centre, library and Horsley Station, regardless of how much pressure is applied to adopt cycling and walking as the preferred means of travel.

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

Sites and Policies A35 to A 41

Although none of the five East Horsley sites that are identified in the Borough’s Land Availability Assessment affect me directly, the indirect effect will be substantial since development of all, or any, of them will have an immediate and adverse effect on the items listed by the East Horsley Parish Council in its comments on Policies 11,12 and 13.

I, therefore, strongly support and endorse the objections raised by East Horsley Parish Council to these Policies.

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 strongly object to no changes being proposed since the 2016 Consultation to Insetting East and West Horsley from the Green Belt. Nothing has been put forward since last year’s Consultation to improve the sustainability of the West Horsley development sites and thus meet National policy requirements. Every home on the West Horsley sites will need a minimum of one car to enable residents to get to shops, medical centre, library and Horsley Station, regardless of how much pressure is applied to adopt cycling and walking as the preferred means of travel.

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

Attached documents:

My objections above apply to the whole Local Plan, and specifically to the Horsleys and Wisley.

I object to the proposal to build at the so-called Thatchers’ Hotel. This proposal has recently been turned down by the Borough Council and so should not even be in the Proposed Local Plan. We are short of hotels in the area and there should be no change of use. The land to the south of the hotel is Green Belt and should remain so. The entrance on to the A246 is between two right-angled bends, each of which is a junction itself. One has very poor sight lines and the other is a very busy, often congested junction.

I object to the proposed Ockham Road North development. It has major problems of access. There is a Nursery and Pre-Preparatory School very close by and another, much larger Primary School in the vicinity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I appreciate the need for more housing, especially 'affordable housing' but to vandalise The Horsleys is a step too far. I see plans for up to a massive 593 new homes but no plans for the necessary infrastructure improvements (eg about 1000 new cars in the villages!) and plans with guaranteed funding for new schools, doctors' surgeries and other vital facilities. As it stands, the character and facilities of the villages stands to be destroyed by the plan which one might have expected to take account of the needs and desires of the present and future residents above all else.

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

This is an ill thought out and obnoxious scheme totally out of scale in this rural area.

1. I object most strongly to the removal of Green Belt status from the Horsleys and the enlarged village boundaries.
2. I object to the additional 500 or more houses that would consequently be built on Green Belt land. This will suburbanise the area and eventually lead to urban development all the way from Epsom to leatherhead and Guildford.
3. I object to the development of the Wisley Airfield which will have a massive impact on our area.
4. I object to new roads which will have to be built to accommodate the traffic generated by this scheme.
5. I object to large numbers of cars which will have to use station car parks which are already full. People will have to seek employment away from this residential area.
6. I object to the vast increase in traffic which will lead to an increase in nitrogen dioxide particulates in the environment.
7. I object to building in the Ockham Road North area. It is a level 3 flood risk area and building there will make flooding a real possibility.
8. I object to a huge development on this scale which will place an unacceptable burden on schools and medical facilities
9. I object to the designation of station parade as a “district centre”. This is appropriate in Beckton in East Landon but not here.

This whole scheme must be abandoned. It is too big and will destroy this Green Belt area which we have enjoyed for so long.

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? ( )

Additionally for all the reasons outlined above about infrastructure shortcomings around Horsley and in particular the proximity to the A3 and junction 10 of the M25 these proposals are unacceptable.

I previously lived at Elm Corner on the edge of the airfield (the entrance to which is directly opposite the entrance the RHS garden) and gaining access to the A3 (for just the half a dozen or so dwellings there) was challenging then with the sheer volume of traffic pouring off the M25 onto the A3 southbound and then coming off at the Ripley/Ockham roundabout - even if access is transferred to the Ripley roundabout, unless the roundabout itself was altered to give access onto the southbound A3 (as it should originally have been built) this will be problematical/challenging - the roundabout is already congested in the morning and Ripley itself is often congested due to the Newark Lane access issues. Additionally the noise and pollution from junction 10 was intrusive before the motorway services were built, now it is almost unbearable. Public transport links are virtually non-existent and, as previously mentioned, potentially hazardous to cyclists, so each dwelling will require at least one car, which then places further stress on an already overburdened situation.

I appreciate that there is huge political pressure to increase residential housing in Surrey and you will have a huge amount of correspondence to deal with in connection with the 2016 Borough Plan, however I hope that you will take my objections into account and that ultimately you will be able to find a more sympathetic, less intrusive solution.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3464  Respondent: 8857057 / Dawn Childs  Agent:

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

I object to removing the Horsleys from the Green Belt - this would change the character of the village beyond belief and need. This would threaten a unique area of the countryside, wildlife and be detrimental for all those currently residing within the villages.

I object to the boundaries being extended as this will be a direct attack on the open farmland and make developments ripe for the picking and lay us open to these encroaches on the countryside.

Infrastructure is already overloaded within the village. The doctors can barely cope, the roads are a rat run for those cutting through to the motorways. The train station car park is bursting and the village simply cannot absorb greater population growth.

I believe that the alleged housing requirements is hugely inflated and way beyond national growth patterns. There are vast areas of brown field sites throughout the whole South East that should be utilised prior to green belt areas coming under threat.

I have lived in West Horsley all of my life and already seen it grow hugely, please do not let this growth start having a detrimental impact on the village, the people already here and the beautiful countryside and wildlife.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPA16/3142  Respondent: 8857537 / Tony Heaney  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

1. The proposals to remove The Horsleys from the Green Belt. The exceptional circumstances required in order to take such action have not been demonstrated.
2. The designation of Station Parade in East Horsley as a District Centre. The nature of the village centre and its facilities have clearly been totally misunderstood. If implemented, this proposal would lead to targeting the village for inappropriate urban development in future.
3. Extensions to the Horsleys settlement areas. This proposal has no sound reasoning attached to it, and looks like it is there just to extend the available land for future development.

The infrastructure in the Horsleys is barely adequate for the current population with full schools, stretched medical and transport facilities and little scope to improve them.

In conclusion, It seems very much that the proposals for development around The Horsleys are so much out of line with those for other similar areas of the Borough that it appears that some very deliberate targetting is taking place to make someone's life easier.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/666  Respondent: 8858113 / Ramsey Nagaty  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

22 POLICIES A36 to A41
22.1 I object to the changes to Policies A36 to A41 (East and West Horsley)
22.2 The number of potential development sites has been reduced by two (A36 and A41, representing a total of 138 dwellings). This leaves four sites (A27-40) which still represent a total of 395 new dwellings.
22.3 Marginal changes such as these would still leave 70% of all new development in the borough built on Green Belt sites. No “exceptional circumstances” or any other justification is advanced for this strange imbalance.
22.4 The deletion of two Horsley sites fails to correct the issue of relative overdevelopment in East and West Horsley, which is both excessive in absolute terms and disproportionate in relation to the rest of the borough.
22.5 No attempt is made to assess the cumulative impact on the Horsleys – either of the four sites now proposed, or of Site A35 (Three Farms Meadow, alias “Wisley Airfield”), with over 2,000 new homes only 2 miles away. This piecemeal approach leaves the future of the Horsleys at the mercy of ad hoc planning applications, which is the opposite of what a Local Plan should intend.
22.6 The new plan Policies put greater emphasis on the need for adequate facilities and infrastructure to underpin development. But this is not reflected in any new wording on the Horsley sites, thus leaving most local objections unaddressed. Again, this defect curtails the plan’s usefulness as a practical planning tool at a site level and undermines its credibility among residents.
22.7 The plan fails to mention most of the known sustainability issues and infrastructure constraints affecting the Horsley sites, including public transport, traffic, road safety, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, flooding/surface drainage and shops. These were fully set out in responses to last year’s public consultation.

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

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

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

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/742  Respondent: 8858433 / Eric Peters  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

2 Sites in East and West Horsley (sites A36-41)

I object. The council leaders representing Ash and Tongham (where the Green Belt is actually being extended) are pushing a disproportionate allocation to this area which will create a mega-village and ruin what is currently two lovely villages. The number of homes in West Horsley, a rural village will increase by 35% which is also I understand 35% of new homes in the plan with urban Guildford taking only 11%.

The infrastructure and schools, doctors, shops can't take the strain of this together with the c. 2,000 houses planned at Wisley airport.

It would damage local tourism

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4197  Respondent: 8858913 / Stephen Carter  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

East and West Horsley
I object to including sites A36-41 (East and West Horsley) in the local Plan. There can be no conceivable justification for the extension of the Green Belt as it applies to the areas represented by Council leaders (in particular Ash and Tongham), whilst at the same time building 533 new houses (and at least another 90 on smaller sites) on 6 sites in East and West Horsley, within what is now the Green Belt. It follows that I also object to taking East and West Horsley out of the Green Belt.

Putting that iniquity to one side, this increase in rural West Horsley (where I live) by 35% is plainly out of keeping, both in number and density, with the countryside and the village. It is disproportionate when measured against the overall increase in housing across the Borough, and particularly in Guildford Town. No case is put forward for such radical transformation of a community. Plainly, the developments in the Horsleys should not only be considered as individual sites, but also for their cumulative impact on the contiguous villages of East and West Horsley and their rural environment.

This increase in housing would inevitably put an unsustainable strain on local facilities and infra structure, including public transport, parking (including at the station, shops and medical centre), schooling, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops.

In respect of waste water, I understand that Thames Water has advised the Council that the current network will not cope and that the Plans will require a wholesale upgrading of the foul drainage system all the way to the treatment works North of Ripley. This is not provided for in the Plan. Indeed, the time that would be necessary (let alone the cost) would render the Plan in its current form unworkable.

Furthermore, Guildford Council's own education review states that "expansion options may need to be considered for primary education in the Horsley area within the first 5 years of the Plan". However, Surrey County Council has no Plans for this, and the Raleigh School is already full. There are private schools, Glenesk and Cranmore, but they are also at or near to full capacity and, in any event, local Planning should not create a situation where only private schools can provide education for the additional pupils in the locality. Using schools in Ripley contravenes the requirement for primary schools to be within walking distance. In any event, considered in tandem with the proposals for Wisley Airfield, the lack of additional schooling will result in an influx of pupils to Ripley with which the school could not cope, without even considering overflow from Horsley. There is a lack of joined up thinking.

Moreover, the density of new housing on the 6 Horsley sites is inappropriate. Planning appeals (in particular on Ockham Road North) have confirmed that densities of the sort envisaged are unacceptable.

The sites in the Horsleys are not permissible under NPPF. They contravene Paragraph 79 as they will contribute to creeping urbanisation along the Green Belt corridors separating the Horsleys from the neighbouring settlements. They militate against the requirements of Paragraph 81 of the NPPF relating to Green Belt amenity and recreational value. On the other hand, there has in the past been much positive in the Planning for the Horsleys at local level. An Amenity Wood and Community Garden have been created, local residents have purchased adjacent fields in order to preserve the open aspect, there are flourishing football, cricket and tennis clubs, with the associated requisite space, tourism is encouraged by the high quality camp site at Waterloo Farm, and Plans have been approved for a "Theatre in the Woods", a unique opera house which, together with East Horsley's unique theatre (the Nomad), funded by Lottery money, will promote the Horsleys as a centre for the arts.

The open nature of West Horsley resulted in the 2012 Olympic cycle races passing through the village, a route since adopted by cyclists as a permanent asset, including the annual Prudential Cycle Race. The enormous increase in the throughput of traffic resultant upon the Plans put forward in the local Plan will be a danger to cyclists.

I also object to Policy 40, which is entirely inadequate to address the problems of safety on the local roads. It is ironic that attempts to expand the 30 mile per hour zone in Ockham Road North have repeatedly been turned down by local authorities, Highways England and the Surrey police, notwithstanding data showing a doubling of traffic over the last 15 years, with an average speed of 52 miles per hour in what is a 40 miles per hour limit.
The additional housing anticipated in the Plan will result in traffic volume that these roads cannot sustain. Ockham Road North and South would become main thoroughfares, which they are not built to support, whilst at the same time incurring heavy use by pedestrians. This includes children attending the Raleigh and Glenesk Schools, and those catching school buses to Guildford and Effingham, pensioners who live adjacent to both Ockham road North and South and the tourists who walk from Waterloo Farm campsite. Footpaths are narrow or non-existent and there is no space to construct or widen them. The roads are unlit, winding in nature and have poor sightlines with concealed driveways (including my own). Drainage ditches run along the side of the road, resulting in vehicles swinging out into the road and crossing the central line when entering or leaving their properties.

Public transport is virtually non-existent by road, and by rail the commuter use will increase with the additional households requiring additional parking spaces which are not provided for (the current parking being inadequate for the proposed additional housing in the Horsleys, let alone the substantial commuting proportion of the proposed additional 2,000 houses at Wisley). In respect of the proposed Wisley development, it is fanciful to suppose any station other than Horsley, being the most convenient station, will be used by commuters (the same applies to the proposed Wisley Airfield site referred to below). It is also fanciful to suggest that commuters will cycle to the station in anything other than very small numbers, still less so from the proposed Wisley Airfield site. As pointed out above, the traffic hazard in doing so will also militate against cyclists.

In stark contrast to the provisions of the Plan, the West Horsley Parish Council and Surrey Community Action Housing Survey carried out in May 2014 identified a limited need for some 20 affordable homes for local people who want to remain in the village - i.e for young people or for elderly people who wish to downsize to a smaller home. Obviously, when elderly people downsize this has a trickle down effect, releasing properties through the housing chain as well. Moreover, such developments for the elderly would not incur the problems that beset the current draft local Plan. Elderly people are not commuters. They would not be making 4 journeys a day (to and from the station). They would not have 2 cars per house, increasing to 3 or 4 as children get older. They would, of course, require medical services to a greater degree than other individuals, but on the other hand there would only be 1 or 2 per household rather than 3, 4 or more. For the latter reason also, there will be less of a strain on utilities.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2154</th>
<th>Respondent: 8859169 / Nicola Baskerville</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I strongly object to the significant increase in the numbers of homes proposed to being built in East and West Horsley (35% more homes). 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. The number of homes is disproportionate to the size of the village and will have a significant impact on infrastructure and village amenities. I travel to both London and Reigate with work. The Ripley junction with the A3 is already always congested and a 15 mile journey will often take over an hour the majority of which is sat on the mile stretch from Ripley to the M25 interchange. Likewise on the trains the line from Horsley to Waterloo is always over crowded with the majority of commuters having to stand. This train line would not support such a huge increase in population within the Horsley’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I strongly object to the amount of building in the green belt in the Guildford Borough plan. The greenbelt is a precious commodity for our borough and country. Once gone it can never be replaced. I raised this as a concern previously and it does not appear that there has been any recognition of the views of the residents from the last consultation and I have still not seen any exceptional circumstances provided by Guildford Borough. On the same note I also object to the recent proposal to build a new primary school off of East Lane for the same reason. This is precious green belt land. The school works well now to support the village and can</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
accommodate the number of children that require a place. I note in the 2016 reception intake that children living in Ripley managed to obtain places at the school.

3. **I strongly object to the change in character of the Horsley’s.** There is no local support for this plan, the villages will change into towns due to the size of the developments, the amount of housing proposed far exceeds the local need and no consideration has been made on the collective impact of the 6 sites and the proposed Wisley development. This is an excessive amount of building for this area when compared to the rest of the Borough, which also has more brownfield sites that could be developed and do not appear to have been considered.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1958  **Respondent:** 8859265 / Jeremy Sharland  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am writing to lodge my objections to the new Guildford Local Plan. I am a resident of West Horsley and I am very concerned about the impacts of the new Local Plans’ proposals.

I object to the proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt as the exception circumstances have not been proven, as is required to remove land from the Green Belt. Further, the proposals for the extension of the boundaries of the settlements is not based upon a robust case and therefore I object to this proposal.

The local primary school in Horsley, the Raleigh school, is already oversubscribed, stretched to capacity and there is already limited outdoor play space for the children. Any increase in numbers of children at the school will have detrimental impact upon the teaching, sport and wellbeing that the school can offer to its pupils.

Further, the local roads around the school are already heavily overloaded at school drop off and pick up time and the roads often become impassable for local residents at this time. Increasing homes in and around the Horsley villages will put further strain on these roads as the homes are located too far away for parents to walk to school with their primary school age children and they will be forced to use their cars.

There is insufficient public transport for the children to uses buses to travel to school either. Therefore object to the increase in proposed housing capacity in the Horsleys for the reason that it will have a detrimental impact upon the Raleigh school, local roads and the quality of life of people living near the school.

The roads around the Horsleys, most notably from Ockham to East Horsley, The Street and the roads from East Horsley to Effingham junction including Forest Road and The Drift, are also very heavily trafficked at commuting hours and school drop off and pick up time.

Extra housing in the Horsleys and the proposed 2,000 homes at the former Wisley Airfield will place significantly more pressure on the roads. The majority of the proposed housing development sites in the Horsleys and the former Wisley Airfield Development site are too far away for people to walk children to the Raleigh school or for commuters to walk to Horsley Station or Effingham Junction Station and therefore the majority of new residents will use their cars. I object to the proposed increase in housing development due to the increased strain on the already congested rural road network.

Flooding is also a major problem where we live in West Horsley. Where The Street passes under the railway line in our village (before The Street becomes East Lane), most years since we have lived here this section of road has flooded rendering it impassable for cars. The impact upon us and other residents in the village has been children arriving late for
school, commuters missing their trains to London, missed refuse collections and damage to property including both land
and cars.

A number of the proposed housing development sites I Horsley are located in the catchments of streams that cause this
flooding. For example, the Bell & Colville site is situated just uphill from a stream that runs north parallel with The
Street. This stream turns into a torrent after heavy rain and it floods directly onto The Street. Development at Bell and
Colville with add to this water discharge by removing permeable natural surfaces.

Thank you for reading about my objections to the New Guildford Local Plan 2016 proposal.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3545</th>
<th>Respondent: 8859745 / Thomas Crossland</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 live in West Horsley and am writing to express my grave concern about the current proposal to remove the Horsleys
from the Green belt and to increase the current number of dwellings at Thatchers, Manor Farm, Bell&Colvill, Ockham
Road and East Lane by 533 in total.

There are three main reasons why I consider the plan ill-advised:

1. a) There is a similar plan to develop Wisley airfield to add 2,000 houses - only a few miles away. This will
obviously create an overspill of people and traffic into our villages and use the already overloaded infrastructure
(see below);
2. b) We should cherish the green and open spaces that we have and consider other options to build the houses
required to meet the shortfall, e.g. the re-generation of existing urban areas, higher-rise apartment blocks in or
near to town centres and other brownfield development opportunities. Only then should greenfield sites be
considered as a serious option. The current proposal to develop the green belt in/around the Horsley area is not
the right way, and if this decision goes ahead it can never be undone.

1. c) The current infrastructure that is in place in Horsley (parking, schools, train station, doctors etc) is already at
stretching point. For example, the limited car parking provided at Horsley train station means that the car park is
full by 8am on a weekday morning. Similarly, the A246 is gridlocked from the traffic lights at Effingham, as far
back as Thatchers on a weekday morning. The proposed increase in village population is simply not compatible
with this current infrastructure. The plans that I have seen make no consideration of this requirement to make
serious investment to upgrade all infrastructure correspondingly. Where will the extra train capacity, parking
capacity (both at the train station and the shopping areas) come from? I have similar concerns in respect of other
infrastructure, schools, doctors’ surgeries, shops, roads, other public transport options etc, as well as those areas
that are less visible, sewage and water systems.

There is so little green belt remaining in the south of England that I think it is outrageous to even consider reducing or
removing this beautiful landscape that no only improves the environment but also attracts tourists and economy to the
area. I urge you to re-consider including the Horsleys in the development plans.

Thank you for taking the time to read this objection

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

Attached documents:
I wish to register my OBJECTION to the Borough's new local plan of 2017, particularly in respect of its impact upon the Horsleys.

Despite the Borough's past promises to protect the green belt this has clearly been ignored in the current local plan, as HAVE the wishes of the people.

Although two of the redevelopment sites have been removed four remain, the largest being the redevelopment of Wisley airfield. This is, as has been said many times, a wholly unsuitable site and the grounds for its unsuitability are well documented.

The encroachment into the green belt around the borough in this already heavily populated area is a big mistake and is not a fitting legacy for the council. Once the green belt is lost it is lost for ever. It must be protected for the sake of future generations.

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

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

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

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2893  Respondent: 8861921 / Jane E Lines  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

a) The alarming number of houses proposed. This is the largest number is almost 70% higher than the official national estimates for population growth in the Borough. This development will have an appalling affect on several sections in the area.

b) The 'exceptional services' required before taking this action. No sound reason has been given for the proposed changes to the extended boundaries and have not been demonstrated.

c) The infrastructure is already over loaded. i.e. Schools, Medical facilities, Drainage, Roads and Car Parks etc. There are no possible means of improvement.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/752  Respondent: 8862401 / Kieran Salter  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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.

There are many areas of the plan that concern me but the complexity of the process naturally works against the average person in the street like myself. It is hard to conclude that there is not some method in said process in that regard.

On that basis i cannot fight all the points. So i will list some concerns that i see in my domain but i would register here that they likely apply across all areas affected by the plan.

I OBJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS

1. Moving the Horsleys out of the greenbelt.
I have in my life chosen both urban living and rural living.
Both have their merits but the beauty is that we have a choice.
The Horsleys are attractive to me at this time because they are in the green belt and all the benefits that that gives.
In time i will move back to urban living to secure all the benefits that that can bring but your intentions remove the democratic right i have to make that choice.
2. Proposed development of Thatchers Hotel.
There is just no confidence in the Authorities locally at their ability or willingness to respect the mood of dwellings in the villages.
Time and again approval is granted for developments that have met with huge groundswell of local opposition.
The rights of the individual are ignored.
The initial plans shown on this development show complete disregard for the local mood, image, trends.

3. The shortfall in local services.
I was unable to get my son into the Howard school due to a shortfall of places.
This despite having lived in the village for 25 years.
I wouldn't go through the pain process to try and get my younger son in in two years time.
So, a fairly basic problem there.
The ability to get in to the Doctors surgery without using an emergency slot is challenging at best and often a lot worse than that.
The state of the local roads is just appalling as is the roadside maintenance clogging up footpaths.
And seriously you want to grow the population.

So there you have it and quite frankly i have not even mentioned Brexit and the likely implications on population growth.
At the very least a pause is required to watch the impact over the next few years but again i object because the Plan seems flawed at many levels.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2243  Respondent: 8862817 / Anne Bowers  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write concerning your development plans for The Horsleys.

It is such a concern that you are planning for so many new homes in this area.

How can an area designated as green belt just be changed to a new village boundary to make room for more houses?

The infrastructure of the Horsleys just will not be able to cope with all the extra people. There doesn’t seem to be any provision for additional parking for the East Horsley shops, medical centre and especially the Kingston Avenue sports area – the result will be more parking on roadside verges causing mothers with prams/pushchairs having to use the road.
We have constant water drainage problems resulting in appalling potholes in the main roads of Ockham Road and East Lane and heaven knows what the result of the building of all these new houses will be on this problem. Will there be another school to cope with the extra children – I no longer have school age children but am aware that not all local children can get into our local primary school as it is now.

I am sure you will be receiving many letters regarding your plans and hope that whoever is responsible for all this will give due thought to the issues that will be raised.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I wish to protest against the local plan proposals and in particular the proposed developments in West Horsley.

West Horsley is a pretty village which receives a considerable number of recreational visitors through the seasons each year who are undoubtedly attracted by its setting in a rural environment. Building 385 new houses on four large sites in the village, plus at least another 50 on small sites within six years would alter for ever the rural character of what had been a small village.

There is no evidence of which I am aware for locating such a large number of homes in West Horsley. I accept there is a need for further housing in the the area and that there should be some development in the Horsleys but what is proposed is not only disproportionate but would have the inevitable effect of ruining the village and causing irreparable damage to the Green Belt.

Why has West Horsley has been singled out for such a huge increase in size? It will be a massive 35% extra houses in one village.

The rest of the borough will increase by a far lower percentage and in particular Guildford town is scheduled to have an increase in size of only 11%.

Surely there are brown field sites in the town which could accommodate many hundreds of new houses in a location which is far more suitable for young families.

A development of this size in West Horsley will put unsustainable strain on local facilities and infrastructure and in particular public transport, parking, schools, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops.

**Transport and parking**

An increase in village population will increase pressure on station parking, (often full in the morning with commuter traffic) and traffic movements to and from Horsley station and an increase in school children getting getting to school in West Horsley or going to Guildford and Leatherhead. The volume of traffic generated from the proposed new housing estates will be considerable and the impact on the local roads, which already struggle to cope with adverse weather conditions, will be significant. It will also impact on the traffic flow on the A3 in and around Guildford which can be a considerable problem at morning and evening school times. The bus service to and from West Horsley is inadequate.

**Schools**

There are as far as I am aware no plans whatsoever to provide the necessary schools to cope with such an increase in population. The Raleigh School is already full and the private Glenesk and Cranmore schools are also at or near to full capacity. The suggestion that schools in Ripley can be used will only increase traffic and surely we all want children to walk to school if possible. Anyway how could the Ripley schools cope with the numbers? The secondary school situation is already critical. The Howard of Effingham is well oversubscribed and is struggling to cope on a site which it outgrew many years ago and I am unaware of any proposal from Surrey County Council to cope with the present situation let alone that which would arise if these plans were to go ahead.

As there is also a plan for another 148 houses in East Horsley, this would also add to the difficulty of getting children into a local school.
Medical Facilities

Kingston Avenue Medical Centre which serves all of East and West Horsley and surrounding areas is already extremely busy and residents experience difficulty in making appointments.

Amenities

With only one small shop in West Horsley which is due to close in September, no post office, an extremely limited weekdays-only bus service through the village, there is no infrastructure which could begin to support the proposed high volumes of new housing development.

Character and Density

The developments proposed are at much higher densities than currently exist in the village settlement and will be totally out of character with the existing mix of different housing styles and layout of the village.

Green Belt

Finally and not least the first line of Policy P2 states, “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt against inappropriate development.”.

It seems that this development is not at all in line with this statement.

A survey of the residents of West Horsley conducted in 2015 showed that they are totally opposed to the village's removal from the Green Belt by insetting and extending the 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area boundaries. I of course accept that their views cannot dictate planning policy, but such a strength of feeling should surely only be ignored if there is cogent evidence to justify it. No exceptional circumstances or other justification is made for the new Green Belt boundaries that will result from the proposed removal of West and East Horsley from the Metropolitan Green Belt.

To allow these plans would be to ruin a village which has real character and which provides a defined community in the increasingly urban spread along the fringes of the North Downs. Once done it cannot be undone and I ask that the proposal be reviewed and the village is allowed to retain its identity due to the many reasons given here.

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

Attached documents:
dwellings per hectare. Residential gardens make a vital contribution towards biodiversity, provide wildlife corridors, and
furnish those open spaces which are vital to the character of the greenbelt. Please visit the rural villages of East and West
Horsley and see how the Green Belt has preserved the rural character and openness of the villages.

I object to the proposed change to the ‘washed over’ status of the villages of East and West Horsley.

Settlement boundaries, GBC are proposing to make a number of changes to the settlement boundaries of East and West
Horsley and so expand the settlement area, all as set out in the Proposals Map. Clearly this change does not protect
natural green belt boundaries but merely brings additional parcels of land including agricultural fields within the
settlement area in order to provide more housing land. However, under NPPF rules this is not a sufficient justification for
changing a Green Belt boundary.

I object to the proposed change to the ‘settlement boundaries’ of West and East Horsley.

GBPSLP Development sites;

Four sites (A37, A38, A40 and A41) in West Horsley are allocated in the Proposed Submission, and two smaller sites
(≤15) identified in the Land Availability Assessment, LAA.

Two sites (A36 & A39) in East Horsley sites are identified in the Proposed Submission Local Plan and four smaller sites
(≤15) in the Land Availability Assessment, LAA.

A36, Thatcher’s Hotel, my chief concern is over the number of houses proposed for this site - approximately 48
dwellings, many of which are on currently designated Green Belt land. This grassland area currently provides an east to
west wildlife corridor between Wellington Meadow and westward into Horsley Tower’s parkland and beyond.
Furthermore, the number of dwellings gives an implied gross housing density of 37 dwellings per hectare, which is
exceptionally high for this restricted location bounded on two sides by a major road intended to provide large scale
transport links.

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

Attached documents:
I am writing because I object strongly to the Local Plan for West Horsley. The number of houses in your proposed plans will completely change the nature and character of the village. It will lead to many more thousands of cars on our local roads some of which are narrow, flood easily and are poorly maintained.

Your plan involves building on and reducing the Green Belt land which has always been protected for very good reason. If your plans for the area succeed, West Horsley and all of the surrounding areas will become urban sprawl spreading out from Guildford. This area does not have the infrastructure required to cope with the scale of the developments. West Horsley has one local Infant & Junior School which is full to capacity. There is one medical centre in East Horsley. From September there will be no local shops requiring a journey to either East Horsley or elsewhere. Again this will increase the traffic on our local roads.

The Street has become a rat run for traffic and at peak times carries the traffic to two private schools.

This building will put additional strain on the A3 which is already heavily congested and the M25 which is completely congested for the majority of the day.

At weekends and even during the week, the roads are used by many hundreds of cyclists. At times it is impossible to overtake them and this causes frustration and delay. The whole area receives hundreds of visitors enjoying the local green spaces and consequently additional traffic. The burden that will be placed on local recreational facilities such as Sheepleas which is already heavily used at weekends will overwhelm the nature and the character of such a beautiful resource.

The local plan offers no solution to these issues and seems intent on fulfilling a need for additional housing without considering the problems that already exist or solutions to the problems this will create. The need for housing should not override the need to protect the Green Belt land.

The proposed development at Wisley to build another 2000 homes has not been removed from the local plan causing great concern, again for the pressures on our infrastructure and the huge increase in volume on main and local roads.

The scale of building new homes in West Horsley should be kept to a level which respects the infrastructure and local facilities (A requirement of The National Policy Framework).

**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? ( )

With reference to my previous letters on the subject of GBC plans for housing developments in East and West Horsley, which I draw your attention to and repeat all my objections and reservations contained therein.

Further I object to East and West Horsley being removed from the green belt. The councillors we voted for promised to protect the Green Belt, especially in East and West Horsley.

There is no mention regarding the provision of the infrastructure (schools enlarged medical centre parking facilities etc)-that will be necessary to cope with the increase in population and the absence of available space to cope with the additional traffic and parking facilities.

I object to the building of houses on land to the north of west Horsley on which 120 houses are proposed – this land is a flood zone area and was so designated but subsequently removed.

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

I wish to lodge objections relating to the Guildford Borough Council New Local Plan 2016 in respect of:

- the scale of the house building programme that appears to be excessive;
- the proposal to build some 65% of developments on land that is currently Green Belt: and,
- the infrastructure proposals that are inadequate even to meet the needs of what is required at present, let alone developments proposed in the Local Plan.

My rationale for the objections listed above is articulated in the letter sent by East Horsley Parish Council Local Plan Response dated 13 June 2016 to which I respectfully direct your attention. Their letter contains additional observations that address many other particulars contained in the Local Plan and these, too, I endorse.

Please consider all that East Horsley Parish Council has stated in their Response to represent my views also, and include these in your survey of responses as emanating from my address too.

I observe with deep misgivings the totality of house-building that is proposed for the corridor that follows roughly the line of the A246 Guildford to Leatherhead road insofar that if authorised this volume of dwellings within and between villages will change for ever the character of the land in which I reside, and it will turn a rural environment into one that is essentially urban. If permitted, this Plan would ruin all that I and many others enjoy about residing in this village (East Horsley).
I therefore object most strongly to plans: to remove from East Horsley: the protection currently provided by its inclusion in the Green Belt, to extend the existing boundaries of the Settlement Area, and to describe it as a 'District Centre'.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/773  Respondent: 8877953 / David Martin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 Submission Local Plan: Strategies and Sites June 2016 particularly the negative impact it would have on West Horsley.

I am totally against the removal of West Horsley from the Green Belt and the scale of the proposed developments. Your plan suggests a 35% increase in the number of houses in this village which would totally change the rural nature of the community and overwhelm the infrastructure which is already under strain.

The local road system is in appallingly bad condition and would need very major upgrading to cope with the massive increase in population planned. I do not see any realistic prospect of this happening.

Local schools are already full or nearly full and could not cope with the planned population increase. Surrey CC apparently do not plan to provide any additional local school places but blithely expect parents to drive their youngsters to schools out of the village putting a huge extra strain on the already inadequate road network.

There is a drainage problem already in West Horsley and concreting over large areas of currently undeveloped land will cause huge extra problems.

This plan makes a mockery of your own Green Belt and Countryside policy and demonstrates contempt for the quality of life of the residents of West Horsley.

The current Guildford Plan has been very poorly thought through and I urge you to scrap it in its entirety.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/810  Respondent: 8877953 / David Martin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 Submission Local Plan: Strategies and Sites June 2016 particularly the negative impact it would have on West Horsley.

I am totally against the removal of West Horsley from the Green Belt and the scale of the proposed developments. Your plan suggests a 35% increase in the number of houses in this village which would totally change the rural nature of the community and overwhelm the infrastructure which is already under strain.

The local road system is in appallingly bad condition and would need very major upgrading to cope with the massive increase in population planned. I do not see any realistic prospect of this happening.

Local schools are already full or nearly full and could not cope with the planned population increase. Surrey CC apparently do not plan to provide any additional local school places but blithely expect parents to drive their youngsters to schools out of the village putting a huge extra strain on the already inadequate road network.

There is a drainage problem already in West Horsley and concreting over large areas of currently undeveloped land will cause huge extra problems.

This plan makes a mockery of your own Green Belt and Countryside policy and demonstrates contempt for the quality of life of the residents of West Horsley.

The current Guildford Plan has been very poorly thought through and I urge you to scrap it in its entirety.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2889  **Respondent:** 8878177 / Jeremy Coventry  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

In response to your call for comments on the draft Local Plan I wish to submit the following:

The Key Evidence document 'Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2031 makes no case for locating large numbers of homes in West and East Horsley or neighbouring villages. The number of new houses proposed for West Horsley is totally out of proportion to the existing number of dwellings and totally disproportionate to the number of new homes allocated to other villages. No reason has been provided for this level of new houses to be allocated to West Horsley. It is even more illogical considering that most new employment opportunities are to the west of Guildford. (West Horsley is east of Guildford)

The development of 385 homes on the four proposed sites is at much higher densities than currently exists in the village settlement and will be completely out of character with the existing mix of different housing styles and layout of the village.

Infrastructure such as schools, medical facilities, drainage, both surface and foul, road capacity, shops, parking, are already stretched. Adding another third to demand would make the situation intolerable. The proposed homes building programme is totally unsustainable. This is especially so as there is no absolute requirement for additional infrastructure to be in place before the proposed development takes place. The surface drainage is already inadequate to deal with heavy rain.

I suggest that the proposed plans should be rejected.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3506  Respondent: 8879457 / Lisa Maycock  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

From looking at the latest plans I feel strongly that no consideration to the village infrastructure has not been taken into consideration.

Travel no regular us service and a station that has a very small car park facility that has no more room to grow. The local children have to rely on school buses to get them to an oversubscribed school and an increase in property would add to the heavily used A246 and village roads already this was very apparent when some roads in Horsley were closed and traffic was directed.

The local school is oversubscribed and the local secondary Howard that asked to move to an adequate site was refused.

There is no true village centre and an increase in properties would not find adequate services with a doctors practice struggling to meet demands.

Also the road systems on the proposed sites are poor and would cause traffic congestions. Also very surprised to receive a flyer from Dandara through our door saying how they are intending to build houses at the bottom of Shere Road which has never been mentioned in the plan before!!!! the school Cranmore already causes congestion and this would add to it.

We are told that this road is in the Surrey Hills AONB and the land around here is home to slow worms which are a protected species.

Overall I do not feel that the villages are capable of accepting the changes and to take them out of the green belt would affect the area which has got AONB attached to it, not adequate infrastructure and schools and roads to support these unnecessary changes.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3678  Respondent: 8879969 / Robert & Tracey Butcher  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Objection to The Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan – Strategy and Sites Consultation June 2016

I object to the proposed insetting of the green belt in the West Horsley Area for the for residential properties. It would have a long-term detrimental effect on the quality of life in the village and surrounding area.

The proposals are not sustainable. The green belt will be adversely affected. The long-term impact has not been modelled or considered.
The transportation and communication links would be severely affected resulting in detrimental effect to the environment.

The local state school is over-subscribed and therefore families moving in to the area in larger numbers than is sustainable by the natural ebb and flow into and out of the area would not receive schooling for their children in the local catchment area.

Sewerage and drainage is a specific issue that the Council has been advised on and no further plans or investment has been developed to overcome these issue.

The Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and Guildford Borough Council proposals do not present exceptional circumstances. There is not enough detail in the proposals for the impact on infrastructure, schooling, health and well-being, environmental impact

The proposal does not represent a sustainable approach to housing need for the area

The wider area proposals again do not appear to have a coordinated approach

The proposal is weakened by the lack of vision for the significant investment and community building required in adding such large numbers of housing units to an essentially rural village area

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

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4393  **Respondent:** 8879969 / Robert & Tracey Butcher  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Guildford Borough Council has not sought to consult or manage the relationship with West Horsley Village as to what sort of development might be appropriate for the village and the mix of residential units that the village might need. The proposal does not represent an organic, sustainable approach to housing need but rather sacrifices for future generations the right to enjoy the amenity and environmental benefits that being within the green belt affords. The increase in the number of residents living in West Horsley Village arising from the development would overwhelm local services such as the health centre, the local school (full) and drainage features. Indeed, GBC has not sought to consult and coordinate the approach amongst the parishes such as Ripley, Send, Wisley and around to achieve sustainable development. Rather it is taking a chance on

The proposal to site large scale high density residential development in the West Horsley Village comparison to are far in excess of what the local infrastructure can accommodate. The local roads, health facilities and schools are already at full capacity.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3577  **Respondent:** 8880321 / Elizabeth Baker  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**
Given the current size of East and West Horsley, the areas identified for enlargement of the settlement areas and village boundaries are disproportionate in the extreme. Proportionately more houses are proposed for West Horsley than anywhere else in the borough. Developing even one site to its declared potential based on target housing density would have a significant and negative effect on the village services and character. Development of all sites would rapidly increase the number of homes in West Horsley by over 35% very likely doubling the population which would destroy the existing character and put pressure on transport and societal facilities that cannot be managed. The sites are on the outliers of the village so they will inevitably increase the use of car(s) even for facilities in the village. There are very few shops in West Horsley and most people use the shops in East Horsley. However to describe East Horsley as a “Rural District Centre” is incorrect. The shops (with limited parking) meet essential needs but are small and have limited opening hours with the exception of Budgen’s food store - which cannot be described as “supermarket”. These shops are appropriate for the villages of East and West Horsley as they now are. The shops in West Horsley are meagre with even more limited opening hours and even more limited parking (5 cars in total at most).

Sites identified in West Horsley are agricultural land and once lost that land cannot be reclaimed. The sites are important for wildlife, the open character of the village as well as some being close to areas designated as SSSI, SPA or SNCI. Land and roads in West Horsley are prone to flooding especially those on the lower lying side of the villages such land alongside Ockham Road North. The site there near Waterloo Farm and surrounding properties has a very high water table and development of that land will impact on the drainage of surrounding land and property in wet weather and on water retention in times of drought – conditions which the consultation admits will become more challenging. Wildlife there is abundant with common and less common wildlife seen.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3693  Respondent: 8880321 / Elizabeth Baker  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Potential Sites for Development in East and West Horsley.

The proposals for West Horsley are abhorrent and would vastly increase village size with loss of character. Too many homes for a village without the necessary roads/infrastructure constitute a major and needless assault on protected Green Belt land.

The proposed 500 new homes would overwhelm the villages and their facilities.

Local schools are oversubscribed and barely cope with the existing population. Existing schools create high volumes of traffic at peak times with considerable congestion on narrow village roads. At one point East Lane is not wide enough to allow 2-way traffic.

The draft local plan is ill-considered and not supportable.

Proposed site A40 is very wet and prone to flooding after rain. Doubtless this would be much worse and would impact upon nearby properties and roads if development is allowed to take place. I note that the consultation document recognizes this problem but nevertheless the site remains as one for potential development.

Site A40 also surrounds a very popular and highly rated campsite with 130 pitches. The site is chosen by campers because of its quiet, sheltered and rural location with a lake and wildlife including deer and interesting birdlife. Development of site A40 would have a profoundly negative impact on this environment and lead to the decline of this local business.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
### Comment ID: PSLPA16/2880  Respondent: 8880769 / Margaret Keepence  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

The plan entails the removal of East and West Horsley from the Green Belt and the allocation of seven sites for the building of 533 houses. The removal of areas from the Green Belt can only take place in exceptional circumstances but evidence of such circumstances is not given in the plan nor is justification of the perceived excessive number of new houses.

The amenities of the area could not cope with the subsequent increased population. The schools and health facilities are already struggling to meet existing demand. The local roads are overcrowded and without scope for improvement.

The proposed building of 2000 new houses on the former Wisley Airfield would further impinge upon the road and rail facilities.

The proposed New Plan 2016 will destroy the beauty and character of the area riding roughshod over the provision of the Green Belt legislation thereby defeating the very purpose of it's creation.

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

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPA16/858  Respondent: 8881505 / Harry Claxton  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**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 plan submitted by Guildford Borough Council, riding roughshod over the published commitment to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt against inappropriate development. Why would West Horsley be expected to increase it's number of new homes by such a large percentage compared with Ash & Tongham and Guildford? We simply do not have the infrastructure to cope, already our Medical Centre in East Horsley is stretched, an appointment to see a nominated doctor can take well over a week. School places are at a premium, East Lane continues with flooding during the winter months and we have barely two buses a day to Guildford, there seems no consideration to service our existing requirements before embarking on the madness of this proposed plan. If it were to proceed it would be the ultimate destruction of these to important rural villages and the destruction of our cherished environment to the eternal shame of our council. I urge you to reconsider your plans and forgo short term gains and reflect on the harm that future generations will inherit.

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

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPA16/2581  Respondent: 8881633 / Gwyn Keepence  Agent:

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

The infrastructure of the area is already overloaded. The demand for places at local schools exceeds capacity. The health centre is under extreme pressure to meet the needs of existing patients. The roads were made to accommodate horse drawn traffic, they are already overloaded and there is no realistic way in which capacity may be increased.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/896  Respondent: 8882273 / Margaret Tirrell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I wish to comment on the new Guildford Local Plan with specific reference to the Horsleys.

The main objections are listed on the attached paper and with which I totally agree.

I would underline two objections in particular. Firstly the Green Belt should be totally protected, not only for the benefit of local residents, but also for visitors from urban areas, Secondly the infrastructure in place at present is wholly inadequate. Ancient drainage facilities can hardly cope at present, roads and car parks are overloaded and medical facilities would not be able to cope - it is hard enough now to get an appointment. I think brownfield sites should be the priority for new housing and that protection of the Green Belt is essential.

Major Objections and Concerns for the Horsleys:

• Proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt

The "exceptional circumstances" required before taking this action have not been demonstrated.

• Extension of the boundaries of the Settlement areas of the Horsleys

No sound reasons have been given for the proposed changes, which seem to be aimed solely at increasing the land available within the settlements for future additional development.

• Infrastructure already in overload.

The local Schools are full. Medical facilities stretched. Drainage is inadequate, roads and car parks are overloaded with little or no scope for improvements.

• Station Parade is designated a «District Centre”

This 'classification' results from a complete misreading of the nature of the facilities in the village centre and would inappropriately target the area for future urban developments.

--Development of over 2,000 houses at Ockham village (former Wisley Airfield)

The impact on the Horsley villages of such a huge mixed housing, retail,commercial, traveller and schools development, under 2 miles away, would be enormous.

The plan also includes extensive developments at Burnt Common (400 houses & commercial developments) and Gosden Hill Farm, Burpham (2000 houses & mixed use developments).
Major doubt concerning housing numbers

The inflated number of new houses proposed arises from a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) that was generated by a consultant's mathematical model which is not revealed in the plan. Nor, apparently, to Guildford Borough Council, GBC.

This SHMA target housing number is then further increased by GBC to give a population increase which is almost 70% higher than the official national estimates for population growth in the Borough.

The scale of this increase has alarming results e.g. an increase of up to 35% in existing West Horsley households - greater than any other single area in the Borough.

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

Attached documents:
village at times to shop and children’s clubs such as football and cubs etc are already over-subscribed and have long waiting lists.

The local survey on the need for homes identified the need for 20 affordable homes to enable local people to stay in the village – I am happy for this to be implemented. I believe the siting of mass housing developments in West Horsley is more to do with monetary reward for developers as selling prices will be maximised in West Horsley as opposed to existing Brownfield sites, and not sound planning logic.

I have lived most of my adult life in West Horsley and because of the rural character of my village I have chosen to bring my family up here. If the proposed development is allowed to progress our village will be spoilt with high density development and once instigated it will be impossible to restore the charming character of this typical English village.

I feel very strongly that the proposals are flawed from a planning perspective, and are being undertaken for the wrong reasons namely for developers profit.

Please, please do not destroy my lovely village by removing it from the Green Belt and over-developing for the reasons noted above. This density of housing will ruin the current character of West Horsley forever.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/327  Respondent: 8883425  /  Paul Jarvis  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I have lived with my wife and family in West Horsley for the last 18 years and am extremely concerned in respect of the proposed developments. Horsley is a lovely village that is recognised nationally as being one of the best places to live in this country due to open spaces, countryside, and heritage. I am extremely concerned and very strongly object to the fact that Guildford Borough Council propose to inset West and East Horsley from the Green Belt, and I consider that no meaningful, substantive, or effective changes to their proposals have been included since the 2016 consultation.

I believe the council has ignored the mass objections from over 30,000 residents. It feels as the intention is to gradually wear us down and this is totally unacceptable. Local opinions must be considered and the heritage of the Horsleys, should be maintained for future generations.

In my opinion nothing has been included since last year’s Consultation to improve the sustainability of the West Horsley development sites. Each new home on the proposed West Horsley development sites will need a minimum of one car, and probably two or more per household and I consider this will cause real safety issues for our children using the local roads. If you know and live in the village it is clear that the current infrastructure and amenities are fully utilised already. The schools, shops, medical centre, roads, parking and Horsley Station are already full to capacity and the proposed development plans will cause major issues for all of the above services.

In summary, I strongly object to the fact that Guildford Borough Council propose to inset West and East Horsley from the Green Belt, and that there have been no substantive or effective changes to their proposals since the 2016 consultation regarding proposed developments and supporting infrastructure.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1002  Respondent: 8883489  /  N & B Hinchliff  Agent:
4. The proposal to extend the boundaries of the Settlement areas of the Horsleys.

No sound reasons have been given for these changes, the only objective seems to be to increase the land available within the settlements for future additional developments.

1. The designation of Station Parade as a District Centre.

Classifying it in this way has resulted from a misreading of the nature of the facilities in the village centre and I fear that this would result in it being the inappropriate target for future urban development.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/406  Respondent: 8886497 / Quentin Bradshaw  Agent:

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

- I object to the number of houses being planned for the Horsleys, particularly West Horsley. It would completely change the character of these quiet villages.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3445  Respondent: 8887009 / Jacqueline Weller  Agent:

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

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

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

The four policy sites are all located within the Green Belt and I consider these proposed movements in settlement boundaries to be invalid. These proposals are also contrary to the principles of the Metropolitan Green belt. It is also totally contrary to the opening statement of Local Plan Policy P2 that “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt” It seems that in West and East Horsley at least the draft Local Plan is doing exactly the opposite.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The four policy sites are all located within the Green Belt and I consider these proposed movements in settlement boundaries to be invalid. These proposals are also contrary to the principles of the Metropolitan Green belt. It is also totally contrary to the opening statement of Local Plan Policy P2 that “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt” It seems that in West and East Horsley at least the draft Local Plan is doing exactly the opposite.

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

As a resident of East Horsley village I have studied the above and my objections, with comments, are as follows:

1. I am totally opposed to the removal of the Horsleys from the Green Belt and do not agree with any extension of the boundaries of the Settlement areas of the Horsleys. This would also have a detrimental effect on the habitat of wildlife, flora and fauna.
2. The highly inflated numbers of proposed new housing within the Horsleys is unnecessary and unacceptable and would alter the present strong characteristics of both villages to their detriment.
3. Both villages are currently struggling with overburdened and inefficient infrastructure. The schools and surgeries are now oversubscribed, the parking facilities at the village halls, surgery and shops are already insufficient - for example the Horsley U3A has approx 650 members and it is impossible for the vast majority of members to park at the Village Hall to attend meetings.

The village roads are overcrowded and in poor condition and the drainage is in an exceedingly poor state and little appears to have been done to rectify these conditions. The Ockham roads North and South are currently overused by huge trucks and lorries - very recently there was a lengthy closure of both roads due to a truck striking the railway arch.

1. Station Parade being designated a District Centre is absurd - totally inappropriate.
2. The possible development of the former Wisley Airfield so close to the Horsleys would have an enormous impact, any such development I strongly object to.

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 have been a resident of West Horsley for over 18 years, and I would like to register my very strong objections to the Guildford Local Plan, and specifically the plans as they apply to the villages of East and West Horsley; including the development of some 500-600 new houses in the Horsleys, and a further 2000 houses within two miles of the villages. The impact on the villages would be catastrophic and irreversible.

With Brexit now clearly under way, surely it would also be far more sensible to reassess the need for housing in the south-east in several years time. There could be a mass exodus of jobs from London to other European capitals meaning that we would have 'ghost towns' with much empty housing instead of thriving communities and the demand for housing less not greater.

I have read the various documents explaining the details of the Local Plan, and it is clear that you are likely to be overwhelmed with letters of objection. It is very apparent that whole parts of the plans have either not been thought through, and indeed significant areas appear not to have been addressed in any way. It seems that there has been a very superficial attempt to create a solution that is clearly impractical, unworkable, and objectionable on various counts.

I am shocked to read about the proposals to alter established boundaries in, what appears to be, an attempt to make the plans work where they are currently unworkable under existing and long established village boundaries. It is my understanding that any change in Green Belt boundaries should demonstrate exceptional circumstances. I see no exceptional circumstances to justify the proposed arbitrary changes to the Green Belt. Furthermore West Horsley seems to have been 'victimised' in these proposals on an unbelievable scale. While the village of Ash, for example, has virtually 'escaped' any similar devastating plans for housing developments on such a huge scale.

If it were to be shown that in fact the destruction of the Horsley villages, along with Ockham and their local countryside can be justified legally by simply re-writing the laws governing the Green Belt, then I would further object to the plans on the grounds of a severe lack of infrastructure, either currently available or planned.

I drive to my place of work each day from West Horsley to Cobham. My route 18 years ago used to less than 15 minutes; most days it is now closer to 30 minutes or longer to travel less than 7 miles. It is clear that the local road structure is completely unsuitable for today's level of traffic and to compound the problems with significant more traffic seems to be verging on complete madness. The local roads and A3 and junction 10 of the M25 will be gridlocked for significantly more proportions of each day. It is imperative that the Authorities take immediate and major action to relieve the congestion that is currently choking our roads without adding to the problems with more housing as this would inevitably result in a significant increase in commuter vehicles as a result of these 'plans'.

This is, of course only one area where the infrastructure is totally overwhelmed. Many people, more qualified than me will explain the equally, or probably even more important, impossible situation with regards to schools, medical facilities, shops and public transport and other aspects of local infrastructure. None of these appear to have been adequately addressed.

There are obvious and real reasons why the plan to 'adjust' the village boundaries and cancel large areas of Green Belt to accommodate a 35% increase in local households does not work. In addition the loss of recreational amenities, both for local people and the considerable number who travel, particularly from London would be disastrous. There appears to be a determination to extend the boundaries of the built up area of London through the Horsleys, past Guildford and beyond. Our Green Belt is precious. It is what protects London from urban sprawl; it preserves air quality; it prevents flooding; it is the city’s playground. It is for us to conserve and protect it. I understand that there are five legal purposes for Green Belt as I am certain you are aware, and the area around East and West Horsley is particularly critical in meeting all of these criterial:

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas
- To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
- To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The concept of limiting urban sprawl, and the requirements for the establishment and maintenance of the Green Belt have apparently been disregarded or completely ignored in the new Guildford Local Plan. I urge you to reconsider this objectionable, unworkable and irreversible plan that will result in the loss of the villages and countryside in which we live.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
My response to Guildford Borough Council’s Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites

I totally reject the plan to remove West Horsley and other villages from the Green Belt. Section 86 of the National Planning Policy Framework states “if it is necessary to prevent development in a village 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 villages that the plan intends to remove from the Green Belt make a terrific contribution to the Green Belt as anyone well acquainted with the villages round Guilford would know.

There is quite a bit of land held by developers in West Horsley which one supposes is why West Horsley has been targeted for development? A Borough Council has the responsibility to protect rural communities from the sort of mass development proposed in the plan, not to endorse it.

If sites A39 and A41 were built on there would be a marked change in the nature of this area around the railway line; at present it is countryside, it would become urban.

If site A40 was built on, particularly to the north of the lane, there would be a clear encroachment into the countryside. The same applies to the north of site A38.

The traffic through East and West Horsley is already very heavy. The fumes at the junction of East Lane and Ockham Road North already provides a serious health hazard for small children, the pavement being so narrow. West Horsley is a village with occasional pavements, none of which are suitable for a wheelchair or two children sitting side by side in a double buggy. To suggest that a village already at bursting point can sustain the sort of development proposed, an increase of thirty five percent, is preposterous. The development of brown field sites in the past has been good and one would hope that would continue.

In one part of the plan it is stated that brown field sites should be built on in preference to fields but in another that the borough intends to grant planning permission to build on the sites in West Horsley early on, none of these are brown field sites. Brown field sites come up sporadically and are not so easy to develop; neither of these excuses should be used to build on fields without very careful thought. A brown field site, can in the fullness of time be changed back, a field once built on is lost forever.

As the proposal to build a small town at Wisley goes against almost every statement in the NPPF it is difficult to understand why it is still being proposed. I oppose this on the basis of excess traffic with its consequential pollution and traffic jams and the curtailment of free movement of wildlife across one of the last remaining truly rural area of West Surrey.

Councillor Spooner says “We consider that exceptional circumstances exist across the borough. These are the requirement to provide sufficient land for market and affordable housing and employment development with the significant adverse consequences of not doing so”. There is much of England where unemployment is a problem, it is not in Guildford.

Guildford has been acting as a dormitory town for London for years, this along with an expanding undergraduate population that has never been properly catered for plus development of the business park etc mean that the borough is
already saturated with people and cars. Removing more of the countryside, as at Burpham, diminishes everyone’s wellbeing.

To minimise traffic any plan should focus on people living as close to work as possible generally this will be in Guildford which already has excellent bus services and a main line station. The countryside should be left for everyone to enjoy wherever they live. In the past councils have respected this it is very sad that the majority of the present Guildford Borough Councillors appear not to.

The Surrey villages and surrounding countryside provide an area for walking and, since the Olympics, have hosted an exceptional amount of cycling. The villages provide cyclists with access to the Surrey Hills and planners need to be aware of the need to keep all road users safe. Every extra adult living in a Surrey village is an extra car on already too busy roads so allowing the potential of hundreds of houses to be built in these rural villages seems to be very irresponsible. Such a potential would exist if the villages were to be removed from the Green Belt.

The plan should show a much more imaginative use of land for residential purposes in Guildford itself, as it is only here that there is the infrastructure to reduce journey times and car usage. As the NPPF states brown field sites should not be being held back from residential development in the hope of future commercial use. This appears to be happening in Guildford.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3454  Respondent: 8888449 / Phillip Marazzi  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am writing to express my strong objections to the local plan as it affects my local community of West Horsley, along with East Horsley and Wisley.

The enormous level of house building along with destruction of Green Belt protection is utterly abhorrent and must not be allowed to happen. Once this starts, it will set a very dangerous precedent, and will certainly continue in the future. Is it really your intention to start the process of joining London to Guildford?

I have seen no possible justification for this ridiculous level of building and loss of protection for our lovely countryside with its wildlife.

The area is made up of small communities and this will erode that enormously turning the Horsleys, Ockham and Wisley into an unpleasant sprawl.

It appears that the continued attempt to build on countryside and not brownfield sites is merely to pander to developers who want to make easy profit. We have a good range of wildlife some of which is very sensitive to traffic, such as barn owls. They need protection.

The local services are stretched to the limit already with schools and medical services at capacity. Our local roads are in a pathetic state of disrepair, and the extra traffic will further aggravate this problem. Where are these people going to work? The extra people will undoubtedly lead to more strain and a total loss of the character of this lovely area.

PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE STOP.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/103</th>
<th>Respondent: 8889537 / Andy Los</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 write to object to

1. the number of houses proposed to be built in West Horsley, particularly the development of Site 41 on East Lane.
2. the removal of West and East Horsley from the Green Belt, this was created for a reason, for the mental and physical health of those living and working around London. It would be an outrage to change this ruling.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/489</th>
<th>Respondent: 8889889 / Simon Stapleton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 would like to OBJECT to West Horsley and East Horsley being removed from the greenbelt in the way that the council proposes in order to allow development on the sites proposed. As things stand currently at the Medical Centre in East Horsley it is already difficult to make an appointment. The one local state primary school shared by East and West Horsley is oversubscribed and there is no state secondary school in the villages. The car parking spaces in East Horsley around the shops, healthcentre and at the station can prove challenging at the best of times. West Horsley itself currently has one food convenience store, two Public Houses and a newsagent. There has been no Post Office since August 2013 so I fail to see how you can classify it as a medium sized village. I feel that local social, shopping, educational, healthcare and policing services will be overwhelmed by the proposed plans for development. There is no infrastructure plan whatsoever in the local plan in order to accommodate the increase in housing which I find scandalous.

I OBJECT to the draft local plan as it will destroy the ruralness of the area. In the villages of West & East Horsley the density of houses to be built on the proposed sites is totally out of keeping with the existing houses in the villages. This will mean that the proposed sites will have an urban estate density which is out of character with the low density rural character elsewhere in the villages. In West Horsley alone it has 41 listed buildings in it which gives the village appeal. Our heritage needs to be considered. This proposed plan would have a huge effect both visually and environmentally on the ruralness of this area. Tourism brings advantages to the area such as boosting the local economy. One of the reasons that tourists visit is because the countryside is rural and attractive and appreciated by walkers as well as cyclists. If the roads were developed to accommodate the proposed increase in development I believe tourism would lessen and the risk of injury to cyclists and pedestrians would increase.

I OBJECT to the draft plan due to the dangers that it may lead to. The pavements in parts of East and West Horsley i.e on The Street leading up to the two local stores, and on Ockham Road South are very narrow and unsuitable for wheelchairs and prams etc. The main routes through the villages are narrow with poor road surfaces and the increase in traffic that development would bring would bring inherent dangers to car users and pedestrians alike.

I OBJECT to the draft local plan as I feel there are unsuitable public transport facilities to meet the increase in population. It is naive to think that most people would walk or cycle to work or to the train station in East Horsley from
the village and neighbouring West Horsley due to the distances needed to travel and the safety issues to take into
consideration. Again this would put huge demands on the road network, increase the carbon footprint and decrease the
air quality. Existing public transport in the villages is very limited which makes it difficult to get around without a car.

I OBJECT to the draft local plan as I feel that the roads in East & West Horsley tend to flood annually making the roads
impassable often even in a 4x4. Development would only increase this risk as surface water would not be able to drain
away so readily.

The Horsleys appear to have a larger number of Potential Development Areas than most other villages within the borough
which appears unfair. In addition to the planned development sites in the Horsley’s there are plans for 2000 houses at
Gosden Hill on the A3, 400 houses at Garlicks Arch, a site of ancient woodland, and a new town at the old site of Wisley
Airfield. All these sites are on green belt and will mean that there is urban sprawl along the A3 corridor and appears to be
an unbalanced allocation of development in one area of the borough. West and East Horsley will grow by over 40% by
2031 according to the draft Local Plan. Most of this will occur in the first 5 years of the Guildford Plan period. This is
much much greater than other areas of the borough and will totally destroy the villages as we know them.

I OBJECT to the Horsley’s defined settlement boundaries being changed and the villages being “inset” therefore allowing
development on current greenbelt land and conservation areas. There are no exceptional circumstances apparent to build
on the green belt. Housing need alone should not constitute as exceptional circumstances.

I OBJECT to the local draft plan as it stands. There is unsubstantiated evidence as to how the housing figures have been
ascertained. Indeed the councillors have rejected several proposals such as the new development planned at Wisley
Airfield and yet they remain in this 2016 draft local plan.

I OBJECT to greenbelt land being destroyed for housing needs. 70% of the proposed development across the borough is
on existing greenbelt or countryside. I believe that the council needs to consult the residents in order to produce a
document which recommends a more suitable level of development which will protect our villages and surrounding
countryside for generations to come. **Once the greenbelt is lost it is gone forever. The NPPF 79 said that greenbelt
land should be open and permanent.** Sustainable development means that it ensures better lives for ourselves and not
making worse lives for future generations.

I feel that as the plan stands in its current format future generations lives will be made worse for the reasons stated in this
letter and for those reasons I OBJECT to the plan. The scale and position of future development sites needs to be much
more sensible in order for the Local Plan to be more practical and realistic.

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

**Attached documents:**
primary and secondary schools (and the planning application to rebuild the Howard was rejected), the doctors surgery, parking at the shops, while several roads like the Drift are badly worn struggling to cope with the volume of traffic as it is. In addition I understand the drainage infrastructure would not support an additional burden.

The scale of the proposed new housing at a 35% increase on the existing village is completely out of line with the proposals for other areas. Why should West Horsley be singled out for such an increase particularly when it is self evidently harmful to the Green Belt?

The National Planning and Policy requires that new development must make due allowance for the character and density of housing in the proposed area and be suitably supported by infrastructure and local facilities. This is very clearly not the case here.

The proposed plan should be rejected and rethought.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4359  **Respondent:** 8891489 / Danielle Mcclements  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**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 on the following grounds:

**I object to the removal of East Horsley and West Horsley from the Green Belt.**

I would like to protest most vehemently at the proposal to remove villages from the Green Belt, in particular East and West Horsley. No 'exceptional circumstances' have been demonstrated. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires any change of Green Belt boundaries to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Unmet housing need is NOT an exceptional circumstance in law. We moved to the area precisely because of the village character. Removing their Green Belt status will leave the flood gates open for development and once built upon, the green countryside will never ever return.

In this new draft local plan, 65% of new houses in the Borough are to be built on land that is currently in the Green Belt. This is not acceptable.

The Green Belt was set up for the very reason of preventing the green and beautiful countryside being built over. Any removal of Green Belt status is the thin end of the wedge - once the protection is gone, bit by bit the land will be built over, and eventually London will spread and sprawl over it all, urbanised and built up.

**I object to the extension of boundaries of the settlement area of the Horsleys**

No sound reason has been given to justify this. The only possible outcome of this is more land which includes field and open spaces is then vulnerable to being built upon, further destroying the nature of the villages.

**I object to Station Parade being designated a district centre**

**Development of over 2000 houses at former Wisley Airfield.**

We have objected previously to an application to build a new village here and were very pleased when Guildford Borough Council turned this down. We again object to this for the following reasons:

Building thousands of new homes here will:
Increase:
- traffic and congestion
- traffic accidents
- pollution
- pressure in rail services
- pressure on parking in the already crowded village of Horsley
- pressure on local, already oversubscribed,
- pressure on local, already oversubscribed, doctors, hospital and other health services

The idea of shutting Old Lane access from the A3 is preposterous. It is a well used route; and the long and winding detour is inconvenient, and will result in even more CO2 and other pollutants in the atmosphere, at a stage in history when we have realised the harm these do to our bodies and the environment, and are collectively and actively seeking to reduce, not increase them.

There are only two (not 9) railway stations (Horsley and Effingham Junction) within five road miles of the site and these are only reachable via narrow, unlit country lanes and have car parking already at near capacity.

Any widening of local roads would require further destruction of trees, and natural habitat.

Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this application. Effingham Junction, Ockham and the Horsleys already suffer badly from flooding problems. The development may lead to sewage flooding.

**Overloaded infrastructure**

The building of 593 new houses in the in the Horsleys within five years would seriously change the character of the villages for the worse, and lead to even more pressure on the already oversubscribed services, particularly the school and doctors' surgery. It is often difficult to park in East Horsley village to visit the shops, and also at the village hall and doctors' car parks. The main village shop Budgens often has long queues. The train station has insufficient parking for its users, with no room from expansion. Doubling the population of the villages would render the already crowded trains a nightmare.

The streets around The Raleigh School are chaos at drop off and pick up time. Given the geography, even if the school expanded its classrooms, there is no more room for parents to stop in the cul de sacs around, and parking on East Lane is obstructive and dangerous.

Similarly Ockham Road North is always blocked by users of Glenesk School in the morning and afternoon, as there is nowhere for parents to stop except in the small forecourt. It is not possible to park along Ockham Road North as it is too narrow and no pavements on one side. Passing traffic is therefore blocked by cars waiting to enter the school grounds. Hundreds of additional houses built would spell significantly more chaos.

There is simply not enough room in these villages for hundreds of extra houses. Yes, there might physically be spaces for the houses, but there is definitely not the space or infrastructure nor employment for the thousands of new inhabitants.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/995</th>
<th>Respondent: 8892353 / Elizabeth Russell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<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 4 of the 6 proposed development sites numbered included in A36-41 which either intentionally or inadvertently will create a town at the cost of losing two separate villages. Quite why GBC should have selected West & East Horsley in this way, as compared with the exceptionally generous treatment of most other areas is, at best, exceptionally disappointing.

Whatever their merits as development sites, the 6 Horsley sites should not only be considered individually but for their cumulative impact on the contiguous villages of East and West Horsley.

Building 533 new houses on these 6 sites, plus at least another 90 on small sites is (a) excessive in absolute terms and (b) disproportionate relative to the rest of the Borough. It will destroy the rural character of these communities and put unsustainable strain on local facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops. The open nature of West Horsley was a significant factor that led to the 2012 Olympic cycle races passing through the village and this same route has since been adopted by the annual Prudential Ride 100 Cycle Ride. Furthermore, the housing NEED in both West & East Horsley (per recent research) is for SMALL houses / FLATS so that (a) young people can get onto the housing ladder and (b) older residents can downsize.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4003  
**Respondent:** 8892353 / Elizabeth Russell  
**Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North  

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

**Specific Sites in East and West Horsley**

I **OBJECT** to 4 of the 6 proposed development sites numbered included in A36-41 which either intentionally or inadvertently will create a town at the cost of losing two separate villages. Quite why GBC should have selected West & East Horsley in this way, as compared with the exceptionally generous treatment of most other areas is, at best, exceptionally disappointing.

Whatever their merits as development sites, the 6 Horsley sites should not only be considered individually but for their cumulative impact on the contiguous villages of East and West Horsley.

Building 533 new houses on these 6 sites, plus at least another 90 on small sites is (a) excessive in absolute terms and (b) disproportionate relative to the rest of the Borough. It will destroy the rural character of these communities and put unsustainable strain on local facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops. The open nature of West Horsley was a significant factor that led to the 2012 Olympic cycle races passing through the village and this same route has since been adopted by the annual Prudential Ride 100 Cycle Ride. Furthermore, the housing NEED in both West & East Horsley (per recent research) is for SMALL houses / FLATS so that (a) young people can get onto the housing ladder and (b) older residents can downsize.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3917  
**Respondent:** 8892609 / Karen Hall  
**Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. There are no “exceptional circumstances” demonstrated to justify removing the Horsleys from the Green Belt and once removed it would not be possible to return the area to the Green Belt in the future.

2. The extension of the boundaries of the Settlement Areas is appalling. This is an inappropriate and contrived device to try to show that there aren’t that many of us in the Areas and to justify the increase of housing as a consequence.

3. The infrastructure of the Horsleys is at bursting point as it is. There are hardly any roads. The ones that we have are inadequate. Peak times are a nightmare at a number of junctions and they wouldn’t be particularly assisted by traffic control. The roads leading to the A3/M25 would be totally blocked. The geography of the area lends itself to local flooding which would be made much worse by any additional building and run off.

   Schools and Medical Facilities are over subscribed and were unable to accommodate our family or others.

4. The local shops are not a “District Centre” by any stretch of the imagination.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3181   Respondent: 8892705 / R.B. and S.E. Davis   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Re: Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan:

: strategy and sites: June 2016 (The Guildford Plan)

I object. I object to the boundaries of East and West Horsley villages being greatly enlarged, the areas inside these new boundaries being removed from the Green belt and to the development of 533 new homes in the villages. This totally fails to recognise that development of this scale in this rural area is unsustainable. The roads, schools, medical facilities, water and all infrastructures are already at full capacity and would not cope with such a development. If the National Planning Policy Framework is followed this development would not be allowed.

I object. I object that Green belt areas are targeted for development when there are brownfield sites within the urban area which if suitably developed would meet housing needs and give people better access to workplaces.

I object. I object to the need for affordable housing being used as a reason to remove protections on Green Belt and areas of outstanding natural beauty when the 40% of affordable housing proposed will be beyond the means of low paid workers. This defeats the reason for plundering green belt and other protected areas.

More thoughtful social housing plans in existing urban areas would fulfill the need far better.

I object. I object to the total disregarding of the detailed and well researched objections submitted after the first Guildford Plan was proposed when it was previously announced that local concerns and objections would be addressed. Instead nothing has changed and no attempt has been made to resolve the immense impact that these proposals would have on the infrastructure and consequently the character of the Horsley's. This is a betrayal of the standards I would expect from an elected body.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3385   Respondent: 8892705 / R.B. and S.E. Davis   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
• I object to the above Plan which proposes an increase of 35% to the number of homes in West Horsley village. The existing local transport, road network and infrastructure systems are struggling to meet current needs and would not be able to cope with this proposed major development. The Plan fails in all respects to address the impact of the development on the village. Furthermore, the Plan does not recognise the significant adverse affect on West Horsley of the proposed developments in the adjoining villages of East Horsley and Ockham. The Plan does not comment on any of these matters and by the omission is incomplete since the consequences are highly significant to all the villages. The Plan is unsustainable.

• The Guildford Plan for the development of West Horsley is based on four sites and gives a total of 385 new houses. Near Horsley railway station, on a site adjacent to the West Horsley Parish boundary, a further 100 homes are proposed in the village of East Horsley. The housing density proposed for each site is much higher than that which currently exists in the villages and will be totally out of character. The National Planning Policy Framework calls for the respect of character and density of housing of new residential developments in the area. Furthermore, it requires that the housing is limited in quantity by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities. The proposed development of these sites is therefore inappropriate and unsustainable.

• I object to the significant enlargement of the West and East Horsley village boundaries as given in the above Guildford Plan. Furthermore, I object to the proposal to remove the village areas inside these boundaries from the Green Belt. Neither justification nor explanation for these changes is provided in the Plan. The Green Belt is protected as a matter for National and Local policy. In the National Planning Policy Framework it is stated “As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.” There are no very special circumstances which justify the above changes as proposed in the Plan. The proposed changes are totally unacceptable and should not be implemented.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1113</th>
<th>Respondent: 8892897 / R.J O'Gorman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<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 wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the removal of West Horsley and East Horsley villages from the Green Belt under the Proposed Submission Local Plan : Strategies and Sites June 2016, by insetting and extending the 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area boundaries.

The Green Belt and Countryside Study is clearly flawed and there is no need for the currently defined Settlement Area boundaries to be extended.

The planned density of new homes is far too high for the village to support as well as being out of character without a sustainable infrastructure of drainage, road capacity or public transport.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I am 30 years old and have been a resident of West Horsley for all my life. I am a qualified construction manager and work for one of the country's biggest construction companies. I therefore feel I am positioned to make valid comments of the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategies and Sites June 2016.

In the first instance, the 385 proposed number of homes is wholly out of character and fat too large to be required or sustainable by the current infrastructure. I would comment that the basis calculation from which the demand for this quantum of housing emerges appears to be incorrect.

the requirement that West Horsley suffers insetting and consequent removal from the Green Belt is wholly unnecessary and again based on the flawed Green Belt and Countryside Study. I very much object to this proposal.

It is furthermore clear from published details that the current drainage and waste water infrastructure could not cope with the scale of building proposed in West Horsley let alone the roads and transport system.

I accordingly must close by registering my wholehearted objection the Proposed submission Local Plan: Strategies and Sites June 2016.

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

I am writing to register my objection to the above plan.

My reasons for objecting are:

1. Removing Green Belt status from the Horsleys will result in high density building developments that are out of keeping with the nature of the villages and detrimental to the character of the villages. There is no justification for this action.
2. The inevitable increase in population arising from the development of new homes within the area will further stress the already failing water and sewer utilities; will overstretch the capacity of the already fragile infrastructure - doctors, state schools, parking, road and rail public transport; and will lead to higher traffic density, an increased number of road accidents, and higher levels of air pollution.
3. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment model, on which the number of new houses required is based, has not been made public and the results appear highly dubious and certainly not a basis for critical planning decisions.
4. The plan will greatly increase the population of young people in an area where local employment opportunities are already low and unlikely to increase as a result of the plan.

Having lived in East Horsley for over 30 years I have seen the increasing erosion of the Green Belt and experienced the already obvious stresses and strains on the infrastructure over this period.

It is the responsibility of the local planners to ensure that these existing problems are addressed and resolved, not greatly exacerbated by removing the constraints that currently exist.

I wish my objections to be noted when this unsatisfactory and highly flawed plan is considered.

Objections specific to West Horsley:-

While there is obviously some modest scope for further appropriate housing development in West Horsley - and the Parish Council has identified a need for approximately twenty affordable homes - I strongly object to the suggestions for West Horsley in this Local Plan for the following reasons:-

1. The infrastructure - schools, medical facilities, roads, parking, drainage etc. are already at breaking point. There is nothing in these proposals about how the insufficiencies would be addressed, what it would cost if feasible and who would be accepting liability to pay for it.

2. There is a duty of care on the part of GBC Planning Department towards existing residents which has been comprehensively ignored in drawing up this Plan for consultation.

3. The character of West Horsley village would be completely ruined by development on the scale envisaged. The number of dwellings proposed is preposterous in relation to the size of the existing village and the proposed densities would be totally out of character with the built environment. There are no precedents for flats and townhouses in West Horsley. Planning Policy Guidelines have again been completely ignored.

4. Any development on the newly identified site A41 on East Lane opposite Greta Bank would be unthinkable. This is an unbroken rural vista of fields, trees and sometimes horses, enjoyed by thousands who make their way along this thoroughfare, especially at peak times.

5. It appears that GBC foresees the best economic development opportunities as lying on the opposite side of Guildford to West Horsley. Why then is huge development of West Horsley such a good idea?

Needless to say I also object to massive development on the site of the former Wisley airfield.

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

Attached documents:
1. We object to the plan which proposes to increase the number of homes within West Horsley by 35%.
2. We object to the plan which proposes that over 70% of new housing to be built within the Green Belt. There is ample brownfield land in the urban areas which needs to be regenerated, without the need to encroach on protected Green Belt land.
3. We object to the disproportionate allocation of housing in this particular part of the borough.
4. We object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. The roads within the villages of West and East Horsley are already worn and full of potholes and are in need of resurfacing (along with the pavements) – more cars, vans and lorries on these roads are going to cause even more problems.
5. We object to the plan due the increased volume of car traffic. The proposed developments would result in an estimated 1,000 additional cars on the local roads.
6. We object to the plan as there is a lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.
7. We object to the plan as the local facilities are already stretch (i.e. doctors, dentists, etc). More people moving into the area, without another doctor’s surgery being added, would cause so many more problems with obtaining appointments.

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

Attached documents:

I strongly object to the number of proposed new developments in the plan for East and especially West Horsley. In West Horsley you are proposing an approx. 35% increase in the number of houses which will ruin the village:

- Proposed housing densities are much higher than currently exist and will be completely out of character with the existing village
- Expansion on this scale is not sustainable – the existing infrastructure (schooling, doctors, parking, traffic, public transport, drainage) cannot support it
- West Horsley is a beautiful village, partly in an area of AONB and this development will ruin it and it will therefore cease to attract large numbers of tourists and visitors for walking and cycling etc
- Like many other residents of the village I am opposed to the village being removed from the greenbelt by insetting and extending settlement boundaries. Green belt is there to protect villages like West Horsley. Before we know it, Horsley will be like Walton– just one sprawling line of housing.
- Green belt land should be protected and no exceptional circumstances have been made for developing greenbelt in the Horsleys
- The local schools are already completely over subscribed

In addition I have seen no evidence to support the fact that so many more houses are needed in West Horsley and the Green Belt and Countryside Study which I read seems completely flawed.

Commenting on a specific site which is the plot of land to the south of the A246, bordering the A246 and to the west of Shere Road and also bordering Shere Road – Dandara have an option on this land are our trying to seek approval for housing development. I am against developing this plot for the infrastructure problems (listed above) and because it would be completely wrong as having open space and farm land next to roads is an important aspect of feeling in the country ie that is why this plot is currently greenbelt.
1. Notwithstanding the above, with regard to my own locality:-

• For reasons previously stated, I OBJECT to the insetting proposed for East and West Horsley the sole purpose, of which, is to enable significant housing. The increase in housing proposed (some 600 dwellings overall - OLP plus other "minor" potential developments with some 400 plus in West Horsley) is excessive and will fundamentally change the character of both villages, placing unsustainable pressure on the local infrastructure. As far as West Horsley is concerned it is difficult to equate the DLP's proposals with the planning authority's Settlement Hierarchy statement that West Horsley is unsuitable/or substantial growth. A proposed circa 40% increase in housing stock within the village (no doubt to be followed by further development if greenbelt status is lost) is, in my view, substantial and excessive.

• I OBJECT to the proposal to develop a "new town" of some 2,100 dwellings on the former Wisley. The consequence of this, coupled with the developments proposed for the Horsleys, will have a devastating impact on the immediate locality, increasing the number of homes by nearly 80% of current homes and releasing significant numbers of additional cars into an area that consists largely of narrow country roads. The local infrastructure cannot accommodate such a dramatic increase in housing/vehicle numbers and local facilities, particularly the railway stations of Horsley and Effingham Junction, would be overwhelmed. Similarly, medical and educational facilities will be adversely affected, at least until additional facilities are developed. The whole nature and character of Ockham and the Horsleys will be destroyed if this proposal proceed.

• Of the developments proposed for East/West Horsley, I PARTICULARLY OBJECT to:-

• The proposal for some 100 houses on site. Any access to this site will require demolition of a house(s) fronting Ockham Road North. Such access will compromise traffic and pedestrian safety, releasing traffic from the development onto a minor (but extremely busy) road with poor sight lines and with only narrow footpaths for pedestrians (including young children on the way to local schools), who are obliged to walk no more than 1-2 feet from passing traffic, including very heavy lorries and goods vehicles most of which, I might add, break the limit. Additionally, the site is subject to severe flooding, and abuts Lollesworth Woods, which are designated a Site of Nature Conservation Importance. Although these woods are private property, it is inevitable that the nature of the woods, the flora and fauna, will be irreparably harmed by the inevitable incursions by inhabitants of any development of this site.

• Site A4 L (90 houses), which looks as if a blindfolded planner has just put a pin in it. It is difficult to imagine a more inappropriate site. A housing development here will destroy what is a significant stretch of rural pasture with woodland behind, which provides an unbroken rural seen and feel between two separate parts of West Horsley.

4.4 Finally, I OBJECT to the proposed designation of Station Parade, East Horsley as a "Rural District Centre" which, by definition, opens the village to uses which are wholly inappropriate.
I OBJECT to the 2016 Draft Local Plan in its entirety:

To proceed with house building on this scale within already overpopulated village areas would totally destroy the fragile rural aspects we have been careful to try and preserve for so many years.

There is no proven demand for anything like this level of new housing from the existing community and this has been demonstrated by the results of a survey carried out by West Horsley Parish Council only last year. Any demand for such expansion is founded upon developers' determination to make money, GBC councillors' self interest and a total disregard from local and central government towards electors' wishes.

The Green Belt was established for the purpose of maintaining rural space and to prevent urban sprawl. It is not there for transient local government councillors to arbitrarily tamper with this provision. They have not been given this authority.

I wish this letter to be passed to the Planning Inspector carrying out the forthcoming review of the 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan and I expect any conclusions drawn from local correspondents to be acted upon accordingly. Clearly, Guildford Borough Council cannot be trusted to deal with this issue.

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

Attached documents:

I am writing to voice my concerns about the above project which I have done many times before.

I object to the plan for the following reasons:

1. The proposal to remove my village - West Horsley - out of the green belt has not been properly considered. Once the action is taken it will have huge effects and yet the decision has been taken lightly without due consideration of the long term consequences.

2. Our village infrastructure is already at maximum capacity. Our schools are full, the station car park and the trains are oversubscribed leading to terrible travel conditions in rush hour and the roads are already busy. How can we cope with the impact of more people?

3. The drainage system needs to be improved at the moment - how will it cope with more houses and people. It won't.

1. Any new housing won't be affordable for anyone apart from the richest - my sons will never be able to live in this village when they require their own homes.

2. If the Wisley development goes ahead all the above problems will be magnified.

This is not a good plan. It requires far more planning about what happens afterwards and I have seen no plans that cover this at all.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2304  Respondent: 8896865 / John Patterson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am very concerned by the plan outlined in the SSIO document for many reasons outlined below. Firstly I would like to object to East and West Horsley being defined as ‘semi-urban’. It is not a semi-urban area but very definitely a rural area although the plans outlined in this document including the removal of green belt status and the extension of the village boundaries would condemn it to becoming semi-urban and destroy the countryside that the ‘green belt’ has so far protected for future generations. What a catastrophe if we are the ones to allow it to be destroyed for ever and let it join the smothering urban hell that England is becoming.

1. The loss of the ‘green belt’ will be irreversible and catastrophic for the future of our countryside, once built on the area can never be reclaimed and it will just be the start of a continual erosion of rural England. We need to protect from the greedy development of urbanisation.

2. The density of housing proposed by this plan is just not in character with this area and I’m not convinced is actually needed locally - indeed there has been no assessment of the housing need. The local employment opportunities are not readily available but tend to be in the Guildford or Leatherhead area so anyone moving to this planned housing will need to travel by car to access it as local transport is poor and sporadic and limited. In fact during the first 10 years of the plan 75% of the housing locations are outside the Guildford town centre and urban area.

3. This increase in housing will mean a huge increase in local population that will have a hugely detrimental effect. Firstly the huge increase in traffic will not be sustainable by the current network. Already the narrow lane running the length of East Horsley (Ockham Road North and South) is an accident waiting to happen, for example when large construction lorries are passing through especially where the road narrows to almost a single lane (outside Conisbees and after Station Parade), currently two cars passing at these points have to slow down otherwise wing mirrors collide. Will the council accept responsibility for any accidents that occur due to the increased traffic especially during times of heavy construction?

4. With this increased traffic will come the need for extra parking especially at the station, Bishopmead shops, Station Parade shops, village halls and doctors surgery which are already heavily over subscribed, does the council propose to also make large areas available for parking?

5. To support the rural label the street lighting is also not of a semi-urban area. There is very little street lighting through East and West Horsley, only occurring occasionally along Ockham road and East Lane. This would also need to be considered with a large and ever increasing population and alter completely the rural village atmosphere.

6. The increase in population and traffic will have a detrimental affect on the air quality and carbon emissions in this rural area also destroying the countryside and health of the local population.

7. These two villages cannot sustain the necessary increase in pressure on the infrastructure that would occur with regard to sewers and treatment works for this level of increase in population. Plus there is already flooding in many areas around the two Horsleys and between Horsley and the A3 at Ockham.

8. The current facilities such as the Doctors and schools are already at bursting point with local people struggling to get appointments at the one surgery that supports East and West Horsley. The Raleigh School is full and cannot expand physically any further and sending children further afield will only of course increase the heavy traffic at a peak time.

9. The horrific idea of abandoning the ‘green belt’ and developing even further into the surrounding countryside is a crime to those of us who treasure our English countryside and want to preserve it for future generations. Where will the greed of development end? Until we are one huge urban hell with no agricultural land left? This plan will mean the loss of important habitats e.g. SNCI and compromises SPA/SSSI which can never be
recovered - this is a crime of huge proportions and I hope those of us who protest will be able to protect it from the selfish encroachment of humanity.

10. Finally the proposed development at the Wisley Airfield is out of all proportion and will have a huge impact on the local area and its facilities. It will hugely increase the traffic around and off the A3 with increased greater demands on the roads through Ripley and Horsley. Also increasing the demands on the local facilities such as the doctors and schools. It will overburden the whole surrounding area to bursting and also destroy a wild and diverse natural habitat.

I am very disappointed in this plan to destroy the character and natural countryside of our local area and feel very let down by the Guildford Borough and local councils in even proposing it and especially removing the green belt status. Many have said that the pressure is from Central Government to provide housing – at what cost? Are we to provide housing for the whole of Europe? Is it our countryside and rural areas to be sacrificed? Will no-one stand up and protect our country traditions. During the cycle races through Surrey which passed through our villages, even Boris Johnson commented ‘who knew Surrey so was so lovely’, if your plan is implemented it will no longer exist.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2771</th>
<th>Respondent: 8896865 / John Patterson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 GBC local plan for Horsley:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. We are in the Green belt – there are no ‘exceptional circumstances’ existing to change this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The infrastructure is already overloaded – schools are full, medical centre is full, car parking and roads all crowded as it is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The A3/M25 area is already over capacity without the addition of a new village at Ockham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON’T DO IT!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2298</th>
<th>Respondent: 8897185 / Kelane Henderson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 LOCAL PLAN: THE HORSLEYS DEVELOPMENT SITES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having already written back in 2014 opposing the draft local plan, I find myself writing yet again to implore those in planning how removing the Horsleys from the Greenbelt will have nothing, but a detrimental effect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have lived in Horsley for 12 years now and have always lived in Surrey, from the age of 13 I lived in Effingham. My partner grew up here and both our parents live in the village. I would like to think that our children could also live here if they chose to and the housing would be available and affordable for them.

Saying that, I strongly oppose to the amount of houses (533, with possibly +60 more) that are being proposed in the plan.

Both of my sons attended both the local primary and secondary school, however, we went through the whole process of appeal when the catchment area boundary was moved. We were faced with having to send my son to a school over 8 miles away, instead of our local school The Howard of Effingham. We went through the upsetting experience of appeal with many other to get him into this school – the result was the school putting a whole extra class of 30 children for that year group. Both schools are severely oversubscribed every year, where will the extra children from the proposed houses go?

This obviously will apply to our local Doctors surgery, where already we find ourselves waiting two weeks for an appointment. The extra cars that each house owner will have – at least 2, means potentially 6,000 cars within a 3 mile radius of the villages – how will our roads cope? I commute 3 days a week into London, the station car parks are already full.

It states that Station Parade in Horsley is designated a “District Centre” – this suggests that the area is urban – potentially allowing the area to be targeted for future, further developments – I oppose this.

The proposed greedy housing development at Wisley Airfield suggests upgrading the current A3 junction- I cannot believe that this is even being considered. I can only think that this will have an enormous impact on our roads though the villages, not only with the increased volume, but also pollution.

I cannot pertain to understand the drainage system our villages use, but I know that with the building of 7 houses (since we moved here) in close proximity to our house has resulted in drainage problems for us and our neighbours. I believe that flooding will be an issue with the proposed developments, with such a demand on our drains.

As I said I would love for the next generation and the next one after could see a future ahead of them living in our villages, I understand the need for affordable housing, but the proposal to remove us from the green belt to build hundreds of houses will destroy our village completely. Residents have been made aware of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (which apparently was not revealed in the plan – or to the Council) whose target housing number is almost 70% higher than the official national estimates for population growth in the Borough, resulting in a possible increase of upto 35% in existing West Horsley households. This is greater than any other single area in the Borough, why?

I can only see that it is Guildford Borough Council’s failure to ensure that other sites and brownfield sites are used first and using the Green belt is not in this instance an exceptional circumstance – there are other available sites that could and should be built on, before attacking this area of outstanding beauty.

I thank you for taking the time to read this and implore those that make these decisions, to reconsider destroying our beautiful villages and the destruction of the green belt.

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

Attached documents:
I am writing to object to the guildford local plan for development. I am particularly making reference to West And East Horsley as this is where I reside and therefore know the villages well.

I object on the following grounds

Traffic and parking

-------------------

I object as the traffic through West Horsley is already extremely busy and many of the roads are now too narrow to take the large lorries and cars at the same time. The parking at the shops is almost impossible now and small businesses will suffer if you cannot quickly pull up and shop. The other day I tried to take my grandson to the swings at the East Village hall and the car park was totally full so unable to stop.

Pavements

----------

I object to more houses being built in the area as the pavements are too narrow and dangerous to walk along with a pushchair. If more houses are built there will undoubtedly be more cars in the immediate area.

Flooding

----------

I object to more houses being built in West Horsley as the drains cannot cope at the moment when it rains. Obviously the infrastructure of drainage was done many years ago when there were fewer houses. My garden for one floods very easily when there is rain and if there is more houses it will certainly impact on drains and drainage.

Medical Centre

----------

I object to more houses being built due to the fact that the Medical Centre is already under pressure and if more residents live in the area it will be even harder to get an appointment.

I object as I feel the proposal will dramatically change the character of our village for ever.

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

Attached documents:
It would be foolish to pretend that there is not a need for more housing, particularly in the South East. However it is difficult to understand the size of the numbers apparently deemed necessary in Guildford Borough and it appears equally difficult to obtain any clear answer as to how they were arrived at.

Whatever the number finally built over the next 15 years, I would argue strongly that it should not be allowed to change for ever the character of existing settlements.

West Horsley is currently a village of some 1,100 homes. These are a mix of various styles and ages, including a number of historic buildings. Most importantly it is LOW DENSITY housing. The number of houses suggested for the proposed sites for development within the village would be completely out of keeping with the current village.

The proposed numbers of new homes (385 on 4 sites) represent a 35% increase on the current size of the village. There are almost no facilities within West Horsley. The last shop in the village is likely to be lost later this summer. The state primary school is fully subscribed every year. Almost all the needs of residents are met in East Horsley: doctor, bank, library, shops and station. Already the traffic and parking situation is almost at capacity there. For the majority of people, the development sites proposed for West Horsley cannot be considered within walking distance of these facilities, so that will mean many, many more cars on already busy local roads and nowhere to put them when they reach their destination.

A major worry with this amount of possible development is the provision of adequate waste water and sewage management. Thames Water has advised Guildford Borough that the current wastewater system is unlikely to cope with the demand from these developments and the foul drainage system from West Horsley to Ripley treatment works will need to be upgraded. This is likely to need 2 to 3 years to complete. AFTER development planning permission is granted. Sewage, roads, transport, schools - what thought has really been given to the infrastructure that is needed for development on the scale proposed, infrastructure that should come first not later?

West Horsley does not want or need this number of new homes. Yes, a serious case can be made for a few limited developments, particularly smaller, more affordable housing for younger buyers and for older residents wanting to 'down-size' whilst remaining in the area (and thus releasing some larger homes for families without the need for new build).

As I understand it, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that new residential development MUST respect the character and density of housing in the area and be limited in quantity by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities. This plan appears to ignore these rules entirely.

Preserving the Green Belt

The NPPF, para 37, reads "As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in VERY SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES." What are these 'very special circumstances' that the Council feels justifies its plan? How has it happened that nearly two thirds (64.6%) of the total number of homes proposed by the Guildford Plan are to be built in the Green Belt? It may well be far more attractive to developers if they can be offered pristine greenfield sites, no expensive demolition or cleaning up, but where is the emphasis on using up brownfield land and regenerating run down areas (even at the loss of a little profit). Are too many of these more urban sites being reserved for commercial development rather than housing? Would it be very cynical to think this housing plan to use Green Belt sites has been 'developer led'?

The plan to take villages (generally, not just West Horsley) out of the green belt seems a very retrograde step. Once this protection starts to be lost, then what incentive is there not to nibble away at it as and when the Council thinks fit?

Please think again. Do not spoil West Horsley and many other similar villages in the Borough by taking them out of the Green Belt and burdening them with development they cannot sustain and that will change them for ever.

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? ( )

It appears that the draft Local Plan has now been revised to feature once more a straight boundary to the very large sloping field to the south west of Silkmore Lane. It had been argued that a straight boundary would make it easier to ensure that no intrusion into the field (and thus into the Green Belt) would take place in the future.

This has been widely regarded as a pointless move, an infringement in itself on the Green Belt for no valid reason - a rather feeble suggestion that the Council might somehow be ineffective in preventing intrusion into the Green Belt as it stands - and a measure which, if adopted, would leave open the probable building in the freed-up space of yet more houses to spoil the serenity of this lovely shallow valley.

We recommend that this particular proposal be struck out of the Plan.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1464  
Respondent: 8899425 / M Nicholson  
Agent: 

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

With regard to the Guildford local plan, I am writing to strongly object to the proposals for such radical changes.

West Horsley is an area already under pressures. Local schools are popular but oversubscribed. The road system here is out-worn with the amount of traffic using it. Our medical centre is extremely busy and appointments not always easy to come by,

Parking facilities are stretched. The station parking seems to be very stretched - often no certainty to a parking space there. East Horsley provides adequate everyday shopping, but again, parking is deficient and could not deal with large increases of people and traffic.

Intrusion into the Green Belt by unsettling will add over 30% to the present number of homes in West Horsely. Unacceptable, surely. Insupportable for reasons already cited, a complete change imposed on our village, on its character and its style and its residents, whether elderly, young, family, groups, all residents of their already busy but pleasant area.

Such changes, proposed to occur in a short time span are the reason for my strong objection.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4224  
Respondent: 8900449 / David and Judith Williams  
Agent: 

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

I would like to strongly object to the new plans for West and East Horsley and please see the comments below.
We have lived in this area for over 40 years and cannot believe the disruption that this new plan would cause.

1. Development of over 2,000 house village at former Wisley Airfield would have a major impact on the Horsley villages of such a mixed housing, retail, commercial traveller and schools development, less than 2 miles away would be enormous.
2. Infrastructure is already overloaded. The schools are full and medical facilities stretched.
3. Problems of finding parking places at the station and shops which at certain times is very, very difficult.
4. An extra 25,000 cars on our roads which are already very congested and this would also mean much higher levels of pollution.
5. Some of our roads are liable to serious flooding and the extra traffic would make this problem much worse.
6. We have some beautiful countryside in this area with probable damage to the flora and fauna if this development happens.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2005  Respondent: 8900481 / John Burgess  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

1. Notwithstanding the above, with regard to my own locality:-

   • For reasons previously stated, I OBJECT to the insetting proposed for East and West Horsley the sole purpose, of which, is to enable significant housing. The increase in housing proposed (some 600 dwellings overall - DLP plus other "minor" potential developments

   - with some 400 plus in West Horsley) is excessive and will fundamentally change the character of both villages, placing unsustainable pressure on the local infrastructure. As far as West Horsley is concerned it is difficult to equate the DLP's proposals with the planning authority's Settlement Hierarch y statement that West Horsley is unsuitable for substantial growth. A proposed circa 40% increase in housing stock within the village (no doubt to be followed by further development if greenbelt status is lost) is, in my view, substantial and excessive.

   • I OBJECT to the proposal to develop a "new town" of some 2,100 dwellings on the former Wisley. The consequence of this, coupled with the developments proposed for the Horsleys, will have a devastating impact on the immediate locality, increasing the number of homes by nearly 80% of current homes and releasing significant numbers of additional cars into an area that consists largely of narrow country roads. The local infrastructure cannot accommodate such a dramatic increase in housing/vehicle numbers and local facilities, particularly the railway stations of Horsley and Effingham Junction, would be overwhelmed. Similarly, medical and educational facilities will be adversely affected, at least until additional facilities are developed. The whole nature and character of Ockham and the Horsleys will be destroyed if this proposal proceeds.

   • Of the developments proposed for East/West Horsley, I PARTICULARLY OBJECT to:-

   • The proposal for some 100 houses on site Any access to this site will require demolition of a house(s) fronting Ockham Road North. Such access will compromise traffic and pedestrian safety, releasing traffic from the development onto a minor (but extremely busy) road with poor sight lines and with only narrow footpaths for pedestrains (including young children on the way to local schools), who are obliged to walk no more than 1-2 feet from passing traffic, including very heavy lorries and goods vehicles most of which, I might add, break the speed limit. Add itionally, the site is subject to severe flood ing, and abuts Lollesworth Wood s, which are...
designated a Site of Nature Conservation Importance. Although these woods are private property, it is inevitable that the nature of the woods, the flora and fauna, will be irreparably harmed by the inevitable incursions by inhabitants of any development of this site.

- Site A41 (90 houses), which looks as if a blind folded planner has just put a pin in a It is difficult to imagine a more inappropriate site. A housing development here will destroy what is a significant stretch of rural pasture with woodland behind, which provides an unbroken rural scene and feel between two separate parts of West Horsley.

- Finally, I OBJECT to the proposed designation of Station Parade, East Horsley as a "Rural District Centre" which, by definition, opens the village to uses which are wholly inappropriate.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3581</th>
<th>Respondent: 8900737 / Denise Graham</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 an East Horsley resident and I would like to state my objection in the strongest possible terms to the developments proposed for East and West Horsley and Effingham as well as the removal of these villages from the Green Belt. I have stated my reasons for objecting below.

**Loss of Greenbelt Land:** Although I understand there is a need for increased housing nationally, as well as locally, I would have thought that the preservation of the Green Belt outweighed this requirement. If we do not act now to preserve the Green Belt I can see that in time these areas will be swallowed up by increased development into the Greater London area. The Green Belt is essential for preserving the ‘gap’ between Greater London and Surrey. Surely any need for new houses, should first be put onto the numerous Brownfield sites in Guildford itself before any encroachment of the Green Belt is even considered. Other options for development to the west (Onslow Village) and east (Burpham) of the existing town also seem preferable as those areas are not currently in the Green Belt and at least existing infrastructure and transport links to local businesses are already largely in place. To make such an increase in these small villages, would change their character irrevocably for the worse.

**Traffic and Parking:** Currently the roads in these villages are small, often without pavements in many roads. There would be a huge increase in traffic in these areas with currently very limited public transport and the existing train stations with car-parks are already full to capacity. The village shops, medical centre and village hall have limited parking, and again, any increase in traffic would only exacerbate this problem.

**Flooding:** This is already a problem in many areas, and this would only increase with increased building. The site behind Ockham Road North in East Horsley is partially a level 3 flood risk area, and local residents are well aware of how much standing water there is in their gardens after rain. We already know what happens to local roads when it rains – the drains can’t cope.

**Schools:** The existing state schools are already oversubscribed, and again, traffic jams are already bad in the times of the school runs. : No extra places are planned in the Horsleys, and the school places proposed at Wisley Airfield will not planned until many years into the project.

**Medical Facilities:** These would be affected in the same way as the schools.

**Pollution:** The large increase in volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment – already a cause for concern in several areas in the Borough.
Transport: Misery for commuters, nowhere to park and full trains at commuting times.

Local Road Network: In respect of the proposals for development at Wisley Airfield and for an upgrade the current A3 junction at Burntcommon to a full 4-way junction, SCC traffic modelling anticipates increased use of Guileshall Lane, Hungry Hill Lane and Tithebarns Lane for traffic accessing the A3 at Burntcommon in order to travel to Guildford and beyond. The SCC report states that “consequently, it indicates that further thought may have to be given to managing traffic in this area as part of a transport assessment should the development be progressed”. It appears that the Plan is proposing a strategic site at Wisley Airfield without even knowing what improvements to the local road infrastructure will be required. If that is the case for Wisley Airfield, then it is almost inevitably true for the proposed developments in East and West Horsley as well and I find this extremely worrying.

It is paramount that GBC should make every effort to retain the present character of the area and address economic and housing requirements without impacting the Green Belt.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3691  Respondent: 8900737 / Denise Graham  Agent:

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

Traffic and Parking: Currently the roads in these villages are small, often without pavements in many roads. There would be a huge increase in traffic in these areas with currently very limited public transport and the existing train stations with car-parks are already full to capacity. The village shops, medical centre and village hall have limited parking, and again, any increase in traffic would only exacerbate this problem.

Flooding: This is already a problem in many areas, and this would only increase with increased building. The site behind Ockham Road North in East Horsley is partially a level 3 flood risk area, and local residents are well aware of how much standing water there is in their gardens after rain. We already know what happens to local roads when it rains – the drains can’t cope.

Schools: The existing state schools are already oversubscribed, and again, traffic jams are already bad in the times of the school runs. No extra places are planned in the Horsleys, and the school places proposed at Wisley Airfield will not planned until many years into the project.

Medical Facilities: These would be affected in the same way as the schools.

Pollution: The large increase in volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment – already a cause for concern in several areas in the Borough.

Transport: Misery for commuters, nowhere to park and full trains at commuting times.

Local Road Network: In respect of the proposals for development at Wisley Airfield and for an upgrade the current A3 junction at Burntcommon to a full 4-way junction, SCC traffic modelling anticipates increased use of Guileshall Lane, Hungry Hill Lane and Tithebarns Lane for traffic accessing the A3 at Burntcommon in order to travel to Guildford and beyond. The SCC report states that “consequently, it indicates that further thought may have to be given to managing traffic in this area as part of a transport assessment should the development be progressed”. It appears that the Plan is proposing a strategic site at Wisley Airfield without even knowing what improvements to the local road infrastructure will be required. If that is the case for Wisley Airfield, then it is almost inevitably true for the proposed developments in East and West Horsley as well and I find this extremely worrying.
# What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3374  **Respondent:** 8900769 / Andrew Frackiewicz  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

1. I strongly object to the overall proposal to remove the villages listed in the above document from the Green Belt, in particular East Horsley, West Horsley, Ockham & Ripley. This is fundamentally against the principles that our countryside is protected from building on and to ensure that there is a balance between houses and open spaces. The Green Belt we have in the Guildford area and particularly around East Horsley, West Horsley, Ockham and Ripley preserves/protects the environment, air quality, helps to prevent flooding and provides open countryside for all to share.

2. I strongly object to the removal of Wisley Airfield and the land surrounding it from the Green Belt. Again this is an open area which should be protected against the developer.

3. I strongly object to the proposal to designate Wisley Airfield as an area for building some 2000 new houses. This is Green Belt land and must remain so.

4. A part of any local plan should be to use up all brownfield sites first, whether immediately available or at a later date, before any other land for housing is considered. There are areas in the Guildford area where there are unoccupied pieces of land, derelict offices and industrial areas. In Guildford itself the areas around Walnut Tree Close and Slyfield spring to mind but all other such areas which need re-generation must be identified and used for housing needs before any other land is considered. Developers must be made to use brownfield land and not just proceed with what they see as a 'cheaper' option, i.e. the development of green fields.

5. The land held by Surrey University should be released for housing for students and accommodation built upon this land. If students were accommodated on this land, the housing that they currently occupy in the Guildford area would become free and allow other people to live there or allow development of new houses. Again this must be implemented before any Green Belt land is developed.

6. I believe that the housing requirements have been over-stated. There is no visibility on how the currently proposed numbers have been arrived at and a further aspect is that the allowance for migration is probably over-stated given the government's latest policies both pre-Brexit and post-Brexit.

**Specific Comments**

1. I most strongly object to the proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt and for extending the boundaries of the Settlement areas of the Horsleys, thus possibly leading to a substantial number of new homes being built. The public facilities are already at full capacity. The doctors surgery is always full and appointments are generally difficult to obtain unless one is prepared to wait for a few days. There is no bus service worth mentioning as there is only the odd bus at times between 9:30 a.m and 4:00 p.m. The only practical way to reach East Horsley is by car and parking is already difficult, therefore additional vehicular traffic arising from more people living in the vicinity or coming to East Horsley could not be catered for and would be chaotic for the residents already living there. Further more there is no available land to provide for additional facilities, other than a few empty shop units.

2. I object to the Settlement Boundary Local Plan 2003 for East Horsley being re-drawn in the 2016 Plan. The lines as designated in 2003 should remain.

3. The infrastructure in East Horsley and West Horsley is already over stretched. For instance in East Horsley we have had Thames Water checking the sewers as they have concerns about their capacity. When we have heavy rain we have flooding - refer to government maps which places part of East Horsley on the 'Flood Plain'. The roads around East & West Horsley are already very busy and in many places 2 cars travelling in opposite directions struggle to pass - never mind any larger vehicle. Examples of this can be found on Oakham Road South between Bishopsmead shops and the railway station.

**Proposed Areas for Housing**
1. East Horsley - I have no objection in principle to use the Thatcher's Hotel Site for housing provided the density is reduced and that adequate road access provisions are constructed due to the already very busy and dangerous access situation onto the main A246 road.
2. West Horsley - I have no objection in principle to use the Bell & Colville Garage Site for housing.
3. The remainder of East & West Horsley - As well as the Green Belt issue I mention at the start of my letter, I object to increasing the size of these villages by some 500 additional houses, mainly the additional designated housing area in West Horsley. This would destroy the character of both East & West Horsley. In addition to adding the 500 or so houses, such an increase would severely impact East Horsley since West Horsley has no facilities to speak of, i.e. no shops, surgery, bank, library, etc. Therefore more people would travel to East Horsley and further increase the parking problem there. There is a primary school (Raleigh) which is shared with East Horsley but I understand that this is full and certainly the secondary school at Effingham is full. So again any significant increase in people living in East & West Horsley would probably swamp the schools facilities we already have in this area.
4. Wisley Airfield - I strongly object to any form of building here as I mention above. This is an area of Green Belt land with no infrastructure and non-existent transport facilities other than road access. The reasons for unsuitability and rejection of this area for potential development are well documented in the recent rejection by GBC Planning of a planning application for access to this site. The Wisley site must be removed from the Local Plan. Access from this site to the A3 is very poor and already the junction is at capacity at peak travel periods. In addition rail transport is already at full capacity on the train line into London and the car parks at nearby stations are fully utilised. The large increase of vehicular traffic and people from houses built at Wisley could not be absorbed by the current infrastructure and public facilities.
5. The recent proposal for housing at the Effingham School site was recently rejected by GBC. Surely if this proposal was rejected then the conditions for building more houses in the Horsleys & Ockham are even less favourable due to the more restricted infrastructure and transport availability and roads which generally are only lanes.
6. Onslow Estate Housing - Why has this proposed area not been listed for housing? I understand from the local press that GBC do not wish to take up the offer for this large area to have housing. It has good access to the A246 and is close to Merrow shops and public transport including buses and the park & ride which provides good access to Guildford town centre.

Other Comments

1. In order to achieve a better balance in the housing stock GBC should implement a strict policy to ensure that the demolition of small houses including bungalows and the resulting construction of replacement houses of a much larger size be immediately prohibited. Whilst current policy appears to favour the developer the removal of smaller housing stock reduces the number of properties to which people can downsize to and obviously if there are no such smaller houses available in the area that people wish to continue to live in then they will just remain in their larger homes and not free up existing houses for growing families.

In conclusion I would ask that Guildford Borough re-consider this plan. It would appear that many of the comments and views raised by local people in the previous consultation appear to have been largely ignored, certainly as far as the Horsleys, Ockham & Ripley villages are concerned.

The objective of adding some 14,000 new homes, which I understand represents a net increase of some 25% to the housing stock of Guildford Borough over the next 20 years, appears grossly overstated given the nationally projected population increase of 15% over the same period. I have to question whether employment in the area; infrastructure including roads and public transport; facilities such as hospital, medical and schooling; will increase by a similar amount. If not then it surely is illogical to start to plan for so many additional houses.

East & West Horsley as well as Ockham are village communities and I wish them to remain so. My plea is that 'brownfield' sites in the Guildford area should be the starting point for any additional housing and Guildford Borough Council being an elected body together with the local Councillors should all be fighting for the wishes of the citizens who have elected them.

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

Attached documents:
This letter is my response to your invitation to comment on the above-named document, which has been studied recently. On 22nd November 2013, I wrote to you about the previous Green Belt & Countryside Study/Local Plan Strategy Sites Issues & Options. The current document offers some improvements on the earlier draft, including the welcome removal of the previously proposed development site which included Lollesworth Wood.

Nevertheless, the present PSLP still contains proposals which I find unacceptable. First of these is the continuing proposal to inset virtually the whole of West Horsley from the Green Belt. In my view this proposal remains unacceptable for the following reasons:

1. West Horsley in particular (as well as East Horsley to an even greater extent but partly for different reasons - see further below) appears on the Guildford Borough Key Diagram (page 13 of the PSLP), as a sea of white (i.e. land no longer to be Green Belt) set in a much larger sea of green representing "countryside". It is clear that the proposed treatment of West Horsley does not measure up to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) generally, but in particular to those of paragraph 83.

2. From the North part of West Horsley there are exceptional open views towards the Sheepleas (the nearest part of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty - ANOB), as well from the ANOB towards the North into West Horsley. Clearly these much-prized views will be damaged by any significant development in any part of West Horsley. Further, West Horsley is the main access point for the public on foot & by car to the ANOB from the North (at West Horsley church and Shere Road).

   1. In particular, the new Strategic Development site A41 in the PSLP is particularly objection able in this regard, as its' effect will be to compromise (destroy) views to and from West Horsley, more than other Strategic Development sites proposed for the Horsleys.

Turning to East Horsley's proposed development as a District Centre, this is beset by problems, particularly as regards the area of East Horsley Station Parade. Already this has too little short-term and long-term parking, both at the railway station and increasingly for the local shops. Other services, particularly medical and educational are quite clearly already insufficient.

The new housing developments proposed for both East and West Horsley in the PSLP will alone overload the proposed District Centre, but the possibility of a larger development at the Wisley Airfield site can only exacerbate this situation, since Horsley station would be the obvious access point for Wisley residents, (in particular London commuters) to the railway. (Residents of the proposed Gosden Hill Farm and Send housing developments might be attracted to a new Merrow Station, but this will be no help to Wisley, and will, in any case, lead to increased over-crowding at later stations, given the likely limit to additional train capacity which could be run on existing tracks). Furthermore, there are no proposals to develop the area around Effingham Junction station, which would be slightly closer to Wisley (if built) than Horsley.

All in all, it appears that the adoption of the current proposals for excessive housing concentration in the Eastern areas of the Borough of Guildford in the current document can only lead over time to the complete destruction of the Green Belt in the Horsley area, and most probably to a major transport disaster.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1887</th>
<th>Respondent: 8901089 / Michael Baker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finally I object to the proposal to build 533 houses on 6 sites in the Horsleys as it is plainly both excessive in absolute terms and disproportionate relative to the rest of the borough. It will destroy the rural character of these communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/1888</th>
<th>Respondent: 8901185 / Annette Baker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finally I object to the proposal to build 533 houses on 6 sites in the Horsleys as it is plainly both excessive in absolute terms and disproportionate relative to the rest of the borough. It will destroy the rural character of these communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/128</th>
<th>Respondent: 8901729 / Justin Underwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 live adjacent to the site previously referred to as Ockham Road North West Horsley (A50 ID 975), Waterloo Farm I am very concerned at the proposed development in East &amp; West Horsley shown in the draft local plan and write in strongest terms to object to this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>villages and Major Previously developed Sites, Policy 18; sustainable Transport for new development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Horsley is one village and always has been, its not west Horsley south and west Horsley North, where did you get this from? Settlement boundaries exist and do not need to be extended you give no good reasons for this and no exceptional circumstances have been presented. West Horsley only has one small shop, no post office, limited bus service during weekdays only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/571</th>
<th>Respondent: 8901729 / Justin Underwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 LETTER IS UNIQUE AND IS NOT AN EXACT COPY OF ANOTHER LETTER/ DUPLICATE SO MUST BE ACCEPTED

I live adjacent to the site previously referred to as Ockham Road North West Horsley (A40 ID 975), Waterloo Farm I am very concerned at the proposed development in East & West Horsley shown in the draft local plan and write in strongest terms to object to this.

villages and Major Previously developed Sites, sustainable Transport for new development

West Horsley is one village and always has been, its not west Horsley south and west Horsley North, where did you get this from? Settlement boundaries exist and do not need to be extended you give no good reasons for this and no exceptional circumstances have been presented. West Horsley only has one small shop, no post office, limited bus service during weekdays only

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/667  Respondent: 8902337 / Stephen Drury  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North 

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

Like many residents of West Horsley and those other villages within the Guildford Borough affected, I view the proposed removal of green belt status with considerable dismay.

Before, commenting on that aspect and the relevant policy statement (P2) I wish to make some general observations.

First, it appears that GBC has taken no account of the objections raised by residents at the time of the consultation in 2014 and has ridden roughshod over those concerns.

This is evident in the statement made in the commentary to Policy S1 ("Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development"). At paragraph 4.3.16, whilst acknowledging the requirement of the NPPF not to amend green belt boundaries save in exceptional circumstances, GBC states:-

"We consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify amendment of green belt boundaries in order to facilitate the development that is needed and promote a sustainable pattern of development"

On further reading, however, it can be seen that the above statement is wholly self-serving. Exceptional means exceptional, not just what a particular council decides to choose as a place on which to build some houses.

GBC has clearly misinterpreted the NPPF. That it and other councils across the land are engaging in similar misguided approaches in this area was recognised in the recent (April 2016) report of the House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee, the report concluding:-

"...at present we do not believe that there is sufficient guidance available to local authorities on whether it is appropriate for green belt land to be used to meet housing needs”.

In the case of the 2016 plan it seems that decisions are being taken either without proper thought or just based on the flawed 2014 plan.
Having made the effort to read both the NPPF and some of the key documents prepared in support of the current proposals, the impression is that it is at best a selective and at worst a deliberately flawed interpretation of the NPPF which is informing the formulation of Guildford's planning policy at this critical time.

1. In the NPPF "Local Plan" is defined as "The plan for the future development of the local area, drawn up by the local planning authority in consultation with the community." In the case of the draft local plan it is said in the foreword by Cllr Spooner that the policies and site allocation of the plan "are informed by an up-to-date, extensive and robust evidence base". However in the case of the recommendations stated under Policy P2 GBC is still basing its strategy on the Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study: Volume IV", a document which was prepared in February 2013 by a third party commercial concern, namely Pegasus Planning Group Ltd. ("Pegasus").

The use of a February 2013 document can hardly be described as "up to date".

Furthermore, the findings reached by Pegasus in that report are not robust in any way. Quite the opposite: they are subjective. I have no objection to outsourcing by local authorities of the provision of services. There is no case, however, for the contracting out, as GBC has done, of such a key area of policy formulation as this. I note that in the "Ministerial foreword" to the NPPF it is observed that "people have been put off from getting involved because planning policy has become so elaborate and forbidding-the preserve of specialists, rather than the people in communities".

In the case of GBC it seems that it is such specialists and their client-serving interpretations of the NPPF that will be holding sway, regardless of the views of the people in the communities affected.

1. According to the NPPF, "the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open". The word "open" in this context is not defined, but what it clearly means in the context is "not built on". This is clear from paragraph 86 of the NPPF.

This paragraph states that a village should be included in the green belt "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". Taking the meaning of "open" as stated above, i.e. unbuilt up, it is reasonably clear what the NPPF is aiming at. That is to say, where a village is not particularly built up and is situated in surroundings that are not built up then it should stay in the Green Belt.

1. It seems that in their assessment of what is considered to be or not to be "open" or "of open character", the Pegasus study is both misguided and in many respects, just plain wrong.
2. That a piece of land is "open" or whether or not a particular village has an "open character" is a question of fact. It seems that the Pegasus study, on which it appears so much of the current proposals are based, takes a somewhat irrational approach to the answering of this test: for example declaring that a village is not demonstrating "openness" where there are trees growing. As stated above, open means not built on: the fact that trees are growing on land does not mean that it is not open. Actually quite the opposite.
3. When the Pegasus study states that "it was considered, in principle, that for the open character of a village to contribute to the openness of the wider Green Belt it would need to be appreciable or visible from Green Belt land" it makes an assumption that has no support from the NPPF. Where in the NPPF is there any mention of "visibility" as the required proof of satisfaction of the condition stated in paragraph 86?
4. On a closer analysis it can be seen what was driving Pegasus to reach the skewed conclusions that it did back in 2013. Paragraph 82 of the NPPF states that the "general extent of Green Belts across the country is already established". And that "New Green Belts should only be established in exceptional circumstances, for example when planning for larger scale development such as new settlements or major urban extensions". I see no mention in any of the documents so far produced of any intention to create such "larger scale development".
5. In the following paragraph it is allowed for local authorities in their preparation of the local plan to "consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period." Pegasus, it seems, have seized on this reference as the carte blanche for the extension of green belt boundaries, thereby paving the way for the "insetting" (newspeak for expansion and building over) of villages within such greater boundaries. It does seem rather odd that there
should be talk of expanding the green belt boundaries with the objective of ensuring greater permanence/
identifiability, when any of us who live in this area know very well that the green belt, and its policy of
prevention of creating any built structure, begins at the end of one's garden, where the open fields begin.

6. In the case of the village in which I live, i.e. West Horsley, this is a village which as the Pegasus study observes
exhibits a low proportion of development to open land. As stated above, that a village is surrounded by open
land is one of fact. Living as I and many residents of West Horsley do with views of open and unbuilt over
countryside I find extraordinary the Pegasus conclusions (at p 73) that "the majority of the village is considered
to exhibit an enclosed character due to tree cover and topography surrounding the village". Equally bizarre is
the Pegasus conclusion that "open (i.e. unbuilt on) areas within the village do not appear continuous with
surrounding open (i.e. unbuilt on) land beyond the village." For me and for many of those who live here it is the
enduring connection to the sights, sounds and natural habitats that such open land provides that marks West
Horsley's essential character, that is, the unbuilt up nature of the village and its surroundings.

7. In conclusion, there is no objection to the formulation of planning policy that follows the letter and the spirit of
the NPPF. However, the impression that is given from the draft plan and many of the documents on which it is
based is of a deliberate and, at best, erroneous misinterpretation of the key elements of the NPPF by Guildford
BC and its paid advisers.

8. There are many other reasons to criticise the draft plan in respect of its intended permission for such large scale
development as it does, eg lack of infrastructure, schools etc. The main objections however are those which I
have stated above. It worries me considerably to see such disregard of the public opinion expressed in 2014 and
the deliberate misinterpretation of policy guidelines. Such intellectual dishonesty is offensive and I therefore
object to the relevant policy P2 for this reason.

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

Attached documents:
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:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3812  Respondent: 8903169 / Andrew Hooks  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 concern with a number of the proposals laid out in the proposed Local Plan, which I feel will have lasting detrimental consequences for West Horsley and the surrounding countryside.

My concerns are as follows:

The proposed scale of development in West Horsley will result in dramatic permanent change to the character of the area, and is unsustainable given the local infrastructure. The local schools are over-subscribed and full every year; the doctors surgery in East Horsley is invariably busy today and appointments hard to come by; the roads (especially Ockham Road North/South and East Lane) are very busy at peak times; and the basic services, especially sewerage/drainage, are already incapable of dealing with the current demand as the widespread flooding that invariably accompanies periods of heavy rainfall in the village shows (further development will mean more surface water runoff, and more immediate demand on outdated sewers and storm drains which in turn will mean more flash flood episodes around the village).

Additionally, there is no proven case for the supposed demand for such a large number of houses in this area. West Horsley Parish Council’s own analysis suggests that approximately 20 properties would be needed in order to meet demand from local people otherwise unable to stay living in the village - a development of that scale and for that explicit purpose would be entirely understood, but what is proposed is anything but. It is unreasonable to expect a few villages in the Borough (of which West Horsley is the most extreme case) to take a share of the burden of future development that is wholly disproportionate to the scale of those villages today, when the equivalent number of houses added to already well-established urban centres (e.g. Guildford) would result in far less significant change to the character of the area.

Removing the Horsleys from the Green Belt is fundamentally unjustified and contrary to the stated Government policy (see Hansard ref. Queen’s Speech, 5th June 2014). GBC’s need to find space for housing does not constitute an “exceptional circumstance” that could in principle otherwise justify the deletion of the Green Belt designation. Removing the village(s) from the Green Belt will lead to further urban sprawl and the unique character and community of East and West Horsley, as well as that of much of the surrounding countryside, will be lost forever to future generations. It is furthermore key to note that the National Trust aspire to pursue the further northward extension of the current Surrey Hills AONB to cover this area, which provides recognition at the most significant level of the importance of the rural nature of this region.

The scale of the proposed Wisley Airfield development is hugely out of keeping with the local area, and a development of that magnitude will have an unsustainable impact on our shared infrastructure, not least on the A3 which already experiences long tailbacks at peak times around the Ockham Park and M25 junctions (which will be those most burdened
by the addition of such a large, new town on the airfield site) and on the already overcrowded South West Trains railway service from Horsley into London and Guildford.

I trust that you will take this opportunity to revise these points in the Local Plan, and insodoing ensure that future generations are able to benefit from the rurality of this area as much as previous generations have done.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4132  **Respondent:** 8903745 / Peter Davis  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Ref proposed new Guildford plan to permit building in and around the Horsleys

I wish to object to this plan for the following reasons

- Removal of the Horsleys from the Green Belt and building on the Green Belt land comprising Wisley Airfield cannot be permitted unless there are ‘very special circumstances’. Government guidelines confirm that ‘unfulfilled housing need’ does NOT qualify as a ‘very special circumstances’. Furthermore removal of these areas from the Green Belt is totally against its rules to prevent metropolitan encroachment
- The volume of building proposed will overwhelm the current infrastructure of medical, education, drainage, roads, car parking, etc. with little or no scope for improvement. Drainage is already a problem in the Horsleys during heavy rainfall. This will inevitably become worse with the result of development as more land becomes impermeable.
- The volume of building proposed will overwhelm the current utilities of water, sewage, gas, telephone and electricity especially at Wisley Airfield where these services do not exist and must be provided from scratch.
- The developments will put thousands of additional cars on roads which are incapable of carrying them. The roads are currently, in the main, twisting country lanes unsuited to heavy traffic and in a small number of cases single lane with passing places. The main route through the Horsley’s, Occam Roads North and South are, in places extremely narrow and do not permit simultaneous passage of a large vehicle and car going in opposite directions. These narrow places occur at current housing locations and frequently where there are extremely narrow footpaths only on one side of the road. Currently lorries and cars mount the paths or swerve into drive way entrances to permit passage. The roads and pathways cannot be widened without compulsory purchase from a significant number of owners. The thousands of additional cars will significantly increase the risk of accident causing injury and sadly probable death. There is already a black spot just outside Cobham that will see an increase in traffic if these developments go ahead.
- The concept that large numbers of proposed residents will cycle to and from shops, schools, railway stations, medical centres, sports facilities, etc. thereby reducing congestion, is flawed. Yes some will but the vast majority will not and the few that will cycle will increase the risk of serious accident. Further there is no evidence that the current fashion in cycling will continue indefinitely.

The number of houses proposed comes from an assessment generated by a consultant’s mathematical model which has not been revealed even to Guildford Borough Council. There is no evidence that this mathematical model is correct or that the software used has been fully proven to produce correct output with a sufficiently wide range of input data. **Is the organisation that produced and uses this model certified as complying with the appropriate level of the UK nationally accepted Software Quality Assurance scheme of TickIT or similar scheme?**

The Consultant’s unproven output has been further increased by Guildford Borough Council to give an anticipated population growth almost 70% higher than the official national estimates. **The whole question of population growth and therefore housing need, requires very detailed analysis and review, especially as we are now we are in Brexit and have good reason to expect a reduction in immigration.**
Firstly I am totally opposed to East and West Horsley being removed from the Green Belt as there is no justification for this status to be changed and the Key evidence document ‘Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2031’ makes no case for siting large numbers of new homes in this area.

There are no exceptional circumstances for West Horsley’s Defined Settlement Area boundaries to be extended and the incredibly important Green Belt be developed - once it is gone it is gone and the whole purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent the disappearance of our hugely valuable countryside.

West Horsley village amenities would not cope with the increased influx of people using the one small village shop, no post office and a limited bus service, not to mention the increased volume of traffic. Nor would the amenities of East Horsley be able to cope with the limited shopping facilities, already crowded train service let alone the further proposals to build 2,000 houses at Wisley aerodrome which would likely also also use and rely upon both East and West Horsley’s facilities.

The area attracts a lot of walkers and cyclists throughout the year as we are at the foot of the Surrey Hills and also have a great deal of historic buildings. It is well renowned for being a beautiful area which we have a duty to preserve, the proposed housing development would be totally out of character with the general character of the area and ruin it forever which is entirely unacceptable and unnecessary.

As previously mentioned the area could not sustain the proposed amount of new homes due to the lack of services, but equally as important the lack of drainage which is a real problem in the area at present (with flooding occurring in both summer and winter, often severe), not to mention the added need for more school places at the local school which is always at full capacity. The increased need for parking spaces would also make using the villages and parking for the Raleigh school incredibly difficult. The doctor’s surgery would also be impacted negatively, it is already difficult enough to get an appointment and sometimes impossible to park at the surgery due to large volumes of traffic.

To summarise, the area simply cannot cope with the amount of new homes provided with lack of services, parking spaces, insufficient school places, the extra burden on the doctors surgery and local hospital, inadequate drainage and is totally at odds with the character of the area in general. These are all very serious considerations which will severely impact the Horsleys but above all the Green Belt simply has to be protected.

I seriously question why the proposed sites are being considered when there is an existing and highly sustainable local town, namely Guilford, where there is a fully workable and tested infrastructure, undeveloped brown sites, the space to do so and it is NOT the Green Belt.

I trust my comments will be taken seriously and the due amount of consideration is used when making this crucial decision.

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 removal of West Horsley and East Horsley Villages from the green belt.

Insetting and altering green Belt Boundaries will severely change the nature of the area and does not admit to any exceptional circumstances that would necessitate any change of the current boundaries.

There are 5 legal purposes for Green Belt, and West Horsley meets them all:

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas
- To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and villages
- To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land?

I object to the proposed building on all sites and especially A39,A40 and A41.

The density of the building does not conform to the current established settlement, the increased traffic and necessary provision is not identified or

The density of building will impose greater burden on an already overflowing infrastructure. The plan makes no mention of any intentions to address any points regularly mentioned in all communications with residents and the Borough Council.

The MEDICAL CENTRE, SCHOOLS, ROADS and INFRASTRUCTURE ARE AT THE LIMIT OF THEIR CAPACITY

HAVE YOU STILL NOT VISITED WEST HORSLEY?

I object to the effect that the Plan will have on the Protection of the Surrey Hills and areas of outstanding beauty.

During wet weather, at any time of the year, OUR LOCAL ROADS ARE FLOODED, often IMPASSABLE AND POTHOLED as a result of erosion and unsuitable traffic.

The TRAFFIC CONGESTION IS AT A STANDSTILL DURING PEAK TIMES and throughout the day regularly obstructed by oversized vehicles that make 2 way traffic very difficult.

Recent damage, by an over height vehicle, to the rail bridge resulted in the temporary closure of access to East Horsley along Ockham Road, redirected all traffic through unsuitable lanes and did damage to road surfaces and borders.

I object to the pressure that the Plan and significant increase in residents will put upon transport.

The current provision is congested, insufficient and inadequate and unable to absorb more demand.

Public Transport provides a limited bus schedule and 4 trains per hour.

Walking to shops, trains and schools is a safety risk as pavements are narrow, uneven and incomplete.

Parking is very limited and congested at all times of day.

The proposed developments will continue to pressurize the safety of movement around the village and increase the risk of injury and accident.

The local plan offers no details for improvements in drainage, traffic, standards of roads, pavements, parking and public transport.
I object to the proposed change in nature of our rural environment and the change in use of use of agricultural land.

I think that Brexit demands that the UK becomes increasingly self sufficient and takes control of its business. Irreversible decisions that influence our National self-sufficiency are unacceptable. A commitment to agriculture would improve the status of our farmers, our provision of foodstuffs and create a sound economic situation.

The delicate balance of Flora and Fauna, erosion and pollution is under threat.

As a reflection of the local regard for Horsley and the maintenance of its character, groups have purchased land to preserve the countryside.

Erosion of verges and ditches as a result of flooding and unusual weather conditions has been a feature of recent weather patterns. The effect of concreting over Green Belt land will serve to reduce the natural drainage system and drive the water into the existing drains, that are already overflowing.

Infrastructure is expensive and GBC admit to there being limited funding for renovation and provision for upgrades. Drive along our lanes in a storm to witness the current deterioration, with so many of our roads in urgent state of repair.

DO YOU CONTINUE PLANNING FOR OUR FUTURE FROM AN IDEALISTIC PLAN DEVISED IN A CONFERENCE ROOM?

West Horsley is a village, in the green belt, surrounded by countryside and a diverse natural environment.

Which, under the NPPF, should be retained where inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the greenbelt.

64.6% of new homes will be built on the Green Belt

Pollution, destroyed natural environment, hedges, habitat and trees, foul water drainage will have disastrous effects on the greenbelt and areas of special interest.

West Horsley is surrounded by areas of special and outstanding environmental importance and justly protected by the Green Belt.

Our Green Belt is precious. It protects London from urban sprawl; it preserves air quality; it helps prevent flooding; it is the city’s playground. It is for us to conserve and protect it.

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

Attached documents:

To conclude:

Our drains, our water supply, our medical facilities, schools and our roads cannot cope at present, and will continue to be overloaded with the proposed number of new homes. Building this number and density of homes will lead to increased flood risk here and downstream (along the Wey and Thames). The planned development on Green Belt is therefore unsustainable, unrealistic and unwise. And contradicts all expert advice and legislation.
For these reasons, I continue to strongly object to the Local Plan.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3048  Respondent: 8907073 / Clive Phillips  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Objection to the Local Plan to Develop West Horsley

Please register and record this letter as a formal objection to the proposed Local Plan Development of West Horsley and East Horsley.

The Horsleys, and West Horsley in particular, are not able to support housing development of upward of the 533 houses on the proposed main sites as the existing village sized infrastructure is already stretched beyond an effective level of service.

The Local Plan as it is presented is not able to justify itself on a number of issues and the following information forming the basis of Guildford Borough Councils submission needs to be questioned for accuracy and integrity at a legal level.

1. Development within the Existing Green Belt.

The proposed Green Belt use by extending the 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area is flawed immediately in Policy P2 of the Green Belt and Countryside submitted documents. This states the Metropolitan Green Belt will be protected against inappropriate development and no justification has been put forward for exceptional circumstances to overrule Policy P2.

The proposed Green Belt Development must not be allowed to stand as a major driving force of the Local Plan.

Insetting proposals of the existing village settlement boundary lines has to be stopped as it a) contravenes the existing Insetting of Boundaries policy of 2012 and b) only sets a future precedence for further insetting whenever a developer can get hold of a suitable piece of land.

1. Sustainable Development.

Policy S1 assumes the Local Plan will be a Sustainable Development.

This assumption will not stand up to scrutiny when lack of local schools, shops, parking, road capacity, public transport, emergency services, drainage, medical, dental and loss of a rural community spirit and wellbeing are taken into account.

The physical services above are unable to successfully support the village at present.

Gas, water, electricity and sewage main services are also inadequate to sustain the proposed number of dwellings/persons. There is no plan to use or introduce zero emission or carbon neutral systems or biodiversity controls under BREEAM Regulations that are part of Planning Regulations.

1. Housing Density

The forecast for the housing requirement for the future is inaccurate and cannot be substantiated due to a closed door policy by the relevant consultants.
The local population cannot be expected to accept or believe the required house quantities put forward by SHMA especially as recent audits have identified errors in calculations and outdated data being used.

The secretive nature of this aspect of the Local Plan is misleading and must not be tolerated by Guildford Borough Council during this stage of the consultation process.

Please address this issue immediately to prevent it leading to a ‘weapons of mass destruction’ scenario. Without true facts, the Local Plan is not acceptable.

There is also no official confirmation that every available brown field site has been fully utilised in the overall plan. Why not?

1. Global Warming Effects.

The torrential storm conditions that have occurred recently and are going to occur more and more frequently due to Global Warming, will have a major detrimental environmental impact on the Horsley area. Being a ‘spring line village’ at the foot of the North Downs escarpment and with much of the land in and around the village being flat, of low permeability and prone to water logging due to clay and bands of solid chalk, there will always be a surface water drainage problem in wet weather.

The village is presently classified as being in the Thames Basin Lowlands and the Local Surface Water Management Plan already highlights persistent problem areas in the village as ‘Horsley Hot Spots’.

These surface water problems, and associated sewage capacity issues will be amplified just by adding dwellings to the sewage system and paving over large areas of currently open land thereby creating new water run off capacity concerns that have not been addressed in the Local Plan.

Anyone who has witnessed the surface water gushing up out of the roadside drains in the village will appreciate the above.

Sewage and surface water problems are inevitable with any sizable housing development but local residents must not be expected to take future flooding as a guaranteed consequence of large high density housing schemes

In conclusion, there is not sufficient housing needs evidence, there is not a sustainable infrastructure or a credible Green Belt removal justification to allow the proposed Local Plan development of Horsley village to proceed.

Please, in the sincere interests of local residents, critically review the Local Plan for the village, maintain the existing Green Belt and protect the environment and community spirit of the village for future generations. There are proven health and wellbeing benefits to living in a rural environment which has a knock on effect of reducing the demand on the stretched hospital and medical practices. Has this been taken into consideration?

This alone is reason enough to not develop the village into a town.

Community spirit or community breakdown also needs to be high on the agenda.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2060  **Respondent:** 8907137 / Jennifer A. Milligan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**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 West Horsley A38, A40, A41. This is a rural village that has had its fair share of infill housing but it is not suitable for over 200 new houses. Why do you want to destroy our Surrey villages?

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/504</th>
<th>Respondent: 8907425 / Julia Wood</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>

RE: OBJECTION to proposed local plan to build extra housing in East and West Horsley (Thatcher’s Hotel Site, Bell & Colvill Garage, Manor Farm Site, Ockham Road North & East Lane, & Wisley Airfield Site)

As a local resident living in East Horsley, close to many of these proposed sites of development, I would like to make you aware of why I believe these plans would have a serious negative impact on our village.

This is land in the Green Belt outside the settlement boundary.

- The Green Belt should protect countryside from sprawl by keeping land permanently open
- The core characteristics of Green Belt land are openness and permanence which we would lose if these developments were to go ahead
- This sort of development sets a precedent for the future, leading to the gradual corrosion and eventual disappearance of the green belt altogether
- No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated in order to waive the status of Green Belt and so by default this application must be rejected.

Infrastructure: These plans would have a huge adverse impact on our already over-stretched infrastructure.

i) Parking: There are only 2 railway stations within 5 miles of the proposed housing sites, both of which have car parking at near capacity. It is already almost impossible to park at both stations after 9am.

ii) Doctors’ surgery and schools: Our doctors’ surgery and local schools are already stretched to full capacity and there’s no way they could accommodate residents of another 500 houses without serious negative impact on all of the existing residents.

iii) Impact on traffic and highway safety: We live on Ockham Road and are already terrified of letting our children anywhere near the main road as it is so dangerous. We can’t even walk along the pavement to the shops with them as it is a particularly narrow road, and we have already seen the volume of traffic increase hugely in recent years. A mother pushing a pram was recently knocked down and concussed as a van met another vehicle coming the other way. Introducing more traffic into our village would be a nightmare. The A3 and local section of the M25 are both stretched to full capacity and the number of traffic accidents would undoubtedly rise significantly (as would air pollution) if we were to put another 500 cars onto those roads.

Policy D4: I object to this policy largely because the council’s plan is intended to provide new affordable housing in Guildford, but East and West Horsley are way outside Guilford. Not least, this creates an increase in road traffic on what are already incredibly congested roads.

Policy P3: (4.3.33) ‘National planning policy states that we should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and support thriving rural communities within it. I object to this statement as the planned developments in East and West Horsley and Wisley airfield most certainly contradict it, for the reasons I stated above.
Policy P1 – Surrey Hills area of outstanding natural beauty: ‘...will be conserved and enhanced to maximise its special landscape qualities and protect it from inappropriate development’. I object strongly to this policy as it’s simply not what is happening. East and West Horsley are part of this area of outstanding natural beauty and you’re proposing to take away the protection the greenbelt offers to them, thereby diminishing the importance of our precious countryside.

I sincerely hope that you will take this and all of the other thousands of objections seriously and refuse the application for development on these greenbelt sites.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1889  Respondent: 8907809 / Sarah White  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object to the proposal to take the Horsleys out of the Green Belt and to build on land around the Horsleys and surrounding area. I believe that there should not even be a discussion on this; the Green Belt was created for a reason and should be considered sacrosanct. People move to this area for the peace and quiet of the countryside and any significant construction should take place on Brownfield sites. If building on the Green Belt is allowed to go ahead a precedent will be set and our country’s beautiful countryside will eventually cease to exist. The unethical/immoral back door methods of extending village boundaries and taking villages out of the green belt is a blatant attempt to get around the building rules. Rather than constantly building without thinking, the problem of housing should be tackled by looking at the core issues that have caused the need to expand out of London; the many properties owned by foreign investors that stand empty from one year to the next, the problem of immigration, basing everything around London as I believe Princess Anne suggested, if only a few new houses were built in every village in the UK it would solve the housing problem. But there is a fixation with London!!) etc. With regards to the substantial number of houses supposedly required in the area, should it not be the responsibility of the elected council to determine the amount required anyway; not outsider companies as is apparently the case? In addition, whenever any building work is done it seems to be for luxury houses and not affordable houses anyway which then take up the space that could be used for affordable housing. Local people in the Horsleys should be given priority for any housing built in the area; building work should not be taking place in this area to accommodate an overflow from Guildford where, for example, the University of Surrey have not built the accommodation previously promised and allowed, thereby causing students to take up housing in the rest of Guildford etc. Furthermore, construction would not stop at houses as more public buildings/services would have to be built to deal with the larger capacity of people; for example, already there are not enough local school places and children are having to be ferried to schools further afield and it can take a month to get a doctor's appointment at the medical centre, not to mention the extra traffic on the already pothole riddled roads of Surrey. I do hope that you will stop and think about the core issues and the consequences of your actions rather than blindly continuing to build on our beautiful countryside.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4376  Respondent: 8907809 / Sarah White  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. Any changes to the current Green Belt status of the Horsleys is unacceptable. 'Exceptional circumstances' have not been demonstrated and this is just a cynical move to allow development to take place. Taking any of the Guildford villages out of the Green Belt is unacceptable. The Green Belt was created as the lungs of London and it is more important than ever that we guard it as the overflow from London drives the concrete sprawl destroying the south East.

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>PSLPA16/1607</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8908641 / J R Jennings</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 wish to object to the above plan in that it contains the proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt by the procedure known as insetting.

In particular the plan proposes development site A37 for the election of forty homes located adjacent to west horsley street and the A246.

This would increase the density by approximately 35% which is more than three times that proposed for Guildford town itself!

The existing facilities in West Horsley are already over stretched in terms of traffic, schooling, sewage and water, flooding and infrastructure.

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>pslp173/371</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8908737 / Rosemary Goodrick-Meech</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>

Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan June 2017 Consultation

I write regarding the above proposal. Although there has been a reduction in the number of new homes to be built on the Green Belt, it still is not enough.

I strongly object to no changes being proposed since the 2016 consultation to insetting West and East Horsley from 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>PSLPA16/1404</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8908769 / E.C. Vessey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I write to object to the Draft Local Plan ("DLP"), and in particular the proposals as they apply to East and West Horsley.

1. I object to changing the status of the land currently within the Metropolitan Green Belt. Our Green Belt is precious and it is for us to converse and protect it for future generations. Removing land from Green Belt status is a once-for-a-time decision, not to be taken lightly, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) underlines this by requiring that any change of Green Belt boundaries must demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Unmet housing need is not an exceptional circumstance in law. The very existence of the Green Belt/AONB is a reason for not meeting objectively assessed housing need (i.e. such protected land is a legal constraint against any such development), yet about 65% of all the housing development proposals within the DLP relate to land currently within the Metropolitan Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated, including as to the removal of Wisley Airfield from the Green Belt.

2. I object to the idea of East Horsley being inset from the Green Belt instead of maintaining its current "washed over" status. This proposal would change the nature of this area of countryside forever. Contrary to the suggestion in the DLP, East Horsley is set in a rural location with the character of a rural village. Over a third of the land within the village boundary is woodland, and the gardens attaching to the majority of the houses are relatively large, making an additional contribution to the openness of the area. Furthermore, the current open spaces provide important habitat for local wildlife that would be lost under the development as proposed. Inset of East Horsley would destroy this character and eventually merge historic and separate villages in the area, such that they would lose their distinctive character and simply add to the urban sprawl that predominates in nearby unprotected areas.

3. The proposal to designate Station Parade as a district centre demonstrates a total misunderstanding of the facilities within the village centre and the nature of the shops and businesses currently here; I object to this proposal as being inappropriate for the area, adversely affecting existing businesses and opening the way for future unsuitable development.

4. I object to the lack of justification for the housing requirements set out in the DLP, which are based upon an undisclosed mathematical model which has been further increased by GBC to result in a population increase set at 70% above the official national estimates for the Borough.

5. I object to the lack of any reflection within the DLP of the different social or affordable housing needs across the Borough; the proposals as they stand, including in relation to East and West Horsley will require affordable housing to be included in developments whether or not such properties are needed to house those locally employed or are otherwise appropriate to those in need of social and affordable housing.

6. I object to the proposals set out regarding infrastructure for the area as being inadequate. Our existing infrastructure is already under strain with no account being taken of this current situation quite aside from dealing with the additional burden the infrastructure would be required to bear under the proposed number of new homes.

7. The proposed developments will add to existing congestion, for example, the proposed development at Wisley will impact negatively on traffic to and through Effingham and Horsley, particularly at peak times. Our narrow and winding roads already regularly block up whenever there is a problem on the A3 and/or M25 and the additional interchange at Burnt Common will simply encourage this. Land proposed for development in both East and West Horsley is subject to flood risk; the Environment Agency has acknowledged the importance of retaining greenfield sites in managing flood risk generally.

8. Users of our Medical Centre regularly have trouble obtaining a prompt appointment due to the number of patients registered, and have trouble parking in order to attend when they do do have an appointment. Our local primary and secondary schools are already full to capacity and with waiting lists; if children are required to travel further afield for their schools their transport adds yet further congestion to already busy roads that were never designed for the weight of traffic they now carry, and the spreading of children into schools across a wide geographical area impacts negatively on their community involvement. These issues will only get worse with an increase in housing numbers locally and the DLP fails to deal either with adequate numbers of school places or these wider implications.

I ask the council to note these objections, and act upon them by rejecting the Draft Local Plan as currently formulated.
I wish to object to the “Local Plan” for the following reasons.

There are no proven “exceptional circumstances” for removing the Horsleys from the Green Belt. The amount of housing proposed is above and beyond local requirements and there is no reasonable proof that any extension of the settlement area is required.

The local infrastructure is already overloaded. No plans on how the problems of Schools, drainage, increased traffic and public transport which would be created by the “Plan” appear to have been addressed. To refer to Station Parade as a “District Centre” is a complete and probably deliberate misreading of the nature of it’s facilities. The roads in and out, the lack of parking and public transport renders any future plans for urban development unreasonable.

The impact of the proposed “village” at Wisley on the surrounding villages would be catastrophic. Commuter traffic would be concentrated on the already chaotic A3 - M25 junction, the inadequate road systems in the surrounding villages and a poorly served public transport system.

To increase housing by the amount proposed would have devastating effects on local villages and their infrastructures, especially West Horsley where a 35 percentage is proposed.

Again as with the last local plan I would urge the Council to reject and rethink what is obviously a developer led project which has nothing to do with the needs of the local population, present or future.

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

Attached documents:

---

I write as a resident of East Horsley and object to the above on the following grounds:-

The exceptional circumstances required to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt have not been demonstrated. If Sevenoaks District Council can meet housing requirements without encroaching on the Green Belt why cannot GBC.

Extension of the Settlement areas of the Horsleys will lead to further inappropriate development and could harm wild life habitats.

The magnitude of impact on existing infrastructure which is already overloaded; narrow roads in the village frequently virtually one-way unless you want to lose door mirrors, the parish council and highway authorities show no interest in maintenance of our roads in safe state, width boundaries unattended, road markings or lack of is puzzling, which is
compounded by the inability to control through traffic. The Horsleys are not in a suitable state for the development planned.

Impact on environment. Horsleys at present are a very valuable asset in the Borough's portfolio with an above average input of wealth into the Borough. The disproportionate and over development planned can only destroy the balance of the exceptional and advanced planning of the Horsleys in the 1920's which is the envy of Boroughs throughout the Country. The possible development of the former Wisley airfield site so close to the Horsleys would have an enormous detrimental impact to which I would most strongly object.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3532  **Respondent:** 8909313 / Andrew Fairley  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Specific Sites in Local Plan

As an East Horsley resident:-

- I am not opposed to development of Site A36 and Site A37. I believe these are supportable development sites.
- I am opposed to development of Site A39 as the site is currently in the Green Belt and in a flood zone area.
- I am opposed to development of Site A38, A40 and A41 as all three currently sit in the Green Belt and will completely swamp West Horsley village.
- I am opposed to development of Site A35, former Wisley airfield. This site is a large area of current Green Belt which provides protected open space near the M25 and is a barrier to outward development from London. Creating this new settlement would cause irrevocable harm to the Green Belt. It would also overwhelm local roads (from a traffic perspective) and local facilities/services (shops, health centre, railway services, schools). The site has no grounds for inclusion in the Local Plan as it was subject to a recent planning application (15/P/00012) which was unanimously rejected by the Planning Committee.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3053  **Respondent:** 8911041 / Alison Watts  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am writing in reference to the Guildford Borough local plan proposal for West Horsley village and I strongly object. I have outlined below my reasons for objection and would hope these will be carefully and sympathetically considered.

I live at [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] with my partner, five year old son and dog. We have lived in the village for nearly 10 years and specifically chose here for its rural setting, close community, green open spaces, good schools and
efficient rail and road access to London.

My first objection, which is the umbrella under which all my other objections fall, is that the Horsleys should not be taken out of the green belt. The green belt is put in place for a very good reason - to help prevent urban sprawl, protect agricultural activities and the unique character of rural communities. Green belt areas help preserve unique landscapes which offer so many benefits to the urban population and preserve the unique character of smaller historic villages, like Horsley. It prevents them from becoming suburbs of larger urban centres and from merging with neighbouring towns. This access to open space provides not only a number of recreational opportunities but educational too.

The Horsley parishes offer exactly this. Taking us out of the green belt will significantly increase the density of housing, taking away its character and causing overcrowding on all of our village necessities and infrastructure - medical centre, schooling, railway station, post office (which has already decreased from two to one), road quality and functionality. We do not have efficient enough public transport facilities to cope with such a huge increase in population. It will also greatly impact on flooding, which is already a serious problem in the Long Reach, East Lane and The Street areas, to name but a few.

Our son currently attends The Raleigh school, which we chose for its very high achieving yet nurturing qualities. It doesn't have the most impressive outdoor facilities but it is certainly efficient enough and highly successful for a village school. However, it is attended by children from many neighbouring towns and villages which in turn has made its facilities seem inadequate as numbers are expanding. The council, therefore, should put some serious thought into why they've allowed this to happen and how the intend to put a stop to this problem. An expansion of the school would increase traffic having a considerably negative effect on the safety of our children on the roads walking or cycling to school.

Overall the proposal of increasing homes in West Horsley by 35% is ludicrous. It would be a complete re-development of a village, in order to support this surge in residents, would cost a fortune with all the additional infrastructure.

As I mentioned at the beginning of my letter, we chose to live in West Horsley for the quality of life it offers us. The people residing in both West and East Horsley covers a wonderful array of ages and I think this says an awful lot about the benefits and joys of living in an area of natural beauty and a close community.

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

Attached documents:
protect the Metropolitan Green Belt against inappropriate development" when the draft Local Plan does nothing of the sort. The NPPF requires "exceptional" circumstances for changing the present Green Belt boundaries but there are none to be found in the Local Plan in its present draft to justify the multiple changes proposed to the Green Belt boundaries around the villages.

The draft Plan provides for more new housing than before and would add some 384 new houses to West Horsley over the period of the Plan - an increase in housing of 35% in the one village. West Horsley is a parish in which housing is at a low density and in which there are a number of historic buildings of significant interest. There is no evidence in the Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-31 document to support the location of such a large number of houses in the Horsleys or nearby villages. It is even less comprehensive given that the economic development site proposals are on the other side of the Borough - unless it is intended for commuter occupation, which then throws the spotlight on the lack of proposals for improvement of transport links and supporting infrastructure.

The sites allocated for development within West Horsley are wholly inappropriate for development. Each must be challenged for its adverse impact on the village, whether on economic, social or environmental scale.

I object to the Local Plan proposals for insetting the Horsley's from the Green Belt and the extension of the village boundaries at the same time. Each proposed development site needs to be removed from the Local Plan for reassessment.

Sustainability

Policy S2 in the Local Plan proposes a total of 13800 new houses for the Borough although, of these, only 12698 have been allocated. As stated above, West Horsley has been allocated 384 new houses. In West Horsley there is one small shop near the A246 with very limited parking nearby. It is reported that it may close later this year. There is no Post Office and only a limited bus service. Most of West Horsley therefore relies heavily on East Horsley for shopping and public transport in the form of trains, which means that much traffic relies on East Lane for access to these facilities.

The density of new houses proposed for the four sites in West Horsley is much higher than elsewhere in the village and, given the likely layout, will be wholly out of character with the existing settlement and actually contribute to the irreparable damaging of that character.

They will impose an almost impossible burden on existing services and amenities from school places to medical services, from drainage to sewerage, from parking at the shops and railway station to public transport capacities. The roads in the two Horsley parishes are in large part narrow lanes, which simply do not have the capacity to carry a greatly increased number of vehicles. There is no justification given for imposing a far greater percentage volume of new housing in West Horsley than on other villages in the Borough or within Guildford itself. The main artery running through the village of West Horsley to East Horsley, The Street and East Lane, is already busy such that, at certain times, the junction with Ockham Toad North becomes almost impassable. The developments proposed can only exacerbate these volumes of traffic and increase the times of day when this junction becomes ever more difficult.

It is difficult not to conclude that the Local Plan merely aims in this regard to tick the box marked 'housing numbers' rather than to provide any serious appreciation of actual need or sustainability.

Quite apart from the sites proposed with West Horsley, there is one on the boundary with East Horsley and within that parish for which 100 houses have been allocated. Access appears to be from the Ockham Road just by the railway bridge, which gives rise to visions of impenetrable traffic at what is already a pinch point on that road, all of which will also affect West Horsley in a major way. Equally, the proposal to include in the local Plan the site at the former Wisley Airfield just up the road at Ockham with its proposals for 2068 houses will have, if ever realised, ill have untold knock on effects on sustainability across the Horsleys.

The housing numbers proposed in the Local Plan come from a Strategic Housing Market Assessment generated from a mathematical model devised by consultants the basis of which is not explained in the Plan or supporting documents and apparently has not even been disclosed to the Borough Council either. This housing target has then been increased by the Borough Council to project a population increase 70% higher than the official national estimate for the Borough. This clearly needs further assessment and enquiry as well as explanation and clarity.
West Horsley Parish Council carried its own survey of housing need with Surrey Community Action Housing in 2014 and identified a need for 20 affordable homes for local people who want to stay in the village. There is nothing in the Local Plan which indicates that, if any housing is built in either of the Horsleys in accordance with its proposals, it will be of the kind actually required by the villages.

The recent proposal for the creation of a SANG in Long Reach in West Horsley (not in the Local Plan as such) would hardly compensate for the loss of real amenity and countryside resulting from further development in the immediate area. Managed space in the form of what amounts to an urban park does not replace actual countryside that has been built over.

I object to the lack of provision for sustainability, be it in housing, transport or in other aspects of the current draft of the Local Plan.

**District Centre**

The designation of East Horsley Station Parade as a District Centre, which would open it to wholly inappropriate forms of development for a village centre is a misunderstanding of the nature and scale of Station Parade and its place in East Horsley.

**Transport**

The proposed density of new housing in the parishes of West and East Horsley will impose an almost impossible burden on the present road network, much of which consists of narrow country lanes, and on public transport. Parking at East Horsley station is virtually full now as are the trains at peak times. The bus service is fairly rudimentary. If the proposal for the former Wisley Airfield ever goes ahead there is a prospect of near gridlock on the roads, insufficient parking at the station and at the shops in East Horsley. There is nothing in the Local Plan which proposes any positive development to meet increases in population - only pious wishes. The idea that developers will be expected to propose and secure "travel plans" for each development and contribute to transport arrangements is so weak as to be laughable. We need positive plans to meet any such population increase as part of any development strategy.

I object to the Local Plan in its present form for lack of clear transport proposals.

**School Places**

There is a distinct lack of school places in West Horsley. The Raleigh School is full every year and there is clearly no room for the likely number of children that would require places if the proposed developments come to pass. Even if the school moves site, as has been proposed, this is not going to happen in sufficient time to solve the places problem and in its own way will add to the other problems under discussion - especially road traffic. Howard of Effingham places are limited and, in any event, create transport requirements. Places at the two private schools in The Horsleys are well patronised and all the schools already have their own traffic problems for the villages.

There is no specific provision in the Local Plan for an increase in school places and is deficient in the respect. I object to this lack of policy, which is a necessity if increasing the population in the villages

**Medical Facilities**

The existing practice in East Horsley is almost at capacity. The planned population increase exceeds Government ONS forecasts and the knock on effect across the Borough means that some enlargement of the Royal Surrey Hospital will also soon be necessary. The Infrastructure Development Plan only refers to a possible extension to the medical practice in East Horsley.

This is not joined up thinking in any way and if developments are to be proposed, I object to the lack of policy in this area.

**Drainage**

The size of developments proposed will impose a burden on the current drainage infrastructure. This does not work well now - I understand that there have already been sewerage overflow problem in the Ockham Road North/Green Lane area.
Surface water drainage across the West Horsley Parish is already overloaded when ever there is a heavy downpour and any prolonged rain brings flooding very quickly. More development will create more surface water run off and add to the problems. A serious upgrade across the two villages will be necessary if these developments are to take place.

I understand that Thames Water has already advised Guildford Borough Council that the area's waste water network is unlikely to support the demand anticipated from all the proposed developments. I further understand that the foul drainage system from West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley will need to be upgraded to cope. Thames Water requires a 2-3 year lead time to deal with this after it has obtained the necessary planning permissions to do the work.

I object to the lack of any positive proposals in this area of infrastructure. It is not plausible to propose the developments set out in the Local Plan without providing for the requisite improvements to infrastructure.

I object strongly to the draft Local Plan in its current form as it affects the Horsleys for the reasons stated.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2341  **Respondent:** 8914721 / Lynne Carr  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Proposed Gargantuan Development of West Horsley (70% plus)

My objections are as follows-

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated in order to allow you to take the Horsleys out the Greenbelt.

Extension of boundaries of settlement areas of the Horsleys -no good reasons have been given for these proposed changes which appear to be aimed at increasing land available within the settlements for future excessive development.

All our infrastructure is already on overload, local schools are full, medical facilities seriously stretched. drainage inadequate, car parks and roads already overloaded with next 10 no room for improvement.

Development of 2,000 houses in Ockham would ruin this beautiful area and the impact on the Horsleys of such a massive mixed housing, retail, commercial, travelers and schools development, so close would be enormous.

Doubts about housing numbers -I understand this envisages an increase of 70% higher than the official national estimates for population growth in this borough. This is very worrying.

Wildlife- their habitat is going to be seriously reduced. Bees for example, are falling in numbers and they are vital to human existence.

Trains to London are already overloaded and insufficient in number to take the number of commuters that need the service.

It is vital that we have countryside close to London for the Londoners to visit and enjoy. Given that one in five of us could have mental illness in our lifetimes, green open spaces are vital to us all to give us a sense of peace and tranquility. This was mentioned on a BBC programmer -a certain study group has stated the extreme importance of our green open spaces.
Farming - I believe that our fields will be needed for food in future years, and once built on, will then not usable for such purpose for some time. I say this in connection with climate change and the various disasters around the world which seem to be increasing in frequency. I gather the likelihood is that this trend will continue and we are bound to be affected at some point, however far in the future that might be.

Brownfield sites in Guildford - I gather there are many unused, including several sites on Walnut Tree Close. This is a shame given its proximity to Guildford Station.

This is democracy - Government by the people for the people. Please listen to us.

Now that Brexit has taken place, numbers of immigrants are likely to be reduced and we should be very careful about how much development we allow, in case we end up with an oversupply of housing. We also need to remember this is an island, and not a continent.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/642  Respondent: 8915425 / Dorothy August  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I wish to strongly OBJECT to the Proposed Submission Local Plan and frankly struggle to find any difference to the draft Local Plan which was submitted in 2014 and rejected. Based on the following reasons:

• I strongly object to the destruction of the Metropolitaln Green Belt which disqualifies out of hand 65% of the proposed developments in the Local Plan, specifically the Wisley Airfield proposal and housing developments on land behind Ockham Road North near Horsley Station as well as sites in West Horsley

• I object to Paragraph 4.3.13: Proposal that the rural village of East Horsley be inset from the Green Belt and no longer 'washed over'

• I object to Paragraph 4.3.16 and Proposals Map: Settlement Boundary changes in East Horsley which GBC are unnecessarily proposing to expand the settlement area

• I object to Kingston Meadows being removed from the Green Belt. Instead of jeopardizing the community value offered by Kingston Meadows Guildford Borough Council may wish to consider ways to enhance its value by building a community swimming pool providing local youth employment and skills training.

• I object to Local Plan Response 13.06.16 to exclude Effingham Junction Station from Public Transport Interchange status; Effingham Junction station is clearly at an important interchange on the Guildford to London mainline; it is indefensible that it be excluded from Public Transport Interchange status.

• I object to Local Plan Response 13.06.16 6. INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES: Existing infrastructure in East and West Horsley is inadequate to cope with existing demand and until 150 new school places as well as additional playing fields
are available at the Raleigh School, expansion of the East Horsley Medical Centre is provided and the upgrading of existing drains, roads, pavements and cycle paths is completed any consideration of new development in East and West Horsley should be halted. Relying on developers Section 106 to contribute to infrastructure and make available affordable housing within developments has not been a successful policy in the past. Once planning permission has been given developers have been allowed to get out of their contractual obligations and Guildford Borough Council has failed to monitor and enforce developer obligations.

I sincerely request that GBC review its own policy objectives which are completely out of step with Borough resident feedback rather than force through the Council a Local Plan which clearly does not have the wider support and interest of the residents of East and West Horsley and the larger Guildford Borough.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPA16/351  Respondent: 8915681 / J.M.K. MacDonald  Agent:**

**Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North**

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

I am writing to comment on the Guildford Plan which was published on 6 June 2016.

I have lived in West Horsley for the past 12 years.

I object to the Plan for the following reasons

1. You are planning to build too many houses in West Horsley without the necessary infrastructure.
2. We already have inadequate roads in and around the village which are too narrow in many parts, some with deep potholes which do not get repaired and too narrow to allow the larger vehicles to pass one another without reversing to a wider part of the road.
3. Lack of car parking at Horsley and Effingham Junction stations and outside the village shops.
4. Lack of schooling both primary and secondary. All of the local schools are already oversubscribed.
5. The medical centre in Horsley is already struggling to meet the demands of the existing population.
6. There is a lack of public transport with infrequent buses to and from Guildford and Leatherhead.
7. I understand that 65% of the new homes which you propose would be in the Green Belt.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPA16/845  Respondent: 8915777 / Tim Elkington  Agent:**

**Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North**

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

Please accept this email as my objection to Guildford Borough Council's Draft Local Plan. I would like to object to the plan on the following grounds.
1 - Developments around East and West Horsley will mean an increase in traffic that the road system will not be able to deal with. The roads are already in bad condition and regularly flood and increased traffic will make this worse and be dangerous.

2 - Increased traffic around East and West Horsley and because of the Wisley Airfield development will cause increased pollution.

3 - Developments around East and West Horsley will put too much strain on local facilities, for example doctors and school places, there are simply not enough surgeries or schools to cope! Added to this parking at Horsley and Effingham stations is already under a lot of pressure and neither car park will be able to cope with the cars added from new developments in the area.

4 - Taking East and West Horsley out of the green belt will lead to irreversible damage to the local environment and wildlife.

Please take these views and my specific objections on the above points into consideration when deciding about the local plan.

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

Attached documents:
accurate and reasonable population projection. At the same time, whatever this housing number is or becomes, it doesn’t justify building on Green Belt land. Within West and East Horsley, there are some sites of already used land which could provide more housing.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3144  Respondent: 8915969 / Colin and Sally Newman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

My wife and I object to the new Guildford Local Plan for many reasons. Firstly the infrastructure of the Horsleys is already overloaded with full schools, an overstretched Medical Centre, a very limited bus service that only runs on weekdays and increasingly busy roads which sometimes flood.

Removal from the Green Belt destroys local quality of life and opens the doors to future development that could mean we become a suburb of Guildford or Woking. The destruction of the Green Belt is something that the Conservative Party said that they would not do but here they are going back on their promises.

The number of homes proposed will mean a 35% increase in the current housing number of 1,111 and is totally out of proportion with the size of West Horsley. The village has no post office and soon will have no local shop which will place further pressure on shopping and parking facilities in East Horsley.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/459  Respondent: 8916449 / K. Baynes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I recently reviewed the new local develop plan for the Guildford Borough and wanted to write highlighting my objections. The specifics of which relate to a number of fundamental areas, notably:-

**Road Congestion / Traffic**

I object to the number of houses the council are planning to add into the Horsleys, which I feel is disproportionate to the size and capacity that the local roads can accommodate. Approximately 533 new house are to be built (Thatcher’s site, Bell & Covill Garage, Manor Farm site, Ockham road North and East Lane), which means approximately 1,000 new additional cars will be added to the morning and evening rush hour traffic. The traffic, congestion, pollution (noise and air) will have a significant impact on the local villages and will have a significant negative impact on the health and wellbeing of the community, not to mention the condition and costs to maintain the local roads. Similarly this also applies to the increase in traffic that will be using the A3 and M25 at the respective junctions

**Unnecessarily Damaging the Green Belt**
I object to the developments proposed for the Horsley and the Wisely airfield in particular on the basis that it permanently damages the green belt which is irreversible once completed. Despite the fact that the Wisley airfield development was rejected previously, again it appears in the new development plan. I find this unacceptable and is not something I can support.

I also question and object the Borough’s long term strategic intent i.e. in terms of building pockets of 2,000 houses which strongly implies that residents can expect there to be further developments in between sites. This causes an even larger concern with regard to the feasibility of the Borough’s plan. It would appear that destroying the green belt permanently has not been fully reviewed or duly considered by the Borough.

**Lack of Available Resources & Amenities**

I object to the Horsley developments as they are insufficient local resources available to support the addition of 533 new house and on average 1,600 new residents (3 people per household) i.e. insufficient train, doctors, shopping, etc. In fact it was only this morning that Eagle radio news announced that the Borough does not have sufficient schools to meet the current demand of new pupils let alone the addition of new residence.

I would respectfully request that you consider my objections as detailed above and that the Council seriously consider revising the plan accordingly.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2958  **Respondent:** 8916545 / Jilian Walton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Having reviewed the latest plans by Guildford Borough Council I wish to raise the following concerns over the proposed development in West Horsley and East Horsley.

Firstly I will say, I do believe that there does need to be some small development nearer to the train station and shops for people to downsize but are able still able to retain their independence and remain in the village that they have lived in for many years. There also needs to be some development for the young I believe we do need to have a balanced community. That being said there seems to have been little thought into the following.

**Infrastructure**

- I currently live on Ockham Road North and the properties back onto those of Nightingale Avenue the gardens here are frequently under water, there is a proposal to build properties on some spare land near here, but the only proposal in the plan is for the builders to ensure that the drainage is sorted for the new properties there is no proposal on in the local plan document on how you will deal with the current drainage to ensure the current properties do not suffer from flooding, this needs to be resolved before building commences.
- Currently all the proposed sites are a significant distance from the station, which is the main means of transport for those without cars or those working in London or Guildford. There is no proposal on additional buses or an additional station in West Horsley to deal with peoples transport needs. The car park at Horsley station struggles to cope with current needs and given the distance of the proposed developments from the station there will be a greater demand for parking. You propose to have a shuttle bus from the site at Wisely but this will only serve people there and not deal with the extra demand from additional housing within Horsley.

**Housing and facilities**
With the additional housing there seems to have been no consideration as to additional facilities required i.e. shops, schools, Doctors, these are already overstretched in the area.

There is no evidence in the plan as to why there needs to be such an increase in the local housing needs. The plan also does not support its proposed additional housing needs with the facilities it will require, such as schooling and Medical facilities.

Village character

Such a significant increase in the properties will have an impact on the current character of the village. As will the removal of the greenbelt status and extending the boundaries.

Before extending and removing the Green belt status of any village within Guildford Borough there needs to be consideration on how the brown field sites can be used. Many of the villages have charm and character and it will be a shame to see this lost without firstly identifying the actual needs of each village, its current infrastructure, and its facilities.

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

Attached documents:

---

I am writing to object to Guildford Borough Council's proposed Local Plan as a resident of West Horsley. I am concerned about the impact so many new houses will have on the infrastructure and culture of the village. I also believe that under no circumstances should villages be removed from the Green Belt, there would also be a detrimental effect on the environment as a result. There is no need for so much housing to be built in and around cities such as Guildford, especially when its satellite towns have neither the school places, health systems, amenities and utilities to cope.

The proposals outlined in Guildford Borough's latest Local Plan for development on Green Belt land cannot be permitted to proceed for these reasons.

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

Attached documents:

---

I strongly object to the inclusion of the Normandy greenfield site(s) and its developer led proposal for the 1000 or so new properties.

Whist progress needs to be made, It is grossly unfair on the village to subject the residents (the people you represent) to the desecration of the villages current character.

As a newer member to the village, I have been overwhelmed by the beautiful - often under rated character of the village.
So do not wish for a developer to lead Guildford down this one way street and ultimately Normandy to become an urban sprawling mass of houses as the planning floodgates are opened.

Schooling

I also object to the placement of a large secondary school in the village, it's extremely out of character for the area, I have a young baby who will eventually go to secondary school. Whereby a train or bus to an existing secondary school is, and will not be an issue for us.

Road System

I also object on the matter that the local road system is already saturated to capacity. I suspect many of the potential purchasers of the new homes will commute, with the likely hood of at least two cars per household. This is likely to subject the current and new residents to major traffic issues. Which the council will need to resolve at their expense rather then the developers (that certainly won't be cheaper then a new school).

The main roads are so narrow that a car generally can't pass a cycle without crossing the centre line on the main routes, which is almost impossible anyway when rush hour traffic ensues.

It is sometimes quicker for me to get to London Waterloo then drive a few miles down the road. Which is to say the least, incredible!

This is only going to be made much worse with more cars on the road and no significant overhaul to the infrastructure (who will pay for that?).

Finally:

These large scale (developer led) housing proposals are not what Guildford needs. I believe Guildford is quite different to other urban towns, and is locally unique due to its greater swathes of Greenbelt land which washes over the area. Why on Earth turn it into another urban mass of houses and destroy its identity forever more.

I am sure with additional effort and collaboration a better solution for all would prevail, not just because a developer is building a free school...

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2549    Respondent: 8917793 / Alan Pickup    Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I have the following specific OBJECTIONS to the New Local Plan:

1. I OBJECT to the proposal to remove East and West Horsley from the Green Belt. The exceptional circumstances needed to justify such a fundamental and adverse change for the Horsleys have not been demonstrated and only Guildford Borough Council's perceived unfulfilled housing needs appear to support the proposal.

2. I OBJECT to the proposal to extend the boundaries of the Settlement areas within East and West Horsley. No sound reasons have been given for the proposed changes which seem to be aimed solely at increasing the land available within the settlements for future additional development.

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

Attached documents:
I strongly object to the plan to remove the villages of East and West Horsley, Wisley Airfield and the surrounding villages and areas from the Green Belt. There are no "exceptional circumstances" which justify this action and I oppose the planned big increase in house building and population in the area for the following reasons:

1. The infrastructure is inadequate to cope with the increased population. Existing roads are narrow and many are without pavements. The roads are already congested at rush hours and the station car parks at Horsley and Effingham stations are full on weekdays. The Medical Centre struggles to provide timely appointments and parking there already overflows.

2. The character of the villages would be totally destroyed not only by the planned big increase in population but by the probable development of infrastructure that would be necessary to support it. Bigger roads, parking areas, medical services, schools, shops, etc. would turn the villages into towns.

3. I object to the proposed designation of Horsley's Station Parade as a "District Centre" as it is likely to lead to further urbanisation.

4. Loss of The local green belt area provides great amenity for visitors and the local population for walking, cycling, bird watching, camping and caravanning etc. The Horsley area is close to the North Downs and visitors enjoy the open country and the existing pretty "Lovelace" villages.

5. The local area provides a "green Lung" for London similar to the large London Parks developed by our ancestors. We cannot allow London sprawl to destroy the pretty local villages and lovely open areas that bring joy to so many. What is the point of the well thought out green belt designation if it can be removed so easily?

6. "Brexit" should reduce population growth but if the Government continues to allow uncontrolled population growth it should be sited away from the south east. Brownfield sites within the urban area of Guildford should be the first to be developed if necessary and then areas to the west, away from London sprawl, if absolutely essential.

I trust that the plan to remove the Horsley villages, Wisley Airfield and surrounding areas from the green belt will now be dropped.

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

Attached documents:
I object to the number of proposed new developments in the plan for East and especially West Horsley.

In West Horsley you are proposing an approximate 35% increase in the number of houses which will ruin the village:

- Proposed housing densities are much higher than currently exist and will be completely out of character with the existing village
- Expansion on this scale is not sustainable – the existing infrastructure (schooling, doctors, parking, traffic, public transport, drainage) cannot support it
- West Horsley is a beautiful village, partly in an area of AONB and this development will ruin it and it will therefore cease to attract large numbers of tourists and visitors for walking and cycling etc
- Like many other residents of the village I am opposed to the village being removed from the greenbelt by insetting and extending settlement boundaries. Green belt is there to protect villages like West Horsley. Before we know it, Horsley will be like Walton – just one sprawling line of housing.
- Green belt land should be protected and no exceptional circumstances have been made for developing greenbelt in the Horsleys
- The local schools are already completely over subscribed

I have seen no evidence to support the fact that such a large amount of houses are needed in West Horsley and the Green Belt and Countryside Study which I read seems completely flawed.

Commenting on a specific site which is the plot of land to the south of the A246, bordering the A246 and to the west of Shere Road and also bordering Shere Road – Dandara have an option on this land are our trying to seek approval for housing development. I am against developing this plot for the infrastructure problems (listed above) and because it would be completely wrong as having open space and farm land next to roads is an important aspect of feeling in the country ie that is why this plot is currently Greenbelt.

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

Attached documents:
Most of all, the character of the village would be changed for ever into that of a town which is not fair on the people who live here and choose to live in a village.

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

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3105</th>
<th>Respondent: 8922273 / Kay Dickinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 believe taking Horsley out of the green belt is fundamentally wrong and not justified. The 'exceptional circumstances' have not been demonstrated.

2) Infrastructure here is already bursting. It is always difficult to make a doctors appointment, primary and secondary schools are oversubscribed (our local secondary school The Howard of Effingham has just been refused in their planning application to upgrade their pitifully old and inadequate facilities.) Roads and drainage are disgraceful. They cannot withstand any increase in traffic as they cannot meet our current need.

3) The huge number of new housing proposed in the plan would completely change the face of our village. It would be ruinous to destroy a village such as Horsley which has a rich village heritage and is even in the domesday book.

4) I question the validity of the housing numbers themselves. They appear to be vastly inflated and would result in west Horsley (where I live) increasing by up to 35%!

I do hope Guildford council sees sense and rejects the plan in its current state,

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

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4382</th>
<th>Respondent: 8924065 / Rachel &amp; Colin Holloway</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have previously written to object to the proposed development at Ockham but we did not include my objections to the proposed housing developments in East and West Horsley. These villages are currently in the Greenbelt and there is no reason why they should be removed from the Greenbelt. They are small, semi-rural villages and the scale of the proposed developments are inappropriate for this location. There could possibly be an increase of a third in size of current population which would have a negative impact on the local environment and effect the quality of village life. Our local services such as the medical centre, school, train station parking are already stretched. Drainage is a real concern as in recent winters there has been widespread flooding. The rural lanes cannot cope with a further increase in traffic and have previously been damaged by heavy vehicles.

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

Attached documents:
I live at [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] with my husband Tom and our daughter. I am writing to express my very serious concern with the proposal to remove the Horsley villages from the Green belt and to increase the current number of dwellings by 40% over the next 5 years. Changing the village boundaries and stealing space from green belt cannot be reversed. The serious compromise to the beauty of our village, plus the devastation of green spaces belies this flawed plan.

We moved to West Horsley in 2012 in search of beautiful countryside, a community we could raise a family in and a functioning infrastructure. Moving from South London, we were already very familiar with the long waits for doctors appointments and rumoured competitiveness for school places even though this did not trouble us at the time as we didn't have children. We found Horsley unaffected by too many demands on local services, due to lower population density, fewer houses and much less traffic.

The proposal to exit the Horsleys from the green belt and to build on open land I find lacks any considered effort and is an 'easy' option. The demand new houses will put on local schools, the doctors surgery and the village roads is going to seriously compromise what is acceptable for current inhabitants of the Horsleys. It's not safe and is too large a compromise with the current village amenities and resources.

In my opinion we should preserve the greenbelt and green open spaces and reconsider existing urban areas in need of regeneration instead. There is no shortage of existing brownfield sites. This must work in tandem with an improved plan for infrastructure.

For West Horsley I fear the proposal is flawed on the following grounds:

1. The Potential Development Areas (PDA) identified in West Horsley would be at odds with the existing exceptional character and geography of the village.
2. The infrastructure simply can't cope. The extra housing means an increased number of households weighing heavily on the few resources we have in the village. The doctors surgery and the Raleigh school are prime examples of public services already stretched. State secondary school places are also already strained in neighbouring Effingham and Guildford. I before more households move to the new buildings.
3. I fear that higher levels of traffic will make getting around the village a misery. Increased queues at school pick up or drop off time and more cars on the roads in general is a danger to our youngsters. Parking at the station would be impossible, train services would become cramped and bus travel cannot be relied upon as an alternative.

Please consider this objection alongside others you will no doubt have received. My main concerns belie the infrastructure and the green belt. What is done to the green belt cannot be undone. Once this precious land is spoilt, our children can no longer enjoy it, and we will be forced to explain why we squandered this precious natural beauty before we exhausted all other options.

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

Attached documents:
I wish to OBJECT in the strongest terms to the proposed Guildford Local Plan 2016 in aggregate and particularly the plans for West Horsley. This is ill thought out, backed by spurious data and should not be allowed.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1547  Respondent: 8925633 / Ray Carnell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

As a resident of Guildford for over 60 years, I write to object to many aspects of the Draft Local Plan as set out in this letter. Having seen the previous Draft Local Plan published some two years ago, I find it very disappointing that the NEW Local Plan (published on 6th June 2016) fails to take account of the serious defects identified in the previous plan. Indeed what was said about many aspects of the previous Plan. Indeed what was said about many aspects of the previous plan seem not only to have been ignored but the situation has been exacerbated by further unacceptable proposals such as the removal of the green belt protection from areas in East and west horsley and the late inclusion of proposals to develop even more areas such as Garlicks arch at Send (site A43). These are unwarranted attacks on the currently widely supported Green Belt policy.

Turning to the local situation in the Horsleys, I would have thought it would have been abundantly clear that the present local services would be overwhelmed by an increase of some 35% in the current number of properties. Not only would this affect current residents but it would be a source of extreme difficulty and frustration to those 'new' residents 'lured' into the area by these new housing developments, only to find a wholly unsatisfactory situation with regards to services and infrastructure that could easily have been avoided by a more enlightened policy towards additional housing provision. Aside from the lack of adequate services, the infrastructure would be inadequate for housing development on the scale envisaged particularly roads such as East Lane and Ockham Road North. I find it remarkable that the planned development alongside the railway on land behind houses in Ockham Road North (A39) seems to completely fail to recognise the potentially extremely dangerous situation that will arise when vehicular traffic emanating from 100 properties attempts to enter the busy Ockham Road North with Railway Bridge abutments allowing very restricted traffic visibility looking southwards (it is difficult to envisage a more obvious way of creating an accident 'black spot'). The traffic situation in Ockham Road North (a busy road linking the A3 Trunk Road with the A246) already gives cause for concern, particularly with the presence of Glenesk School and associated traffic. It was for these reasons that it was found necessary, a few years ago, to install a 'traffic calming' platform at the junction of East Lane/The Drift with Ockham Road North and why it was decided not to grant Planning Permission for 'Back filling' developments that would have increased traffic entering/leaving Ockham Road North (for further details see Planning Applications 03/P/02143, 02144 and 05/P/01191 etc).

Besides the completely unsatisfactory nature of the proposed development in Ockham Road North (A39) to which I object most strongly (see previous paragraph), the overloading of services and inadequate infrastructure applies equally to Manor Farm (A38), Waterloo Farm (A40) and East Lane (A41). I also object to the proposal to build over 2,000 homes on the site of the former Wisley Airfield (A35) which would be an inappropriate intrusion on the Green Belt and overwhelm local services (including the road network) already functioning at maximum capacity.

In considering the proposals in the Draft Plan it is relevant to examine the basis for this 'perceived' need for more housing and I understand that official population forecasts are available (I assume based on information produced by the Office of National Statistics) but those producing the Local Plan have chosen to ignore these figures in favour those from dubious mathematical modelling produced by a 'Strategic Housing Market Assessment'. The suggested needs relating to the latest Draft Local Plan must be viewed in the light of this apparent overestimate of 70% in the estimated population growth in the Borough. In any event, whatever the level of accommodation planned, I am strongly of the opinion that there is a need...
to preserve the Green Belt and support the 'National Planning Policy' which 'recognises the intrinsic character of the
countryside and supports thriving rural communities within it'. As they stand, the proposals will, in my view, irretrievably
damage the local environment and its undoubted appeal not only to residents but also to tourists for whom it is one of the
prime attractions and destinations in the South East.

I trust that you and the Council Officials concerned will see fit to revise the Draft Plan in the light of these comments.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2919  Respondent: 8926561 / Lindy Bomford  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 remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt

The "exceptional circumstances" required before taking this action have not been demonstrated.

• I object to the extension of the boundaries of the Settlement areas of the Horsleys

No sound reasons have been given for the proposed changes, which appear to be aimed solely at increasing the available
land within the settlements for future additional development.

• I object because the infrastructure is already overloaded

Local Schools are full. Medical facilities stretched. Drainage is inadequate, roads and car parks are overloaded with little
or no scope for improvements. Large increases in the volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and
particulates in the environment – already a cause for concern in this area.

• I object to Station Parade being designated a “District Centre”

This 'designation' results from a misreading of the nature of the facilities in the village centre and would target the area
inappropriately for future urban developments.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3811  Respondent: 8926689 / Sarah Douglas  Agent:

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 for the following main reasons:

Take away our beautiful villages -The local people love, look after and are proud of our beautiful villages in East and
West Horsley. I volunteer to help lead a local Brownie group and one of the things the parents and children get involved
in is local litter pick-ups, because we care for our environment. The activities and customs in the villages are steeped in
English history and culture, we have formed our own allotment for example for which villagers volunteer hours to grow and share local produce.

These huge developments are being **IMPOSED** on the local people by the borough council and developers. Taking our villages **out of the green belt** with over **40 listed properties**, building on **ancient woodland** and taking away the **beautiful landscapes** I believe **UNETHICAL**. Is this really **acceptable and justified**? Is this what we want to teach our children?

I accept that we need new **AFFORDABLE** housing in Britain, but the Guildford plan proposes a **35% growth in West Horsley alone** and as affordable means up to **80%** of the local average value, that would mean new homes could cost over **£800,000 in the Horsleys**.

**WHY THE HORSELEYS?**

I WANT TO KNOW THAT THERE IS NO BETTER ALTERNATIVE.

I OBJECT TO THE SIZE OF DEVELOPMENT - Even half this proposed number of new houses would **SWAMP** the Horsleys with cars and people. Plans for further shopping facilities do not resolve this amount of extra residents and cars.

CURRENTLY AT PEAK TIMES AND WEEKENDS IT IS DIFFICULT TO GET A PARKING SPACE NEAR THE SHOPS IN EAST HORSLEY.

The Guildford plan would impose an unsupportable burden on drainage, infrastructure, schools, roads, medical facilities, parking, shopping queues and public transport.

**THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF) REQUIRES THAT NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT MUST RESPECT THE CHARACTER AND DENSITY OF HOUSING IN THE AREA AND BE LIMITED IN QUANTITY BY THE AVAILABILITY OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND LOCAL FACILITIES.**

**IS THIS REQUIREMENT BEING MET? THE GUILDFORD PLAN SURELY DOES NOT MEET THIS REQUIREMENT.**

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3879  **Respondent:** 8926913 / Lois Elam  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I wish to submit my objection to the ruination of West Horsley by the obscene extent of development proposed.

The scale of the proposal is out of proportion to the size of West Horsley and seems to be much greater than any other area.

Specific concerns are:

1. Destruction of the green belt which also appears to contradict the Green Belt and the Countryside (Policy P2). The proposed developments are NOT appropriate. The greenbelt MUST be retained. The reasons for its existence still stand.
2. There are NO exceptional circumstances to remove West Horsley from the green belt
3. Given Brexit, the whole plan for housing numbers should be revised down
4. Housing density is not in keeping with the rest of the village
5. There is not sufficient infrastructure to support so many new homes - insufficient bus services, insufficient parking at Horsley station, no capacity at local schools and doctors surgeries. There are huge issues with drainage already in the area. The roads will become over used and unusable. There are no concrete commitments from developers to invest in the level of road and transport networks that would be required to accommodate this level of extra homes.
6. I have not seen any proof that West Horsley needs all these houses. It will turn a lovely semi rural spot into a noisy, congested area and where will it stop? when it finally joins up with Guildford and Woking?
7. NO village should be destroyed in this way - stop trying to turn semi rural areas into urban areas.
8. With the Wisley developers still hoping to get their proposals through, the whole area could be changed beyond recognition and not for the better. It will just become a little London.
9. The proposals are slapdash and seem driven by a vendetta against West Horsley.
10. Stop allowing the developers to dictate what happens to our towns and villages. They will walk away rich and laughing, the rest of us and this country will be poorer in so many ways.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4033</th>
<th>Respondent: 8927073 / Jane E Tarbuck</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

But not only these factors, because furthermore all main roads in The Horsleys are only ‘lanes’, unlike nearby urban areas like Cobham only 4 miles away in Elmbridge, or Woking about 9 miles away and Merrow and Burpham about 6-8 miles away in Guildford. Also street lighting is very minimal in The Horsleys in comparison to these nearby urban areas and pavements are absent or inadequate on several of the major roads, which as mentioned above are only lanes anyway. The road widening and pavement construction that would be needed to improve the infrastructure to support your development proposals would not only be difficult to achieve because of the existing layout restrictions and would require demolition or significant destruction of existing landmarks, which would be unacceptably detrimental. Also existing facilities in The Horsleys are currently very basic, sufficient to support the existing small communities of the 2 villages but insufficient for the large increase in population that you are proposing with your housebuilding plans. For whilst Horsley is fortunate in having a station, its location in East Horsley is too far to walk to from most of West Horsley, as well as some of East Horsley, and local bus services are very minimal and unlikely to increase because their uptake is sporadic. The larger village of East Horsley has a good parade of shops at Station Parade and a smaller one at Bishopsmead, but in both cases the shops are only of a very local type, so I contest your designation of Station Parade as a District Centre. It is not sufficient to cater for the week’s entire shopping needs or social requirements, with larger shops and supermarkets located several miles away in neighbouring towns (Cobham, Guildford/Burpham, Woking, Leatherhead etc), which most people need to visit several times a week. West Horsley has even less, just 2 or 3 shops. People who currently choose to live in these villages are therefore of an independent nature, who don’t expect or need everything to be on their doorstep and are able, with the current level of infrastructure, to travel several miles outside of the 2 villages to seek the amenities and facilities they need such as big supermarkets, swimming pools or leisure centres, cinemas and other entertainment venues, fashion shops, senior schools, other social facilities etc. Increasing the population of the 2 villages with the numbers of houses you propose to solve a general housing shortage in the Borough isn’t well-thought out in terms of the above factors since it could result in people being drawn into the neighbourhood for a much-needed house without considering that they would then feel very isolated and unhappy stranded in what they might perceive as a quiet and boring environment since the trend today is very much towards town living and being surrounded by good facilities. This not only applies to your proposals for East and West Horsley but very relevantly to your huge proposal for the former Wisley Airfield. Even with your proposals for local shops and a village community centre this cannot replicate the facilities available in a long-established urban area and your proposed Wisley New Town will feel isolated and ‘in the middle of nowhere’. This will impact more on children and young adults but young mothers may be affected too where
they had been used to a bigger support structure around them in a larger community and it is important to bear this in mind because general well-being is a very important issue and boredom amongst teenagers can also have a very negative effect on a community. Non-drivers would be particularly affected since we do not know what public transport improvements your plan would be implementing, but a network of buses would certainly be needed for Wisley. Far better for us to provide housing for people who specifically want to live here because they like rural communities and I am in favour of building houses to cater for people who were brought up here and want to remain near their parents, or for elderly people who need to downsize as well as new people who have done all their research and chosen to live here because it is specifically a lifestyle they want and are happy to live in a small, quiet area with limited facilities and infrastructure compared to an urban area. But not for large numbers of people in bigger developments who will be artificially attracted here. We also need to consider that an increase in road usage in the villages as a result of these proposals is a potential problem not just because of the existing road infrastructure (which is a major aspect) but also environmentally because we are already very congested in this particular section of the A3/M25 where pollution levels are frequently registered as unacceptably high. Increased traffic volumes are potentially hazardous with Ockham Road North and South being particularly narrow yet will have to bear the brunt of this increase, Ockham Road North has had a drainage problem at its section near the approach to the A3 for a few years now, Ockham Road South is very narrow and would need to be widened for safety reasons, usage of Old Lane (particularly from any development on Wisley Airfield) would significantly increase yet it is currently a dangerous road where accidents on the sharp bend at the A3 end are not uncommon and the crossroads at the Black Swan Pub at Hatchford/Ockham is a potential black spot. And as mentioned before, pavements are absent along much of these roads and street lighting is either absent or minimal.

I can’t see that the exceptional circumstances required for these proposals have been demonstrated and there is no good reason to extend the boundaries of the settlement area of The Horsleys. I urge Guildford Borough Council Planning to cancel the proposal to create a 2,000 house development with retail/school/commercial at Wisley Airfield and rethink the usage of the site and significantly reduce the proposals for housebuilding in East and West Horsley to a number that can cope with the limitations of the environment and infrastructure and match demand from people who want to live here for all the right reasons, environmentally and socially, not as a result of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) whose basis for these numbers appears to be unclear and unjustified. It is vital environmentally that East and West Horsley should retain their rural status in the Green Belt. There are plenty of urban areas lying nearby so why destroy the character of these villages or we’ll end up one huge urban sprawl? Please let some rural villages survive in Surrey, particularly these in view of their geographical location between the Surrey Hills and Sites of Special Scientific Interest at Wisley and Ockham Commons.

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

Attached documents:
I feel that the intended additional 593 houses in the Horsley area are a ridiculous increase in relation to the amount of current residential housing. The current infrastructure is already overloaded and I cannot see how current provisions will be able to support such a dramatic increase in housing over the next 5 years. I feel it would be irresponsible to place such additional pressures on the locals schools and medical facilities.

I was under the impression that the green belt only to be overturned in "exceptional circumstances". I feel that these exceptional circumstances need to be outlined clearly to the local community as I do not feel that this has been done. I also feel that the plan has not considered how the increase in population and traffic will affect the Sheepleas nature reserve and site of specific scientific interest. Should the proposed plan be accepted how would these concerns of mine be addressed?

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4236  Respondent: 8927297 / Amanda de Haast  Agent:

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

There is no need to move the settlement area boundaries of West Horsley as proposed in the insetting of the two parts of the village and there is no case for siting large numbers of new homes in the Horsleys - new business/employment opportunities lie elsewhere in the county. There is no justification for removing West Horsley from Green Belt. and I believe none of its residents want this.

In West Horsley the infrastructure is not capable of accommodating any more homes - there will be no shops (as of the Autumn), the schools (both Private and Public) are full/stretched, the EH Medical Centre struggles to meet appointments. There are serious drainage issues that would need massive large sums of investment to meet, the roads are already overloaded, in third world condition and were never designed/laaidout to cope with the volume we currently experience. There is no capacity for further car parking at either the shops or stations, and an extremely limited bus service. As far as I understand the only housing need we have in West Horsley is for downsizers and affordable for both young and the elderly. To claim that there is a need to increase the Horsleys housing by close to 35% is totally unproven and unsubstantiated. There are enough problems and issues meeting our current infrastructure needs, let alone those required by an increased population.

Throughout the documentation there are numerous generalizations, vague statements and comments of no substance and until each policy can be explained and justified this Local Plan should be rejected.

I object to the Proposed Submission Local Plan at every level.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4106  Respondent: 8928961 / Sue Reeve  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The only possible reason I can see for Guildford Borough Council proposing to remove any villages from the Green Belt is to remove any objection for development for Green Belt reasons.

East Horsley, where I live, is known far and wide as the “historic Lovelace Village”, how will removing it from the Green Belt satisfy the NPPF guidelines to “preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and villages.”

West Horsley, our adjoining village, has a wealth of very old houses, one going back to 1380 and many more timber framed buildings similarly old. How can removing West Horsley from the Green Belt be possibly justified?

I strongly object to the insetting boundary defined for the Horsleys

The proposed insetting boundary for both East and West Horsley does not follow the settlement boundary. Instead it encompasses green fields and recreation areas which in time would be ripe for development. This is a travesty. In particular:

- the area identified as site A39 and Kingston Meadow south of the railway line, should not be included in the insetting boundary. Both these sites have excellent defensible boundaries as a large watercourse runs along their eastern boundaries.
- Pennymead Lake and attached recreation ground should be excluded.
- The pastureland at the end of Norrels Drive and adjoining Ridings Wood (a semi-ancient natural woodland with nationally rare hawfinches) should be excluded.
- Site A41, West Horsley: The insetting boundary defined by the draft Local Plan is completely wrong at this point and there is the perfectly good defensible boundary of East Lane to stop these fields being included.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4109</th>
<th>Respondent: 8928961 / Sue Reeve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>

**Sustainability**

I strongly object to the lack of sustainability in the draft Local Plan.

Much weight is given in the NPPF document of addressing the sustainability of any development that will take place.

**East & West Horsley and the surrounding areas**

The draft Local Plan wants to commit East Horsley and West Horsley to at least 533 houses. There has been no provision for additional infrastructure in either village whatsoever.

Schools: There is one local primary school which serves East & West Horsley, The Raleigh School, which is already oversubscribed. 533 houses would create at a minimum, say 200 primary pupils almost half a school’s worth. Where will they be educated? The Howard of Effingham School is the local secondary school which serves the Horsleys, Effingham, Bookham and parts of Fetcham. It is already full. There are no proposals for a secondary school which could accommodate any additional students form the Horsleys.
Doctors – the surgery in East Horsley serves not only East and West Horsley, but East Clandon, Effingham and Ockham and probably Downside. The surgery is already extremely busy. How on earth will it cope with a huge influx of patients – potentially thousands. There are suggestions in the Plan that this will be expanded but not in the short term.

Village parking:

- Station Parade – already well used and no space to expand.
- Station Parking at Horsley and Effingham Junction – already full and no place to expand.
- Medical centre – parking is already inadequate at the surgery.
- Village Hall – generally full and misused by commuters using the trains.

Road systems in East and West Horsley:

The building of 533 houses in the Horsleys will introduce at least 1,000 extra local cars. The draft Local Plan wants to promote walking and cycling as part of its sustainability package. The local roads have been described by John Furey, Head of SCC Highways, as lanes NOT roads. They have evolved from the time before the station was even built in East Horsley and the north/south route through the village is very narrow for the most part and already unsuitable for the weight of traffic it takes. Cyclists will certainly be put off by speeding traffic on these narrow roads – particularly at rush hour. Footpaths, where they exist, are far narrower that statutory guidelines suggest (and no room to widen) and are in poor condition and are difficult for all but the ablest amongst us. They are difficult for mums with buggies or toddlers (too narrow and uneven) and impossible for disabled users. Commuters will only walk in dry weather as flooding and uneven path surfaces make for very wet journeys during and after rainfall.

Drainage:

Drains cannot cope with moderate to heavy rainfall in many parts of Horsley notably along the main pedestrian approaches to the village centre in East Horsley. Flooding occurs locally in several places.

House prices.

The draft Local Plan states: “Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking”. The draft Local Plan states that 40% of the housing should be affordable housing. As I have said before, this is not possible in areas of extremely high property prices. East Horsley regularly appears in the press as one of the most expensive villages in Britain. West Horsley while property prices are slightly lower, is still a very expensive village to live in. I would expect any person looking for affordable housing would not consider a figure £350,000 for a 2 bedroom property affordable.

The only way in which the Guildford Borough Council could address the sustainability of affordable housing would be by developers building houses controlled by housing association or similar ownership and the draft Local Plan should make this plain. Also once given planning permission, for a development which includes low cost housing, the developer should not be allowed to back track and say after the event that it would not be viable for them to build smaller houses – as has happened in the past. Any planning permission granted should make this very clear and only be allowed to go ahead if this ruling is 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: PSLPA16/4111</th>
<th>Respondent: 8928961 / Sue Reeve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>

General comments about other proposed development sites
West Horsley

I object to the planned building of at least 385 houses in West Horsley because it is disproportionate to the current size of the village (over 35% increase). It would swamp West Horsley. West Horsley is defined as a large village – this is because it is spread out but has very few amenities. The local primary school (The Raleigh) serves both East & West Horsley and is full already. There are two pubs and one small grocery store which is about to close down. The village is rural in nature. Areas to the north of East Lane have already been more heavily developed.

• A small infill development of affordable homes could be on site A38, but the number of homes proposed for this area is certainly too much.
• A40 A small infill development part of the proposed site between Green Lane and Ockham Road would be acceptable but not the overwhelming numbers proposed. Access onto the B2039 which is narrow and has poor site lines is difficult. The campsite which adjoins this site is popular and a very good asset to the village, especially given the many local tourist attractions. Any development on A40 would have to be sensitive to the ambience of the camping grounds.
• Site A41. This pasture land should not be developed at all. It is part of the rural area in the village, close to very old and historic Grade 2* listed buildings and adjoins ancient woodland.
• Site A37 – I don’t object to a small development on this site but it should be in keeping with the area in which it stands.

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>PSLPA16/24</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8929057 / East Horsley Parish Council (Nick Clemens)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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? ( )

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

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

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

These proposals are also contrary to the principles of the Metropolitan Green belt. West Horsley represents one of the first ‘lines of defence’ against London urban encroachment outside of the M25 circle. Yet these policies will eliminate a significant part of this defence as they seek to expand the boundaries of this village and fill-in every bit of green space within this rural setting.
It is also totally contrary to the opening statement of Local Plan Policy P2 that “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt” It seems that in West and East Horsley at least the draft Local Plan is doing exactly the opposite.

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

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4328  Respondent: 8930305 / Elaine Best  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
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 a number of policies and sites described in this draft local plan. I list my specific objections below.

Firstly, I must say I found your statements that this latest draft has taken account of the many comments received on the last effort totally disingenuous. From my reading of this draft hardly any comments relating to West Horsley were listened to let alone taken on board. Also, I am aware of the two independent reports on the methodology and modelling of the housing needs assessment and note that both demonstrate that your assessment is well over-stated. The need is for a much lower figure than the SHMA currently states. This means that the basis upon which the Council has developed the draft local plan is fundamentally flawed and therefore unsafe.

Secondly, West Horsley is very rural, picturesque and within the green belt. It has seen some development over the years but this has been done sensitively, in individual or very small amounts thus retaining the character and rural nature of a village. I therefore find your intention to remove West Horsley from the green belt totally unacceptable and OBJECT strongly. The plan to put 35% of the Borough’s housing need in this village which is small (currently 1120 dwellings with a population of 2828) that is served by narrow lanes, frequently floods and has such limited infrastructure that the school and medical centre are already heavily oversubscribed and parking at the train station an impossibility on week days, ridiculous and ill-judged. Reference is also made to housing being affordable. As the definition for “affordable housing” is 80% of average market value in the area, this would translate to circa £750,000 in this village which I strongly suggest is not affordable in the terms envisaged in your plan.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1480  Respondent: 8930529 / Marianne Hooley  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Having written in September 2014 to object to the original Draft Local Plan, I am deeply concerned about the 2016 Plan which seems virtually unchanged and containing the same flaws. Namely:
- The wholesale removal of rural villages, in particular Ripley, Wisley, Clandon, Send and E & W Horsley, from the Green Belt;
- The monster house building proposals at Wisley, already rejected by the GBC as unsuitable, Burnt Common, Gosden Hill and Blackwell Farm;
- As well as the proposed 385 new homes in my village, West Horsley, which is completely disproportionate to the 1,100 existing homes in the village - an expansion of the size of the village by nearly 40%;
- The evidence for this scale of new housing number, namely 14,000, is just not there; nor is the infrastructure in terms of shops, schools, doctors' surgeries, railways and car parks.

The proposals in this Plan are completely disproportionate and unjustified, and are a disservice to the need for a properly controlled expansion of our housing stock in the UK. I hereby register my objection to the 2016 Draft Local Plan.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/275  Respondent: 8930529 / Marianne Hooley  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I note that the overall housing growth forecast on which the plan is based is now reduced, but it is still stating a growth assumption of nearly 25%. This is far more than that of the Office of National Statistics for Guildford.

The removal of rural villages such as Ripley, Wisley, The Clandons and The Horsleys from the Green Belt still remains.

Whilst the number of new homes proposed for The Horsleys is reduced, it seems to me that 500 new homes for West Horsley is still a large number. Increasing housing by a third more for this village would drastically affect the character of the village and its infrastructure.

The Wisley Airfield proposed development for 2,000 homes is still on the plan. This again would affect the local infrastructure around the area massively.

I therefore register my objection to the Proposed Submission of the Local Plan on the above grounds. I hope that my objections to the plan are properly addressed. The Plan as it stands does a disservice to our local communities.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4361  Respondent: 8931105 / Elizabeth Murphy  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to proposals in the above document, specifically:

The proposal to remove the Horsleys from The Green Belt. The Green Belt is central to the essential character of the Horsleys. The exceptional circumstances required by the NPPF have not been demonstrated, necessary to permit such development in the Green Belt. The villages are rural in character, one of the main reasons Surrey is so attractive, and should remain in the Green Belt.
When I looked at the June 2016 draft of the Local plan, I was very disappointed. Very few changes had been made to the earlier draft of the plan in the light of the many hundreds of consultation responses you received including my own. What is the point of local consultation when you are just 'going through the motions' and have - so it appears - fixed views on what the outcome will be?

I maintain my strong objection to removing the villages of East and West Horsley from the Green Belt. As I have said before the existence of the Green Belt has not hampered the development of the villages in the post-war years, and I believe that suitable creative planning policies could be devised to continue this organic development of the village while maintaining appropriate standards consistent with the existing character of the villages.

I therefore object to the Local Plan because of the proposed removal of the villages from the Green Belt.

I reside at [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998]

I have several objections to the Guildford Plan. The following are the most significant;

1. I oppose the unjustified removal of the village from the Green Belt by inserting and extending the 2003 Local Plan Settlement boundaries.
2. The development of 385 homes on the 4 proposed sites will result in much higher densities than exist at present and will be out of character with the existing layout and housing styles.
3. The building proposals will be unsustainable with regard to schooling, roads capacity, shops, drainage, access to healthcare, and car parking in the Horsleys. Insufficient thought has been given to infrastructure problems, in particular, roads, transport and waste water. Car parking is already a problem at the Medical Centre, East Horsley Station, and shops. East Horsley Station car park is normally full on weekdays and the car parks are used not only by residents of the Horsleys but also by people from outlying locations. The proposals are likely to make car parking more difficult if not impossible for local residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4203</th>
<th>Respondent: 8944929 / A Jefferies</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 all sites in West Horsley for over 5 homes. There is insufficient infrastructure planned. It is impossible to deliver sustainable housing sites of this size in the countryside. These sites will merge the villages of Ockham, West and East Horsley creating URBAN SPRAWL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/4204</th>
<th>Respondent: 8944929 / A Jefferies</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 insetting of West Horsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/4265</th>
<th>Respondent: 8948673 / A L Tozer &amp; Tozer Seeds Ltd. (Angela Holloway)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re. Guildford Borough Council – Proposed Submission Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a long time resident of West Horsley I write to Object to the proposals set out in the above proposed local plan as they affect The Horsleys, Ripley, Send and Ockham.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed removal of West and East Horsley from the green belt. The villages are well into the green Belt, are not adjacent to any non green belt urban areas and it would be incongruous to have Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) within or adjacent to urban areas. At what point does a village stop being a village?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposal to add 385 new homes within the parish of West Horsley.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposals on the grounds that the villages do not have the infrastructure to service the homes proposed; that is insufficient water, electricity, gas and sewerage. In addition there is no provision for extra school places, at all levels the schools are over subscribed, nor plans to expand medical provision. The current road network is based on roads which remain country lanes, founded in the days of horse and cart, are narrow, without safe pedestrian footpaths and because of the increasing heavy use are uneven, pot holed and breaking up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| If Guildford Borough Planning department was of a mind to develop and plan the development of the borough and region in a meaningful and positive way it would start with planning improvements and expansion of the infra structure. If the planning department was a business it would fail as it has not thought through or planned for the development it is proposing. The way it is going about the plan will lead to the Borough trying to develop without sufficient income to
service the plans. The proposals do not demand that developers contribute meaningful sums to the infrastructure development.

I object to the plan as the housing density proposed is much higher than anywhere in the parishes. The parishes need smaller starter homes so that younger people/our own children can live in the area in low rise properties with gardens.

I object to the proposed plan for its impact on the green belt and in particular on the Surrey Hills ANOB, which abuts and is part of the parishes of East and West Horsley.

I object to the plan as Guildford Borough Council has not demonstrated joined up policies for car parking, access to shopping areas, development of local shopping opportunities rather than their reduction. There has to be access to shops and parking availability to increase footfall. This is necessary while transport locally is geared to the motor car. Busses are like trains they cannot go everywhere so many people will not use them and then they are uneconomic.

I also object to the plan as I am concerned as to where new residents and future generations will work. We are all different and we all enjoy our own space. Myself and my husband chose Horsley as a place to live 20+ years ago and we have been fortunate to be able to bring our family up in a beautiful Green Belt area and have used local schools, clubs, medical etc. It would be such a shame to change the current beautiful village environment. Green space is important for the mind and wellbeing and should be available for us all to enjoy, whether it be living in it or visiting for enjoyment/recreation. Once it’s gone, it’s gone!

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3080</th>
<th>Respondent: 8949569 / Richard Deighton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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. Inappropriate Developments outside the present Horsleys settlement boundaries

I object to the proposals for development beyond the present settlement boundaries in East and West Horsley (policies A36, A37, A38, A39, A40, A41) on each of the following grounds:

- It is not demonstrated that any Green Belt development is necessary in the Horsleys, for the reasons set out above.
- The construction of between 533 and 623 new homes within as little as 5 years in the Horsleys (which currently comprise less than 2,700 homes) represents a disproportionate allocation on one local community of the new development burden imposed by the Plan.
- The developments will overload existing primary and secondary schools in the area, as there is no firm provision in the Plan to increase school
- The housing densities proposed on the sites are out of keeping with the existing neighbouring semi rural
- The increased local population will place added strain on local recreation spaces and open country and it is not clear that the half-hearted provision of associated local SANG will in fact discourage new residents from exercising their right to go onto the nearby Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, to the detriment of the rare species it
- It is proposed that around 40% of the housing be affordable The Horsleys are not a suitable location for large settlements of social housing given the lack of local employment opportunities, the poor local public transport, the long walking distances to the closest shops and medical facilities, and the distance to major centres such as Guildford and Leatherhead.
The Horsleys are in a flood area and any large-scale developments will adversely impact on the ability of the land to absorb heavy rainfall. Building on open land in the vicinity will only worsen these problems.

A 30% increase in local housing will overwhelm the Horsley Medical Centre which is already operating at or beyond capacity – it can take 3-4 weeks to get a GP. It is unclear whether sufficient expansion is possible at the site given its proximity to a Designated Open Space (Kingston Meadow) and to the nearby storm drain. Car parking capacity at the Village Hall and Medical Centre is already insufficient to meet demand, and Kingston Avenue is frequently congested by overflow car parking.

Similarly the 30% increase in housing will place unacceptable strain on local public transport – the infrequent bus services to Guildford and Leatherhead, and the train services to Guildford and No increase is possible in car parking at Horsley Station (due to lack of land), in train size (due to platform limits) or in rush hour train frequency (due to capacity constraints at Clapham Junction).

The 30% increase in housing will exacerbate road congestion problems on local roads and particularly the B2039 Ockham Automatic traffic surveys by Surrey County Council on the B2039 regularly report peak hour traffic flows approaching 80% of the peak traffic flow on the main A246 – this on a minor road which in places is too narrow to permit two HGVs to pass safely and is too narrow even to justify its B-road classification according to Department of Transport standards. There is no practical scope to widen the road or provide alternative routes for the significant increases in car traffic and heavy traffic which will result from placing high density housing development on the outskirts of the villages.

None of these developments can therefore be regarded as ‘sustainable’ and they should be withdrawn from the Plan for the reasons given above.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3184</th>
<th>Respondent: 8953025 / Peter R Dawson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly object to the proposal to add 385 new homes within the parish of West Horsley and further I object to the proposal to build 100 homes in East Horsley close to the railway near to East Horsley Station, but adjacent to parts of West Horsley.

I object to the proposals on the grounds that the villages do not have the infrastructure to service the homes proposed; that is insufficient water, electricity, gas and sewerage. In addition there is no provision for extra school places, at all levels the schools are over subscribed, nor plans to expand medical provision. The current road network is based on roads which remain country lanes, founded in the days of horse and cart, are narrow, without safe pedestrian footpaths and because of the increasing heavy use are even now breaking up.

If Guildford Borough Planning department was of a mind to develop and plan the development of the borough and region in a meaningful and positive way it would start with planning improvements and expansion of the infrastructure. If the planning department was a business it would fail as it has not thought through or planned for the development it is proposing. The way it is going about the plan will lead to the Borough trying to develop without sufficient income to service the plans. The proposals do not demand that developers contribute meaningful sums to the infrastructure development. Crazy!

I object to the plan as the housing density proposed is much higher than anywhere in the parishes and while the parishes do not need more large 4-5 bed houses, but smaller 2-3 , particularly 2 bed maisonettes, and terraced houses so that
younger people can live in the area, with green space between the blocks to maintain the garden feel of the parishes. In
some locations, perhaps near railway embankments 4-5 floored blocks of flats of interesting design could be built.

It is time that Guildford Borough acknowledged that a good part of the housing need could be met by the development of
high rise buildings in the centre of Guildford, such as the railway redevelopment proposals. Other areas are also suitable.
As towns develop into cities their centres go up. Centres of the Guildford suburbs could also rise higher to perhaps 5/6
storeys.

I object to the plan as Guildford Borough Council has not demonstrated joined up policies for car parking, access to
shopping areas, development of local shopping opportunities rather than their reduction. There has to be access to shops
and parking and parking availability to increase footfall. This is necessary while transport locally is geared to the motor
car. Busses are like trains they cannot go everywhere so many people will not use them and then they are uneconomic.

I object to the proposed plan for its impact on the green belt and in particular on the Surrey Hills ANOB, which abuts and
is part of the parishes of East and West Horsley.

I also object to the plan as there is no or little indication of where the new residents will likely find employment to enable
them to live in the new houses planned. The Railways are already at capacity as are the local trunk roads and there is no
surplus parking space at any of the local railway stations. As we are likely to continue to use the motorcar for personal
transport and with buses rather like trains in that they only travel on limited routes the current plans will increase
pollution in the atmosphere and increase Global Warming.

These local plan proposals have not been well thought out and must be rejected.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/145  Respondent: 8956481 / A J Thompson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

Detailed comments relating to West Horsley

I approve the removal of Site 41 from the plan but the total of 295 homes proposed for the village is still substantially
excessive. It would destroy the rural nature of the village and overwhelm its infrastructure.

I object in particular to Policy A37. Bell & Colvill already have permission for nine houses on the site of their workshop
and adjacent property; this is reasonable as it is brownfield land and provides homes of a size needed in the village. The
proposal in the plan to expand this onto adjacent Green Belt land and increase the number of homes to 40 is totally
unacceptable. It would involve high density development in a conservation area within 500m of at least five listed
properties. I object most strongly.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1489  Respondent: 8962369 / Barbara Nourhan  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
West Horsley should be kept within the Green belt for the following reasons:

1. It is within the flood plain of the Hogs back and suffers severe flooding when heavy rain occurs, we hence need to restrain building and allow open green space to absorb the water.
2. The local population has no demand for large houses with developers making profits, sometimes with the promised, often ignored, of providing infrastrcture. The only demand in W.H. is for small houses for Down – Sizing for older people and young village people to live in and not to provide for immigrants from London and who will not be part of village life but work in London and commute daily on the congested and polluted A3 and M25 or over loaded trains.
3. The demand for housing is in London where many properties are empty and owned not for living in but as investment or to provide safe havens for foreigners when life in their own countries becomes difficult. West Horsley is an historic village with ancient woodland many listed buildings, both medieval and more modern heritage
4. Open land is required for agriculture grazing horse riding, rural activities, cycling (W.H. is on the route for the well-known prudential cycle race). Being near the famous RHS Wisley gardens WH continues the Green Lung needed for wild life such as cuckoos swallows barn owls etc.
5. The green belt was instigated to stop urban sprawl which is exactly what is proposed now by GBC in its local plan. The recent referendum shows that people will react in the end when the establishment ignores the wishes of the majority. West Horsley and the surrounding villages say no,no,no to building in the green belt.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1242  Respondent: 8988353 / Fenella Harrison  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

We have been without internet for three days now: I am reduced to having to Send this 'snailmail'.

I object most strongly to the content of this new local plan. I have lived in the A.O.N.B of West Horsley parish for over 32 years and have special knowledge of the area. I have read the objections of West Horsley Parish Council to the plan, and those of the Horsley countryside preservation society (H.C.P.S) most carefully and fully endorse them. I shall not repeat all their well grounded objections here. West Horsley is an ancient, rural village in London's Green Belt, with two attractive pubs and an ancient network of public rights of way, enjoyed by outsiders, It also has over 40 listed buildings. Most councillors and planners will be completely oblivious to the amenity value of the whole village.

Beatrix Potter, the children's Peter Rabbit author, frequently stayed where I live with her favourite uncle, Sir Henry Roscoe and his wife Lucy Potter. The latter, gave the land to build West Horsley's village (see the plaque there). A huge number of tourists and visitors (and horses and cyclists) pass through this lovelace farming hamlet at 600 up. I often stop them. Nearly always they have come up here from the village itself, the railway stations or the sheepleas. Situated as it is between Horsley Railway station to the east and East Clandon to the west, our village is a vital gateway to the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Look at any road map and your will see the largely uninhabited area between the A246 to the north and the A25 to the south: West Horsley leads to it.
This is exactly what the Green Belt is for: for the enjoyment of others. It is not pure Nimbyism which leads to the general outrage with which G.B.C's ignorant proposals have met.

Though now conservative councillors can in all conscience vote against the Green Belt, and in favour of “insetting” is a mystery. It seems to me that the top echelons of GBC are in thrall to developers, land speculators and all while the main body of decent councillors have become mindless sheep. Will GBC be back in Private Eye etc as a rotten borough? I hope not.

Now that West Horsley is to be the site of a prestigious opera house (Grange Park) at West Horsley place- landed even by the Head of S.C.C- surely it is not right to fill up this village with 35% more homes?

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

Attached documents:
• I found little evidence that there are concrete plans to address the capacity of local schools, car parks, medical facilities and other public amenities that the residents of Horsley rely on. The local roads are already in a very poor state in many places as it is.
• The scope of the proposed development at Wisley will impact the traffic (access to/from the A3) and local amenities enormously.
• The rationale behind the number of new homes proposed for West Horsley seems very opaque and ill thought through – it will completely change a rural village into a mini-town.

I do hope that you will listen to people’s concerns and revise the plan again. Many of us accept that new homes are needed but at the expense of changing the face of established communities so utterly.

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

Attached documents:
9. In addition to the houses in West Horsley a further 140 are proposed for East Horsley, 400 at Ripley and over 2000 at Wisley Airport. These will all impact on West Horsley and alter the nature and character of the villages in this beautiful part of Surrey causing congestion ion and pollution.

10. On most of the sites proposed there are many mature trees which contribute greatly to the environment and beautiful aspect of this lovely old established village and many of these would inevitably be filled to the detriment of the GREEN BELT.

I would further like to point out that the Council's claim, in its own newspaper "ABOUT GUILDFORD" Summer 2016, that the plan seeks to give protection to the Green Belt making use of brown field sites first is A SHAM and this relates to WEST HORSLEY AND THE WHOLESALE DESTRUCTION OF ITS GREEN BELT LAND in particular.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3920  Respondent: 9045857 / Aaron Keddie  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Specifically, I am concerned and want to register my objections to the following:

1. **Removal of the villages from Greenbelt status:** The exceptional circumstances required before removing an area from the Green Belt has not be sufficiently demonstrated and the plans go against the recent instruction for areas within the M25 from Sadiq Khan for “no development on Green Belt land to be approved”. In a world were it is widely known that man is having a detrimental impact on the environment, why would we want to exacerbate and further contribute to the downward trend leaving a poorer world for our future generations to inhabit.

2. **Scale of proposed housing:** The inflated number of new houses proposed would give a population increase which is almost 70% higher than the official nation estimates for population growth in the borough. The scale of this increase is alarming - an increase of 35% in existing West Horsley households - greater than any other single area in the borough.

3. I object to the inadequate proposals around infrastructure which accompany the proposed substantial increase in housing in the borough. Specifically,

   1. **Traffic and Parking:** There is the potential for an additional 6000 or more cars within a 3 mile radius of the villages. This will make the already busy, narrow roads and lanes even busier, increasing the chance of accidents with people flying through the village at speed. The stations, shops and medical centre are already at capacity for parking and will not be able to cope with the additional volume. Finally, the very poor condition of our roads, which already cause damage and additional upkeep to our vehicles, will only increase due to volume and use.

   2. **Schools:** Local schools are already at capacity and no extra places are planned as part of the Local Plan development proposals. We live just 1 mile away from The Raleigh School in West Horsley and struggled to get our daughter into the village school due to the already high demand. Where do you propose all the additional children go to school?

   3. **Medical facilities:** The local doctor’s surgery is already at capacity and no extra facilities are planned as part of the Local Plan development proposals. With an increasingly elderly and very young population, sufficient medical facilities are critical.

   4. **Transport:** The commuting trains to London are already full and recent issues across the rail networks will only increase and affect more and more of us as commuter volume of use increases.

OVERALL I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN
As a resident in the village of West Horsley, I have carefully reviewed the Proposed Submission Local Plan which Guildford Borough Council has published for public consultation. My comments and objections are set out in this email.

Specifically, I am concerned and want to register my objections to the following:

1. I object to the scale of the proposed house building programme in the area, which is considerably larger than the previous plan proposed back in 2014 and over double that proposed back in 2003. The volume of houses proposed in this Local Plan would transform the character of the borough from mainly rural/Green Belt to urban.

2. I object to the inadequate proposals around infrastructure which accompany the proposed substantial increase in housing in the borough. Specifically,
   1. **Traffic and Parking:** There is the potential for an additional 6000 or more cars within a 3 mile radius of the villages. This will make the already busy, narrow roads and lanes even busier, increasing the chance of accidents with people flying through the village at speed. The stations, shops and medical centre are already at capacity for parking and will not be able to cope with the additional volume. Finally, the very poor condition of our roads, which already cause damage and additional upkeep to our vehicles, will only increase due to volume and use.
   2. **Schools:** Local schools are already at capacity and no extra places are planned as part of the Local Plan development proposals. We live just 1 mile away from The Raleigh School in West Horsley and struggled to get our daughter into the village school due to the already high demand. Where do you propose all the additional children go to school?
   3. **Medical facilities:** The local doctor’s surgery is already at capacity and no extra facilities are planned as part of the Local Plan development proposals. With an increasingly elderly and very young population, sufficient medical facilities are critical.
   4. **Transport:** The commuting trains to London are already full and recent issues across the rail networks will only increase and affect more and more of us as commuter volume of use increases.

3. I object to the Local Plan as it does not consider the impact on the Guildford Green Belt. 65% of new houses planned for the borough are to be built on Green Belt land. This goes against the recent instruction from Sadiq Khan for “no development on Green Belt land to be approved within the M25”. The proposed development programme will be sure to leave no rural communities for generations to come to enjoy and be part of which is criminal.
Yet again I write to express my horror at the Guildford Local Plan 2017 with regards to its effect on East & West Horsley and Ockham. It is utterly stupid to consider the vast quantity of housing you are recommending in your plan which will ruin our lives, yes that is most people's view. Do you not take notice of 300,000 objections to expansion into the Green Belt, which you already have? Clearly little notice is taken of objections and "common sense" has not been used. Please please do give more thought to your proposals. You know that the infrastructure of these areas was not built to take what we already have, let alone what you now propose. It seems pointless to go into detail as one gets the feeling that it not given proper consideration. The long and short of it is that this area is not suitable to take the proposals that you are considering. I and a vast number of people are strongly against it, please do give it more practical and sensible consideration.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2877  Respondent: 9046657 / Susan Finch  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am concerned about the number of houses that are wanting to be built in West Horsley, where I live with my family. I understand that some houses have to be built as it's working progress but not an extra 420! I'm concerned with the extra number of cars which will be on the road and the pollution, the roads aren't made for lots of cars, East Lane is in desperate need of being resurfaced, the turning by Ockham Road.

Where are all the extra children going to go to school? there are no places at the Raleigh and the Howard of Effingham. Drs appointments? The trains are already full, where are all the extra passengers going to go?

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1642  Respondent: 9047265 / Clare Hewlett  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I object to the proportionally large scale proposed development of West Horsley. An approximate increase of 35% , greater than any other single area within the borough. It would make more sense to increase the population in less sensitive urbanised areas where the infrastructure, especially transport and employment are to be found and brownfield sites can be used.
• You are incorrect to split West Horsley in two – it is one village with a separate character to that of East Horsley.
• The facilities in the village (West Horsley), such as they exist, (one shop, no Post Office, a very limited bus service, an oversubscribed primary school) cannot support a high number of new homes.
• East Horsley cannot be described as Rural District Centre on the basis that it has a ‘large supermarket’. Budgens is treated as a small shop or convenience store ( less than 280m2) under the terms of the Sunday Trading Act 1994. Did the consultants visit the place?

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? ( )

**Green Belt**

I am appalled at the proposal to remove land from the Green Belt. This is against policy. The conservatives stood at the last election on a green belt protection pledge.

The manifesto says: “ - ensure local people have more control over planning and protect the Green Belt” That says it all.

There is no valid exceptional circumstance to make removing land from the green belt acceptable.

**Infrastructure**

- Our **roads** could not cope with an increase of so many extra cars due to so many new houses.

- Our amenities are for a small village. **Parking** at the shops would become a nightmare?

- Our **Railway Station** would not cope with such an increase in parking requirement.

- Our **Medical centre** is barely large enough to deal with the current population.

- Our **bus service** is already very poor.

**Flooding**

I believe there is plan to build on the area which suffers from flooding. The roads in this area already flood easily. **Building here can only make matters worse.**

**Schools**

The **Raleigh School is too small** for such a population increase. I believe there is a plan to move the school to another site. I believe this is also a flawed plan. If anything, the Raleigh should stay where it is and a plan is required to build another school if required.

The loss of Green belt is NOT ACCEPTABLE.

I am not in favour of the draft Local plan
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/325  Respondent: 9052129 / Sue Wright  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

General Observations about West Horsley

• There is a lack of state primary school places in the village, so if particularly social housing were built, where would these children attend school?

• Secondary school places are limited, we were under threat of our child attending the Bishop David Brown rather than the Howard when he was 11!

• Cranmore and Glensesk parking and traffic cause many traffic problems at various times of the day and on certain evening and weekend open days and events without more children attending.

• The Medical Centre in East Horsley serves both East & West Horsley and as a working couple we have extreme difficulty in getting an appointment to see any doctor early or late in the day, let alone our own GP. How would this cope with some 385 extra households in West Horsley let alone those planned for East Horsley?

• There is virtually no public transport through the village – from our property it’s a good half mile walk to the nearest bus stop along an unlit road, this would apply to the site earmarked for 120 homes near the Ockham Road North.

• The bus service to Guildford stops only at Bell & Colville roundabout so is pretty inaccessible to most villagers.

• There is limited parking at East Horsley station for those wishing to commute.

• Most households would have 2, if not 3, cars which would put an intolerable strain on the roads.

• Drainage – this is poor in the area, anyone walking along Ockham Road North on a rainy day will know the footpaths are puddle ridden and heaven help you when a car passes.

• As previously mentioned, the manhole covers lift in wet weather – in Green Lane we have had raw sewage spill over the road in inclement weather presenting a health risk. If the 114 extra houses off Green Lane/Ockham Road North were built this would be much worse.

• We have few facilities within West Horsley, with just a couple of shops and very little parking.

• West Horsley residents need to use East Horsley’s facilities e.g. shops, library, doctors and there is limited parking there too.

• The additional housing would no doubt bring with it a huge amount of extra traffic and currently the roads in the village are already ptholet bound in many places, with no sign of repairs being made.

All in all, this is an unsatisfactory plan for the village and representation should be made to keep East & West Horsley firmly in the Green Belt and resist this excessive housing plan.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3804  Respondent: 9052673 / Beverley Nash  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. **OBJECT** to the proposal to inset East Horsley from the Green Belt. The proposal to inset East Horsley from the Green Belt will be detrimental to the rural character of the village and should be dropped. The specific changes proposed are not justified under the National Planning Policy Framework rules. The local infrastructure is also already overloaded and will not be able to cope with the large number of new houses proposed.

2. I strongly oppose and **OBJECT** to the proposal to remove Fangate Manor from the Green Belt and include it within the Settlement Boundary. There are no exceptional Planning circumstances to justify removing Fangate Manor from the Green Belt, and changing the Settlement Boundary does not in any way enhance the defensible nature of the Settlement Boundary. It merely involves moving the boundary from one hedgerow to another, but leads to the loss of Green Belt and agricultural land.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4100</th>
<th>Respondent: 9054433 / George Rushton</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>

**Re: Objections to new Guildford Local Plan**

We have lived in West Horsley for over 25 years and write to object to the new Guildford Local Plan as follows:

1. The exceptional circumstances required to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt have not been demonstrated.

1. Our infrastructure is already overloaded with too many cars on our roads, stretched medical facilities etc.

1. In particular, the Ramada (Thatchers) Hotel development will rob the villages of much needed hotel beds and destroy an important building which has long been an important part of the character of the Horsleys.

1. It appears that the Bell & Colville development at least maintains the garage building, another important local icon which must be protected. However, the traffic around the Bell & Colville roundabout is particularly bad with long queues and the addition of a further 40 homes and 40+ cars accessing the road at that point will make a bad situation worse and should, therefore, be rejected.

1. As we understand it a company called Dandara are lobbying to have the fields to the south of Epsom Road reinserted for development. We should be strongly opposed to such a move which would represent a dangerous incursion of additional development into an area where it is critical for further major building to be avoided if the Horsleys are to maintain any semblance of rural character and the Surrey Hills are to 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: PSLPA16/879</th>
<th>Respondent: 9056705 / Linda Crawford</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>
As a resident of West Horsley I would like to object to the Local Plan 2016. My reasons are listed below:

**HOUSING**

I note that the Horsley’s have various sites marked for new housing totalling approximately 533 in number. Can anybody tell me why the Horsley’s, especially West Horsley, has been unfairly targeted for development? I understand that 40% of these homes have to be affordable. I would like to ask the question — what price is affordable in the Horsley’s when most of the homes in the village are in excess of national average figures? Developers are loathe to build affordable housing as their profit margin is low. The need for all of these affordable homes is not proven. The West Horsley Parish Council and Surrey Community Action Housing Survey in May 2014 identified a need for only 20 affordable homes within the village. It prompts me to ask how the figures for new housing are reached!

It would be a better alternative to build **small** new developments with a slightly different mix of houses on brown field land.

The proposed Wisley airfield development of in excess of 2000 homes would add to the sprawl and I anticipate a conservative estimate of 5000 to 6000 residents moving onto this site, flooding the roads. How is the entire infrastructure of the villages going to be able to cope with such large numbers?

The National Planning Policy Framework requires that new residential development **MUST** respect the character and density of housing in the area and be limited in quantity by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities.

The same policy states that “As with Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in **very special circumstances**.”

This leads me on to the

**INFRASTRUCTURE**

Our village is made up of mainly narrow country lanes not suitable for the number of cars that would be on the roads if all of the new building was to go ahead. The roads are not suitable for major traffic and are often flooded. Thames Water has advised Guildford Borough Council that it may not be able to support the demand for all of these developments and that the foul drainage system works would need to be upgraded in order to cope. Could someone please let me know if the developers are going to pay towards this cost or are we as Guildford council tax payers having to pay for something that very few of us want or need.

The local schools are full; traffic levels at certain times of the day are excessive. At school times the Raleigh school causes major congestion and parking problems and is an “accident waiting to happen.”

The only Doctors’ surgery in Horsley is full and the small local shops not easily accessible due to the limited parking. Transport links within the village are poor, buses commencing at 9am and running every hour. New houses would mean hundreds of additional cars using the lanes to access the M25 and A3. Has anyone looked at junction 10 on the M25 not just at peak times but also during the day? The roads are at a standstill and cannot cope with more traffic especially if the Wisley Airfield were to be developed with 2100 houses. Horsley railway station car park is normally full and as there is very little employment within the area, it is quite clear to see that most people need to travel by car or rail as the bus service is not suitable.

**GREEN BELT**

In setting of the villages would create an urban sprawl of housing and would be an extension of Guildford/Leatherhead. The villages would be “no more” but become large towns. The Green Belt is precious, should be protected and villages not inset. To remove most of the Borough’s Villages from the Green Belt would change the nature of this area of countryside forever and would eventually merge historic and separate villages. It would be an environmental outrage.

The Green Belt preserves air quality, prevents flooding and is a joy to those that live in large towns and thus should be for us to conserve and protect it.
The residents of West Horsley are opposed to the village’s removal from the Green Belt by insetting and extending the 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area boundaries. There are no exceptional circumstances for building on the Green Belt as the Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2031 states that “there is no case for large numbers of homes in West or East Horsley or neighbouring villages.”

There is brownfield land available in the town centre which is being earmarked for commercial development rather than for housing. This is enough to meet our real needs for affordable local homes. There are enough vacant commercial sites to cope with genuine business need, and we have enough retail capacity already, so urban brownfield/derelict land should be used for housing.

For all of these reasons I must once again state that I object to the Local Plan 2016.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4211  Respondent: 9066625 / Kate Palmer  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am writing to oppose the above plan and what it means for the Horsleys.

As a resident of West Horsley I am horrified at the thought of building another 385 houses. We moved here because it was in the green belt, we moved here because of the beautiful countryside, a wonderful place to raise our children. To build a further 385 houses will completely change this village, making it a very different place to that of when we moved here. It will lose its wonderful community feel, a huge reason why we want live here.

My understanding is that there needs to be 'exceptional circumstances' to take us out of the green belt. Everyone in the village is wondering what these are? To my knowledge none have been communicated. This opens up our village to any number of problems with developers ruining our countryside, taking away such beautiful countryside enjoyed by so many in the village and outside of it.

If these plans did get through, surely there would have to be further plans to support this many houses, increasing further building. Our school is one example, the village already suffers with waiting lists for the Raleigh school. My family personally suffered when our son could not get into the school for two years, we live just over a mile away and were forced to use a school out of the village. Building these houses will have a huge impact on the school and local children will suffer. Building another school will not help, it's just more building and more houses on the original sight!

The medical centre is already stretched. Roads will hugely suffer.

Building these houses will be devastating to myself and my family. It is wrong for the Horsleys to be removed from the Green belt.

Furthermore, the development of over 2000 houses in Ockham will also put a huge strain on our village

I know you will have received so many emails repeating what I have said. I am sure many can quote all the facts and figures in a better way than myself. What is important is that almost everyone in this village is against this plan proposing such an alarming increase in housing

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

Attached documents:
This is a proposal that will have a hugely significant effect on West Horsley and I strongly object for the following reasons:

This village is no longer a quiet rural backwater. There are heavy volumes of traffic and the existing roads are badly maintained and can barely cope. A 35% increase in the existing number of houses will obviously lead to significant further difficulties.

The general infrastructure is now stretched to capacity. The medical centre can barely cope, the railway carpark is full at peak times.

There is no additional capacity at the Raleigh school nor any of the other local state schools.

 Guildford Borough Council must stand up to Central Government and reject this plan otherwise West Horsley will be irreparably damaged.

Enough serious damage has already been caused by infills and the construction of dwellings which are entirely unsympathetic to their surroundings. An outstanding example of this is the vulgar monstrosity constructed recently behind Charles Cottage in Silkmore Lane.

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

Attached documents:
In addition to the tragedy that would the the removal of the Horsleys from the Green Belt, the following is also true:

- an increase of housing by 385 homes is totally out of any sensible proportion.

- schools and station car park (and even the village centre car parks) at at maximum capacity now and a big increase in houses will cause huge problems in these areas.

- the proposed sites in the villages are a much higher density than the village is now, and therefore not in keeping with the village feel.

That said, I understand some level of development is necessary and I have made suggestions in my previous letter. 40 houses maybe, not 400!

Please focus on opportunities to develop in and around the towns and keep our borough villages great and green! Any other approach would be a disgrace.

I object to the building of new houses proposed in West and East Horsley (and the Wisley airfield for that matter) on the following grounds.

1. our daughter is 9th on the waiting list for our nearest Horsley school (The Raleigh). How much worse will it get?
2. I often cannot park at Horsley station. How much worse will it get? This is a commuter belt. You will make it impossible for people to live and work here.
3. We moved to the area for green fields, amenity space and fresh air. We chose not to live in Suburbia. You are proposing to allow the beginnings of urban sprawl.
4. As a Geography graduate, who studied Ebenezer Howard's 'Garden cities of Tomorrow' I am a real believer in Green Belt's as a mechanism for preventing the aforementioned urban sprawl, which allows amenity for city dwellers, (London) as much as for those who live in the villages and settlements within the green belt. Just because Govt allows building in the Green Belt, does not mean councils should be so short-sighted. The green belt helps sustain the AONB of the Surrey Hills in this area.
5. There are more appropriate sites, which are closer to towns, or more built-up and would be less radically affected by building works.
6. Traffic along the busy roads of the Street, Ockham Road N and S, and the roads through Clandon would increase - they are already fast and over-congested given the number of properties which are directly accessed from them - and the number of cyclists who choose this area for their sport.

7. There is a need for affordable housing. The houses in the Horsley's, on the open market, would soon not be affordable. This is a wealthy area and inappropriate to meet that need.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/399  Respondent: 9072609 / Jane Brider  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I write to register my objections to the above.

1. I wish to object to West Horsley being removed from the Green Belt as it is and ANOB and part of the Surrey Hills.

1. I would like it noted that in Policy P2 it states "We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt against inappropriate development". I believe that the proposals are inappropriate development.

1. As a former resident of Northcote Crescent, West Horsley and a victim of sewage flooding I am well aware of the failings in the local drainage system and to my knowledge none or very little has been done to improve this. As such there is no capability to take more waste away from any new development in the area.

1. Also living by The Raleigh School I know that there is no more capacity to expand on the current site to accept a bigger intake.

1. Transports links are very limited and as many roads merge into one lane in East and West Horsley at some point they would be unsuitable to take more cars let alone more buses.

1. Few roads have pavements so for those walking safety would be compromised by more vehicles on single lane local roads.

1. Our local shop is closing, one of the reasons being the lack of parking for customers and no prospect of increasing parking, another of our essential facilities gone, along with our local Post Office in West Horsley.

1. Long waiting times at Horsley Medical Centre, these would only increase with a larger patient list. It would also effect to those needing the Royal Surrey Hospital and other medical services as waiting times would therefore be longer as more people living in the areas.

1. I do not believe that so many houses are needed and believe that a limited amount of affordable homes may be required for the young and elderly of West Horsley. A conclusion made by The West Horsley Parish Council and Surrey Community Action Housing Survey: May 2014.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3475  Respondent: 9096129 / Jane Wilkes  Agent:
I am writing to object to the new Guildford Local Plan currently out for consultation. My objection relates to the plans in respect of East and West Horsley and is as follows:

- I do not believe that there are any exceptional circumstances which would warrant removing these 2 villages from the Green Belt;
- I do not believe that the village boundaries should be enlarged; and
- I am strongly opposed to the proposed 500+ new homes as the existing infrastructure is already overloaded and will not be able to cope with the additional demands that would arise eg schools, transport, doctor's surgery etc and furthermore this number of new homes is such a significant increase on the existing number that the character of the village would inevitably change for the worse.

I therefore strongly object to the proposals for West and East Horsley contained within the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategies and Sites June 2016.

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

Attached documents:

I OBJECT

To the influx of thousands more families with school age children, when our local junior school, The Raleigh, is full and they want to move to a larger site now! If they took one of your sites and you took over their 2 sites, at least the planners would have a few hundred more houses and the school would be able to accommodate more new children, but only a few! Not the hundreds you propose to bring into our little villages.

We are villages, people want to move here, as we did because of the quiet, the fields, the village atmosphere, and the safety of a village.

I OBJECT

there is no infrastructure which has been confirmed.

The flood plans in these areas get flooded every winter. West Horsley is known for being a flood plain area, totally unsuitable for hundreds more houses.

Thames Water has advised that the current wastewater network is unlikely to support the demand from all these developments!

I OBJECT
To the overcrowding at our shops, we have two little parades of shops for the use of the two villages, not thousands more people using them. There is only limited parking, only one little supermarket, Budgens, and no access to any larger supermarket.

The train does not take us into Cobham centre, only Stoke D'Abernen, miles away from the Cobham town Centre, how do all these new people get to ships?

We have no bus which has a regular timetable to Cobham, our nearest town, there would have to be in place public transport regularly into Cobham and Guildford.

I OBJECT

To the state of our roads when thousands more people will be using them. The Drift, which is a narrow lane from West Horsley to Effingham, is already used by lorries, coaches from the schools, and many local businesses, it is full of potholes from constant use, how is that going to cope?

All our roads are narrow, we are a village, the drainage is already a problem through the village every winter.

BROWNFIELD ARE BEING IGNORED

We need more houses in the centre of towns, not out in our villages, therefore using more cars, more pollution, more congestion on our already crowded roads.

Recycle derelict and urban land.

I OBJECT

to the proposed planning of hundreds of houses in the West Horsley and East Horsley villages.

I wish to register objections to the local plan job 13,860 new proposed houses, as not sustainable.

There will be damage to local communities, these will not be villages any more.

We need to check unrestricted sprawl of large buildup areas, We need to protect our Green Belt land and fields.

We live here because it is a village and surrounded by green fields and farmland.

We like the village atmosphere, knowing our neighbours and meeting them in our villages, being part of a small community.

I OBJECT

To the huge influx of traffic this planning will cause.

Our little country roads cannot cope with the traffic as it is. The condition of our local roads is Appalling! Pot holes everywhere, causing dangerous driving, trying to avoid the holes, damaging cars.

We have narrow country roads, not suitable for hundreds more ‘large family cars’.

We don’t want yellow/white lines all over our village and road signs, which are quite unnecessary, which will only increase with your planning proposals.

I OBJECT

To the lack of facilities suitable for thousands more people using our Doctors Surgery.
We cannot get an appointment within a week as it is, there is nowhere to expand the Surgery, are you planning to build another?

The local hospital The Royal Surrey is overcrowded already, there is nowhere else for us in our villages for go.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1202  Respondent: 9101505 / Frances O'Gorman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

As a lifelong resident of West Horsley having been born and educated in the area, I wish to register my personal objection to the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategies and Sites June 2016.

The proposal is for far too many homes for a village that is already at the limits of a sustainable infrastructure. The schools in West Horsley were full when I went there some years ago with road access for cars being difficult and public transport being inadequate.

The possibility that part of West Horsley could be removed from the Green Belt by using the now known to be incorrect Green Belt and Countryside Study is wholly inappropriate and I object to this as being totally unnecessary.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/611  Respondent: 9102145 / Mary Watson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Policy A41/Policy A40/Policy A38 and Policy A37

The Local Plan has suggested a 35% increase in housing for West Horsley by 2022 and only 11% for Guildford Town. Why is this? The village has no shops, no post office, no petrol station, no train station, no medical centre and a very limited bus service. It also offers no employment opportunities for residents. The National Planning Policy Framework requires that new residential development must be limited in quantity by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities – this policy has been ignored in the Local Plan.

The density of houses on the proposed sites is completely out of keeping with the rest of the village and will change the character of the village forever. The National Planning Policy Framework requires that new residential development must respect the character and density of housing in the area – this policy has been ignored in the Local Plan.

Removing West Horsley from the Green Belt

What is the exceptional circumstance for removing the village from the green belt as required under government guidelines? It cannot be justified on the basis of unfulfilled housing. There is no explanation as to why West Horsley has been chosen to be removed and no justification for doing so. The Local Plan states the “we will continue to protect the
Metropolitan Green Belt”yet the Local Plan is taking West Horsley out of the Green Belt. West Horsley is a distinctive rural village and its green belt status is essential to ensuring the character of the village remains.

Please take my objections seriously and reconsider your plans for West Horsley.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3179  Respondent: 9102209 / C Dawson  Agent:

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

Guildford Borough Council – Proposed Submission Local Plan

As a long time resident of West Horsley and earlier of Ockham, I write to Object to the proposals set out in the above proposed local plan as they affect The Horsleys, Ripley, Send and Ockham.

I strongly object to the proposed removal of West and East Horsley from the green belt. The villages are well into the green Belt, are not adjacent to any non green belt urban areas and it would be incongruous to have Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) within or adjacent to urban areas.

I strongly object to the proposal to add 385 new homes within the parish of West Horsley and further I object to the proposal to build 100 homes in East Horsley close to the railway near to East Horsley Station, but adjacent to parts of West Horsley.

I object to the proposals on the grounds that the villages do not have the infrastructure to service the homes proposed; that is insufficient water, electricity, gas and sewerage. In addition there is no provision for extra school places, at all levels the schools are over subscribed, nor plans to expand medical provision. The current road network is based on roads which remain country lanes, founded in the days of horse and cart, are narrow, without safe pedestrian footpaths and because of the increasing heavy use are even now breaking up.

If Guildford Borough Planning department was of a mind to develop and plan the development of the borough and region in a meaningful and positive way it would start with planning improvements and expansion of the infra structure. If the planning department was a business it would fail as it has not thought through or planned for the development it is proposing. The way it is going about the plan will lead to the Borough trying to develop without sufficient income to service the plans. The proposals do not demand that developers contribute meaningful sums to the infrastructure development. Crazy!

I object to the plan as the housing density proposed is much higher than anywhere in the parishes and while the parishes do not need more large 4-5 bed houses, but smaller 2-3 , particularly 2 bed maisonneutes, and terraced houses so that younger people can live in the area, with green space between the blocks to maintain the garden feel of the parishes. In some locations, perhaps near railway embankments 4-5 floored blocks of flats of interesting design could be built.

It is time that Guildford Borough acknowledged that a good part of the housing need could be met by the development of high rise buildings in the centre of Guildford, such as the railway redevelopment proposals. Other areas are also suitable. As towns develop into cities their centres go up. Centres of the Guildford suburbs could also rise higher to perhaps 5/6 storeys.

I object to the plan as Guildford Borough Council has not demonstrated joined up policies for car parking, access to shopping areas, development of local shopping opportunities rather than their reduction. There has to be access to shops
I object to the proposed plan for its impact on the green belt and in particular on the Surrey Hills ANOB, which abuts and is part of the parishes of East and West Horsley.

I also object to the plan as there is no or little indication of where the new residents will likely find employment to enable them to live in the new houses planned. The Railways are already at capacity as are the local trunk roads and there is no surplus parking space at any of the local railway stations. As we are likely to continue to use the motorcar for personal transport and with buses rather like trains in that they only travel on limited routes the current plans will increase pollution in the atmosphere and increase Global Warming.

These local plan proposals have not been well thought out and must be rejected.

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

**Attached documents:**
local Primary School and there are annual arguments over catchment areas between the local villages just to get children into the nearest Secondary Schools. The proposals do not address these problems adequately they would just make them worse and mean parents would have to drive their children to schools many miles away. What about hospital and Dr surgery?

The increase in housing will also strain the services infrastructure, local sewage and drainage requirements are overloaded as can be seen after a heavy downpour water floods over Ripley Lane and The Street between the Railway Bridge and Long Reach due to many natural springs in the area. Localised flooding will of course be compounded by the proposed new homes the plans take no account of this.

A couple of years ago heavy construction lorries were employed at Jury Farm for a couple of months in Ripley Lane and the Road was structurally damaged as a consequence and has still not been satisfactorily repaired. Building in the local area on the scale proposed will never be made good by the construction companies lining up to build on nice Green Field Sites.

I note that in the latest version of the local plan that the Station Parade in East Horsley has been designated a District Centre which is incorrectly identifying the village facilities in order to justify inappropriate development of the area.

I urge the Council to-

a) Think again on a local scale and consider what is actually needed by the people living in the borough.

b) Go back to Central Government and seriously question the whole premise of this notional housing requirement. Do we really need so many houses in such a small area? when it will only compound the pressure on local facilities and have a major negative impact on the local environment, adversely affecting the quality of life of all those currently living around Guildford

I am sure that there is plenty of room for new housing and properties that could be refurbished in other parts of the country, without the impact to sensitive environmental and designated Green Belt or conservation areas where effort should be put to regenerate both jobs and industry supported by investment in affordable housing.

I really hope you take us serious and try to find a solution.

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

Attached documents:
I believe that the Government's housing pressures do not justify reducing the Green Belt any further and certainly not to the extent contemplated by the Local Plan especially in West Horsley. It's not just a question of allowing new houses on greenfield land but also whether the local infrastructure and amenities would be able to cope without destroying the whole character of the villages concerned. Once an area has been changed for the worse by erosion of the Green Belt it can't be changed back.

Surely there must be other areas outside the Green Belt that can be used to satisfy the Government's housing needs without burdening the local villages and their infrastructure. Shouldn't the Council be prioritizing the protection of the Green Belt and the interests of the existing residents who want it maintained?

*The local roads will simply not be able to cope with the increased traffic especially in the rush hours when there are already considerable traffic jams caused by commuters and parents taking their children to and from school. Ockham Road North and South and The Street/ East Lane would be totally inadequate to deal with the extra traffic.

* The car parking at Horsley Station and in the main shopping parade in East Horsley (that also serves West Horsley and Ockham) is barely adequate for the existing residents and could not cope with additional cars thus resulting in parking chaos.

*The Horsley Health Centre is already under considerable strain.

  - Where would all these new residents work? There are not enough job opportunities locally. Therefore, most of them would be using the A3 or Horsley Station. The A3 is already a nightmare in the rush hours and as mentioned there would be no parking available at the Station even if they could get through the traffic jams to get there. I am talking about an appalling congestion situation here.

  - Where would all the additional children go to school? At present there is less than adequate provision of school places for the local children who are in competition with children from outside the area for the places available. We need extra provision at all levels of the children's education, nursery, infant, junior and senior schools not just an extension of the Howard of Effingham school which caters for senior pupils only.

*The water and sewage drains are already in a poor state and would not be able to cope with the additional demands on them.

*Housing needs in this area have not yet been proven and certainly not to the extent to warrant a major intrusion of this scale on the Green Belt.

*I must also mention the proposed Wisley Airfield Development. Most of those residents will also use the A3 or Horsley or Effingham stations causing further congestion, air pollution and damage to the environment.

In conclusion I am appalled that the Council should even be considering a major increase of the population levels in villages like West Horsley, Bookham, Ockham and Effingham and the development of Wisley Airfield which alone will have a tremendous knock on effect on these villages particularly Ockham and East and West Horsley.

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

**Attached documents:**  

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1899</th>
<th>Respondent: 9314433</th>
<th>Daniel Colledge</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have reviewed the sites and development that have been identified in the Horsleys and have serious concerns over the following impacts that will be had on the two villages:

1. The area is greenbelt land (and adjacent if not within the Surrey Hills AONB), where it is required that “exceptional circumstances” should be the only reason that would allow this development to take place. No evidence has been provided of how “exceptional circumstances” have been met and it is difficult to see how this is the case. A nature area of great natural beauty will be taken away forever with these new large developments going ahead.

1. Plenty of opportunities exist elsewhere within the commuter belt (and inside the M25) where housing needs can be met with far less impact on an area of such natural beauty. These areas ad sites should be used prior to ruining the countryside in the UK which is constantly being put under threat before more appropriate sites are considered.

1. The development would ruin the nature of this AONB and green belt. It would be forever changed. Local flora and fauna, which are already so greatly under threat in England, would be placed under further pressure to relocate further afield or otherwise die off.

1. The infrastructure in the Horsley’s is not sufficient to deal with this level of development

The local school (Raleigh) is not able to support even the villages as they currently stand. We live in West Horsley and the catchment area does not even extend to our home. We have a 2 year-old daughter that will be applying for a school in a year’s time and will not fall within the area currently and will already need to look for schools outside our village. There are already 2,000 houses to be built in Ockham (Wisley airfield) which will put pressure on road and rail transport and other infrastructure in the area as it is, even before the Horsley developments have been considered. The roads are busy enough already and are narrow and will not be able to cope well with the huge influx in traffic that will be created.

If houses are to be developed, a new school, traffic lights, wider roads and other infrastructure would need to be planned for implementation at the same time as the completion of the houses if the plan were ever to even go ahead to reduce frustration and annoyance within the local community.

5. The increase in households proposed of up to 35% is the highest in the borough and in an area that would have the most detrimental impact on the AONB. This would more than likely make it unsustainable and the quantity of housing far exceeds the needs for the local area by some 70% over the official national estimates for population growth in the Borough.

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

Attached documents:
a large number of extra homes in West Horsley or elsewhere. For the purpose of this letter I am only concerned with the
Horsleys.

Furthermore the above strategic planning document makes no case for an extra 100 homes in East Horsley. And why the
Horsleys, given that new economic development sites are a long way from here on the other side of the Borough?

The 385 extra homes will further compound the 'planning' errors committed while I have lived in West Horsley. The last
40 years have seen significant infilling which has left West Horsley like a large housing estate with only 2 significant
non-farming businesses, and a couple of pubs. During this time, apart from a little tinkering, there have been no
significant infrastructure changes, and none are proposed now. The needs of the occupants of the proposed homes will
put an unsupportable burden on our roads, schools, medical facilities other infrastructure facilities. I therefore wish to
objet to the plans on this ground.

It is obvious from comparing the site sizes with the number of homes on each that the proposed homes will be both out of
keeping and of a significantly higher density than the current stock of housing in West Horsley. The whole character of
the place will change. Again, I wish to object.

I am most upset at the proposed funding of the Green Belt to enable Green Belt land in West Horsley to be built upon. The
intention of the Act was that Green Belt land would be protected from development in perpetuity. No exceptional
circumstances or other justification have been cited for this proposed 'insetting'. Please register my objection on all
these grounds.

From all the above you might conclude that I oppose all change for it's own sake. I do not. I accept that over time, West
Horsley will expand. If it is done organically, over time, and to meet proven needs, then so be it. What I do object to is
the spoiling of the place by increasing the housing stock by some 35%, almost overnight, to meet unproven need.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/673  Respondent: 9412065 / Stephen Bray  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 I have been a resident of West Horsley since 1992, the year my son was born, and for many years we lived in
Northcote Crescent next door to Raleigh School which my son attended for the full 7 years from Reception right through
Key Stage Two at age 11. I have since 2004 lived in Ripley Lane on the northern perimeter of the village, and my son has
now graduated through university with a masters degree and is in full time employment.

1.2 I have become increasingly concerned and dismayed at the apparent recent and continuing disintegration of the
village of West Horsley as an entity in its own right, and at its becoming more and more reliant on its near neighbour East
Horsley for essentials such as a Post Office, a newsagent, and a convenience store, all of which it has recently lost or is
about to lose. West Horsley-ites have long had to rely on The Medical Centre and Horsley railway station, both situated in
East Horsley, and both villages have recently lost all high street bank branches other than Lloyds also in East Horsley.

1.3 West Horsley is very much a village in its own right, separate and distinct from East Horsley by virtue of its history
and its semi-rural nature, points amongst others which were made by West Horsley Parish Council in its application to
Guildford Borough Council to be a Designated Neighbourhood Area in 2014, and which was accepted.
1.4 My concerns are now compounded by the prospect of a substantial number of new homes being sited in the village, but I also very much feel that the Local Plan should now be taken as an opportunity to improve this situation, with particular emphasis on community needs, spatial connections and inf

2.0 LOCAL PLAN POLICIES

2.1 S1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development:

2.1.1 I very much support the principle of a sustainable development policy generally, and in West Horsley specifically, which would assist in addressing my concerns for this village in particular as stated above. Key to this is “to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area”.

2.1.2 My present perception, however, is that the allocation of some 5 key sites for a substantial quantity of new housing within the village, without the attendant proposals for such as community needs, facilities and infrastructure to serve what will be a substantially increased population, would thus over-burden those facilities which do remain and place yet more reliance on the neighbouring village of East Horsley.

2.1.3 There is undoubtedly, in my view, a critical need to look at West Horsley as an inset village as being a place in design and townscape terms, bearing in mind the developments proposed.

2.1.4 The following sections in this consultation response attempt to potentially address these issues with some positive suggestions.

2.2 S2 - Spatial development strategy:

2.2.1 Whilst I applaud and support the statement of intent, I see no evidence in the draft Local Plan of a spatial development strategy for West Horsley itself. Again, the following sections in this consultation response attempt to potentially address these issues with some positive suggestions.

2.3 H2 - Affordable homes:

2.3.1 With both a young adult son and ageing friends and relatives, I absolutely support this policy from both ends of the spectrum - to see a minimum of 40% affordable homes being provided as part of a substantial housing development, and 70% of those being made available for rent, would I feel very much serve the need for local youngsters to stay in West Horsley and for the older generation to downsize and stay in the village.

2.4 H3 - Rural exception homes:

2.4.1 On the same premises, I wholly support this policy which seeks to secure affordable homes in West Horsley for young people and the older generation alike, in perpetuity.

2.5 P2 - Green Belt, limited infilling:

2.5.1 Again I support this policy in the interests of West Horsley, there are to my certain knowledge a selection of suitable sites available in and around the present village settlement boundaries which are not presently allocated for potential housing, but which would meet this criteria.

2.5.2 These additional sites would also be available to provide affordable homes, and/or on a rural exception basis, and to potentially provide community facilities as I have put forward later in this consultation response.
2.6 **E9 - Rural local centres:**

2.6.1 I question that West Horsley is not nominated as a rural local centre, certainly it has the capacity to be so if a sufficiently sustainable development plan is in place as per the comments I have made elsewhere in this consultation response.

2.7 **D1 - Making better places:**

2.7.1 The development of sites within West Horsley containing 25+ new homes to be inclusive of a mix of uses, to promote a sense of community, and to provide facilities and services is a policy I will wholly supp

2.7.2 Similarly I will support the creation of meeting places, play and recreation areas, and public spaces, complimentary to acceptable housing developments in West Horsley.

2.7.3 I do not presently see that the objective of facilitating and promoting walking, with short walking distances to and from facilities, is sufficiently addressed in the plans for West Horsley. Again, the following sections in this consultation response attempt to potentially address these issues with some positive suggestions.

2.7.4 Ease of access, promotion of a healthy lifestyle, and safety for pedestrians and cyclists are laudable objectiv I do not, however, see them sufficiently addressed in the plans for West Horsley, and there follow some suggestions to potentially address these issues.

2.7.5 There is, in my view, a critical need for a study of West Horsley as a village to go hand in hand with individual site developments The injection of investment into the village should enable positive improvements to be effected to the wider environment, to be achieved through Section 106 agreements. Such improvements are likely to make otherwise potentially controversial developments more acceptable to local people.

2.8 **D3 - Historic environment and heritage:**

2.8.1 West Horsley benefits from a wealth of history and heritage as I discuss in the following sections of this consultation response That there is a proposed policy to recognise this has my wholehearted support, but the proposed development of West Horsley should specifically take the opportunity to reclaim and embrace its past.

2.9 **D4 - Development in inset villages:**

2.9.1 I generally support this policy on a sustainable development basis as before discussed, and in particular the designation of West Horsley as an inset villag

2.9.2 However, the special character of West Horsley, with its north and south settlements either side of the railway line, needs to be looked at carefully to make the most of this opportunity.

2.10 **I3 - Sustainable transport for new developments:**

2.10.1 I support this policy, but see little evidence of its application in the case of West Horsley. I believe it to be fundamental and crucial, particularly in a semi-rural setting such as West Horsley, that there is infrastructural provision made for walking and cycling, which is very much the national drive towards a healthier and safer lifestyle in this the 21st century.

3.0 **TOPIC PAPERS AND STUDIES**

3.1 I generally support the changes in the application of Green Belt policies in West Horsley, as set out in the Topic Paper Green Belt and the Countryside, provided that the policy of sustainable development is pursued to its full measure.

3.2 Paragraph 120 of the Topic Paper Housing Delivery refers to West Horsley (north) as a large village, but it has not been accorded Rural Service Centre status - it is suggested that it instead relies on East Horsley which has been accorded this status. Whilst this is indeed presently the case, it is to be lamented for reasons discussed elsewhere in this
consultation response. The application of a sustainable development policy which treats West Horsley as its own entity would lessen the reliance of West Horsley residents on the facilities of East Horsley, and thus the burden on the latter’s infrastructure and facilities.

3.3 Of particular relevance and importance in the consideration of the development of West Horsley is paragraph 4.117 of the Topic Paper *Housing Delivery*. To quote verbatim:

Development around villages “can be a sustainable option so long as careful consideration is given to the choice of location, where it can enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities ... it is important that we consider smaller sites, such as those around villages, which are able to deliver in the early years to ensure that whilst much of our supply is backloaded, we are nevertheless making a concerted effort to boost the sustainable supply of housing in the early years”.

Allied with this objective must be that it is “a sustainable option”, but sustainable it will not be in the apparently present absence of wider considerations of local community needs and infrastructural links.

4.0 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF WEST HORSLEY

4.1 The 2014 application by WHPC sets out the historical background of the village, which has a traceable history back to 1036AD, and which boasts still remaining buildings going back to the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries. The illustration on the cover page is actually a 19th century map, before the construction of the railway line (which effectively split the village into a north half and a south half), and the following illustration is that same map with the then spine of the village - Silkmere Lane, The Street, and Ripley Lane - highlighted upon it:

[IMAGE 1]

4.2 With the arrival of the railway line came the development of the separate village of East Horsley, also the schism between the north and south sections of West Horsley, as illustrated below:

[IMAGE 2]

4.3 To finally arrive at what is essentially the present built landscape as illustrated below:

[IMAGE 3]

WEST HORSLEY VILLAGE STRUCTURE

5.1 Although a single community, the now two settlement halves of West Horsley are separated on the ground by the presence of the railway line. Its impact on the ground is minimal, it is set within cuttings and largely shielded from view by woodland and trees as broadly illustrated by the satellite view shown below, but its role in the townscape has previously been greatly overstated - assessment from a map necessarily gives a two-dimensional viewpoint, but it does not form a significant boundary.

[IMAGE 4]

The railway line is only perceived to divide the village, and it is this perception that has resulted in the previous definition of the village boundary from a 2D perspective. Given that there are a number of existing houses north of the railway line between Ripley Lane and Silkmere Lane, as well as the substantial facility afforded by Horsley & Send Cricket Club, a more appropriate village boundary here might be the HSCC access road.

5.2 West Horsley is generally well served by sports and recreation facilities, including Horsley & Send Cricket Club off Ripley Lane and Horsley Football Club off Long Reach, and there is a hard court tennis court beside HFC which is available for public use now free of charge. All these facilities serve both junior and adult levels, although there is little
recreational facility for senior citizens who might, for example, benefit from the provision of such as a crown green bowling club.

5.3 There is presently no safe pedestrian link between the two halves of the village, and no dedicated cycle route at all. In townscape terms, there is poor village definition without a clear boundary. With its proposed status as an ‘inset’ village within the Green Belt, there is now a great opportunity to provide new definition, also new facilities, with Silkmore Lane resuming its historic role as a spine of the village, and potentially adding an east/west pedestrian and cycle link along the north side of the railway, linking north and south.

5.4 Re-establishing this link could give a basis for new and sustainable development. The area between the two halves of the village could be used to create a central place with facilities for both areas. The existing location of HSCC could be appended with new community facilities, even retail uses to replace those being lost elsewhere in the village.

6.0 ACCESS AND MOVEMENT

6.1 Pedestrian movement is presently restricted by the lack of footpaths, that which do exist do not provide a satisfactory network within and between residential areas, see the illustration below. Consequently, there is poor access to local facilities, most trips demanding the use of a car. Pedestrian routes should be safe and within a pleasant environment.

[IMAGE 5]

6.2 Public transport is somewhat limited, there is a main service along the A246 at the southern end of the village, but an hourly bus service (438) which passes through West Horsley presently runs only on a Monday-Friday basis. Horsley railway station allows good accessibility to London Waterloo and Guildford, but is situated some 2 miles away from the outskirts of West Horsley village.

6.3 Bicycles are generally restricted to main roads, with no dedicated cycle routes in the village. This is somewhat paradoxical in light of West Horsley being part of the 2012 Olympics road race route towards Box Hill, which has as such brought a surge of visitors and interest in cycling to the area, plus the Prudential road race now passes through on an annual basis. It also flies in the face of an otherwise national initiative to encourage cycling as a valid alternative means of transport. As an example, pupils are encouraged by The Raleigh School to cycle there and back but this noble endeavour is frustrated by not being properly or safely facilitated by the local infrastructure. It would be also highly desirable to provide dedicated cycle routes from the residential areas to the railway station for commuter use.

7.0 SITE ALLOCATIONS IN WEST HORSLEY

7.1 Given the approach it is now proposed be adopted with the inclusion of West Horsley as an inset village, there exists an opportunity to look at an even wider range of potential sites giving housing development opportunities than has presently been identified, together with allied community facilities and infrastructural links so to achieve sustainable growth. Linking the settlements of north and south West Horsley by pedestrian and cycle routes indicates the possibility of developments such as on land adjacent Horsley & Send Cricket Club. There are, indeed, a number of possible sites with existing road access offering the opportunity for immediate development.

7.2 Site A37 - Bell & Colvill

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

7.3 Site A38 - Manor Farm:

7.3.1 This site is located in the north half of the village, linking with Long Reach to the west and East Lane to the south - however, Long Reach presently has no pedestrian walkway, and neither road has a dedicated cycle way.
7.4 Site A39 - Ockham Road North:

7.4.1 Although strictly being in East Horsley, this site is also on the north side of the railway line, and is directly adjacent to Horsley station. Areas of West Horsley would greatly benefit from a foot/cycle path running alongside this site on the northern side of the railway line to afford easy and safe commuter access to Horsley station.

7.5 Site A40 - Waterloo Farm:

7.5.1 At the northern periphery of the village, this site has a northern link to Green Lane which could feasibly be improved to afford a safe and pleasing route for walkers and cyclists down to Long Reach and Ripley Lane beyond. The southern boundary backs onto Nightingale Crescent and Northcote Crescent but with no way through towards Horsley station, whereby the only feasible direct route is along the busy Ockham Road North, having a pavement on one side but again with no dedicated cycle way.

7.6 Site A41 - Lollesworth Farm:

7.6.1 It is now understood that The Raleigh School have elected to relocate onto this site, which will consequently be unable to accommodate the projected housing provision, but which may free up the existing Northcote Crescent site for some limited housing development. Nevertheless, it would now seem pressing that alternative housing site(s) be found.

7.6.2 This site benefits from close proximity to Lollesworth Lane on the north side of the railway line, a well-trodden pedestrian walkway with its bridge over the railway line, thence down to East Horsley and the railway station. It is, in my view, of critical strategic and infrastructural importance that as much of the northern side of the railway line passing through the village as is possible is utilised as a pedestrian/cycle route, with Lollesworth Lane (opposite the junction of East lane and Long Reach) acting as a fulcrum point between the north and south parts of West Horsley.

8.0 SUMMARY

8.1 In conclusion, I do broadly support the objectives of the draft Local Plan, but only subject to parallel consideration and implementation of a sustainable development policy running alongside the proposed housing developments in West Horsley, and specifically in address of the following critical factors:

- Approved developments must be sustainable, and which improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the village.
- Community needs, facilities, and infrastructural links must be accommodated, with a view to self-sufficiency of the village insofar as is feasible.
- There must be a comprehensive spatial development strategy.
- Approved developments must contain a high ratio of affordable.
- Pedestrian and cycle links across and between the two halves of the village, which are fundamental to a healthy and enjoyable lifestyle.
- The preservation and restoration of the history and heritage of the village, and ideally the re-creation of the historic village centre.

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

Attached documents: [IMAGE 1.jpg] (180 KB)
[IMAGE 2.jpg] (232 KB)
[IMAGE 3.jpg] (260 KB)
[IMAGE 4.jpg] (191 KB)
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Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2016

Please find enclosed a copy of my formal consultation response as regards the above, which has also been sent via email.

I have been a resident of West Horsley since 1992, the year my son was born, and for many years we lived in Northcote Crescent next door to Raleigh School which my son attended for the full 7 years from Reception right through Key Stage Two at age 11. I have since 2004 lived in Ripley Lane on the northern perimeter of the village, and my son has now graduated through university with a masters degree and is in full time employment.

I have become increasingly concerned and dismayed at the apparent recent and continuing disintegration of the village of West Horsley as an entity in its own right, and at its becoming more and more reliant on its near neighbour East Horsley for essentials such as a Post Office, a newsagent, and a convenience store, all of which it has recently lost or is about to lose. West Horsley-ites have long had to rely on The Medical Centre and Horsley railway station, both situated in East Horsley, and both villages have recently lost all high street bank branches other than Lloyds also in East Horsley.

West Horsley is very much a village in its own right, separate and distinct from East Horsley by virtue of its history and its semi-rural nature, points amongst others which were made by West Horsley Parish Council in its application to Guildford Borough Council to be a Designated Neighbourhood Area in 2014, and which was accepted.

My concerns are now compounded by the prospect of a substantial number of new homes being sited in the village, but I also very much feel that the Local Plan should now be taken as an opportunity to improve this situation, with particular emphasis on community needs, spatial connections and infrastructure.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1458  Respondent: 9412065 / Stephen Bray  Agent:

TOPIC PAPERS AND STUDIES

I generally support the changes in the application of Green Belt policies in West Horsley, as set out in the Topic Paper *Green Belt and the Countryside*, provided that the policy of sustainable development is pursued to its full measure.

Paragraph 4.120 of the Topic Paper *Housing Delivery* refers to West Horsley (north) as a large village, but it has not been accorded Rural Service Centre status - it is suggested that it instead relies on East Horsley which has been accorded this status. Whilst this is indeed presently the case, it is to be lamented for reasons discussed elsewhere in this consultation response. The application of a sustainable development policy which treats West Horsley as its own entity would lessen the reliance of West Horsley residents on the facilities of East Horsley, and thus the burden on the latter's infrastructure and facilities.
Of particular relevance and importance in the consideration of the development of West Horsley is paragraph 4.117 of the Topic Paper Housing Delivery. To quote verbatim:

Development around villages *can be a sustainable option so long as careful consideration is given to the choice of location, where it can enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities ... it is important that we consider smaller sites, such as those around villages, which are able to deliver in the early years to ensure that whilst much of our supply is backloaded, we are nevertheless making a concerted effort to boost the sustainable supply of housing in the early years*.

Allied with this objective **must** be that it is "a sustainable option", but sustainable it will not be in the apparently present absence of wider considerations of local community needs and infrastructural links.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1461</th>
<th>Respondent: 9412065 / Stephen Bray</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>

**HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF WEST HORSLEY**

The 2014 application by WHPC sets out the historical background of the village, which has a traceable history back to 1036AD, and which boasts still remaining buildings going back to the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries. The illustration on the cover page is actually a 19th century map, before the construction of the railway line (which effectively split the village into a north half and a south half), and the following illustration is that same map with the then spine of the village - Silkmore Lane, The Street, and Ripley Lane - highlighted upon it:

With the arrival of the railway line came the development of the separate village of East Horsley, also the schism between the north and south sections of West Horsley, as illustrated below:

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

**Attached documents:**

- capture2.jpg (182 KB)
- capture3.jpg (209 KB)
- capture1.jpg (163 KB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1462</th>
<th>Respondent: 9412065 / Stephen Bray</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>

**WEST HORSLEY VILLAGE STRUCTURE**

Although a single community, the now two settlement halves of West Horsley are separated on the ground by the presence of the railway line. Its impact on the ground is minimal, it is set within cuttings and largely shielded from view by woodland and trees as broadly illustrated by the satellite view shown below, but its role in the townscape has previously been greatly overstated - assessment from a map necessarily gives a two-dimensional viewpoint, but it does not form a significant boundary.
The railway line is only perceived to divide the village, and it is this perception that has resulted in the previous definition of the village boundary from a 20 perspective. Given that there are a number of existing houses north of the railway line between Ripley Lane and Silkmore Lane, as well as the substantial facility afforded by Horsley & Send Cricket Club, a more appropriate village boundary here might be the HSCC access road.

West Horsley is generally well served by sports and recreation facilities, including Horsley & Send Cricket Club off Ripley Lane and Horsley Football Club off Long Reach, and there is a hard court tennis court beside HFC which is available for public use now free of charge. All these facilities serve both junior and adult levels, although there is little recreational facility for senior citizens who might, for example, benefit from the provision of such as a crown green bowling club.

There is presently no safe pedestrian link between the two halves of the village, and no dedicated cycle route at all. In townscape terms, there is poor village definition without a clear boundary. With its proposed status as an 'inset' village within the Green Belt, there is now a great opportunity to provide new definition, also new facilities, with Silkmore Lane resuming its historic role as a spine of the village, and potentially adding an east/west pedestrian and cycle link along the north side of the railway, linking north and south.

Re-establishing this link could give a basis for new and sustainable development. The area between the two halves of the village could be used to create a central place with facilities for both areas. The existing location of HSCC could be appended with new community facilities, even retail uses to replace those being lost elsewhere in the village.

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

Attached documents: capture4.jpg (201 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1463  Respondent: 9412065 / Stephen Bray  Agent:

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

Pedestrian movement is presently restricted by the lack of footpaths, that which do exist do not provide a satisfactory network within and between residential areas, see the illustration below. Consequently, there is poor access to local facilities, most trips demanding the use of a car. Pedestrian routes should be safe and within a pleasant environment.

Public transport is somewhat limited, there is a main service along the A246 at the southern end of the village, but an hourly bus service (438) which passes through West Horsley presently runs only on a Monday-Friday basis. Horsley railway station allows good accessibility to London Waterloo and Guildford, but is situated some 2 miles away from the outskirts of West Horsley village.

Bicycles are generally restricted to main roads, with no dedicated cycle routes in the village. This is somewhat paradoxical in light of West Horsley being part of the 2012 Olympics road race route towards Box Hill, which has as such brought a surge of visitors and interest in cycling to the area, plus the Prudential road race now passes through on an annual basis. It also flies in the face of an otherwise national initiative to encourage cycling as a valid alternative means of transport. As an example, pupils are encouraged by The Raleigh School to cycle there and back but this noble endeavour is frustrated by not being properly or safely facilitated by the local infrastructure. It would be also highly desirable to provide dedicated cycle routes from the residential areas to the railway station for commuter use.

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

Attached documents: capture5.JPG (44 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1465  Respondent: 9412065 / Stephen Bray  Agent:
SUMMARY

In conclusion, I broadly support the objectives of the draft Local Plan, but only subject to parallel consideration and implementation of a sustainable development policy running alongside the proposed housing developments in West Horsley, and specifically in address of the following critical factors:

- Approved developments must be sustainable, and which improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the village.
- Community needs, facilities, and infrastructural links must be accommodated, with a view to self-sufficiency of the village insofar as is feasible.
- There must be a comprehensive spatial development strategy.
- Approved developments must contain a high ratio of affordable housing. Pedestrian and cycle links across and between the two halves of the village, which are fundamental to a healthy and enjoyable lifestyle.
- The preservation and restoration of the history and heritage of the village, and ideally the re-creation of the historic village centre.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/151  Respondent: 9607905 / Anne Pascoe  Agent:

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

I am writing to protest regarding the proposed local plan which will affect West Clandon. I live on The Street (A247) in West Clandon and this road is already full to capacity. If this proposed plan goes through we will have grid-lock as the A.247 cannot take any more traffic. The road is very narrow in places, which necessitates trucks having to mount the pavement to pass each other and there being a school close by, means a major accident is very likely, especially when parents are attempting to accompany their children to school. The infrastructure needs to be put in place before such a plan can be instigated.

You are proposing to build 2,100 houses at Garlick Arch and Gosden Hill as well as a further 2,000 at Wisley etc., etc. Each of those properties will have at least two cars, possibly more and therefore the roads will become impassable. The A.3 is already at a standstill on a daily basis but is expected to take on even more traffic. You are proposing to build an Industrial site on the Burnt Common areas – this will mean yet more heavy duty vehicles using both the A.3 as well as the A.247.

I fully appreciate more homes are required but these need to be built on brown field sites and to be affordable to the younger generation and not Executive type homes. This is an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and needs to be maintained as well as the Green Belt which appears to be slowly eroded by such plans. Infrastructure needs to be a priority before any of these proposed plans can be instigated and I implore you to give this priority consideration.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3199  Respondent: 10430401 / St John the Evangelist (Mark Woodward)  Agent:
I OBJECT ESPECIALLY TO 6 POLICIES: A36, A37, A38, A39, A40 & A41: • Amount of new housing far exceeds local need. • Housing density excessive when compared with existing development. • Would transform the Horsleys into a sizable town, something for which no case is made. • No local support. • Collective impact of these 6 sites on a small part of the borough not considered. Should not be treated as isolated, separate sites. • Total amount of new building out of scale with the planned development elsewhere the borough, especially less sensitive urban areas not protected by Green Belt. • Sites unsustainable. Key infrastructure lacking. No adequate provision is made to increase it – e.g. poor wastewater capacity, lack of schools, absence of traffic management plan, flooding. • No account taken of additional impact of Wisley Airfield site on Horsleys. • Extension of settlement boundaries too permissive. Horsleys characterised by streets with development along only one side of the road. Policies allow too many adjacent green fields to be developed by squaring off boundaries and claiming they don’t contribute to Green Belt “openness”.

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

Attached documents:

I have read some of the documents on your website and it appears to me that some of the articles are written assuming that the decision has been made to house many more people than can be sustained in the area.

It is surely self-evident that traffic in the area cannot be increased without significant degradation of the living standards of the current population.

Two examples will clearly demonstrate this. The first is the commuter trains that head to London every morning and return every evening. Your staff, since they are based in Guildford, will not have experienced the overcrowding that is apparent every day of the week. Delays are frequent and the trains inadequate - among other things they do not have air-conditioning.

No doubt your response will be that the platforms are being extended and will be able to accommodate more passengers. My view is that, with the extended platforms, the current commuter traffic can be accommodated; not increased traffic resulting from all the additional houses that are planned.

Secondly, it appears from your plans that road traffic will be alleviated by the realignment of roads around the A3 / M25 junction. This is a complete fallacy. I travel on the road from Horsley to Cobham every weekday morning and find that 90% of the time the M25 heading clockwise is backed up and unable to move around 7:30 in the morning. What hope is there to improve this situation if the A3 / M25 junction is improved. This will do nothing to improve the traffic flow on the M25 which is already a dangerously crowded road at rush hour.

There are many other objections that I have and I feel that the views of the majority of current residents are being rode roughshod over by studies that purport to claim that the expansion of housing in the area will be achieved with minimal disruption.

I therefore submit my objection to these schemes in the strongest terms to ensure that the countryside is preserved and we do not all end up in continuous traffic jams and dangerously overcrowded trains.
I look forward to hearing that these plans are stopped in the near future and also look forward to your reply to confirm that you are of a similar view.

I wrote in 2014 to explain the reasons why I am very concerned about the number of houses planned for the area around the Horsleys. I have copied the email below.

Please note that I have also attached an article from the New Civil Engineer magazine which is the magazine of the Institution of Civil Engineers.

It highlights the problems encountered locally on the M25 at present and shows how the reliability of travel is declining year on year. Adding more houses in the area will only make the problem worse.

Finally, please explain why I need to write a second time on the same subject. You surely have the email below on record.

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

Attached documents: [IMG_20141005_0001 (1).pdf](1.4 MB)

---

**Comment ID: PSLPA16/310  Respondent: 10619905 / Louise Philips  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

As a resident of West Horsley I am writing to object strongly to the proposed development of East and West Horsley.

This plan is far too ambitious. To increase the size of West HOrsley village by 35% is quite unrealistic. There is not enough infrastructure - medical centre, schools, meeting halls, shops, parking spaces and in particular the roads could not cope with l00s more cars and people. Whatever development takes place, a much better public transport system would be needed as the increased population would be gridlocked.

I urge you to take a much harder look at these plans.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID: PSLPA16/734  Respondent: 10620097 / Susan Elgar  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Re: Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategies and Sites June 2016

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

1. The removal of West & East Horsley villages from the green belt by insetting.
The implication of which will completely change the character, balance and nature of these villages for ever, losing historic value and precious green belt. There is no 'exceptional' justification for building on this green belt.

1. The proposal of high density housing within West & East Horsley, is a staggering increase of over 35% more However, there is no evidence of improved infrastructure. Already these villages combined have only one overcrowded medical centre, one over subscribed under 11’s academy school and badly potholed roads. The inevitable increase in cars on the roads, will not only further damage the road surfaces and create traffic congestion, but parking for the shops and railway station will become a nightmare. The drainage in the Horsley's is barely coping at the moment, and it is understood from Thames Water that further housing developments, will be unlikely to cope and the foul drainage system will need to be upgraded.

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

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

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4242  Respondent: 10627457 / Graeme Morrison  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I agree that a modest amount of additional housing is needed in the Horsleys and in the Guildford borough and that a better mix of properties is needed, in particular, more properties for first time buyers and for those wishing to downsize.

However, I object strongly to the scale of extra housing proposed in the Draft Plan because this is based on what I believe to be some fundamentally flawed calculations and a complete lack of understanding of the environment of the Horsleys.

The Environment of the Horsleys

The Horsleys are ill equipped to cope with significant development as any rational analysis will quickly expose.

1. a) The road network

East and West Horsley can only be accessed on restricted roads

From the South

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

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

From the North

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

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

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

From the East

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

b) Retail Structure

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

c) Infrastructure

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

d) The Geography of the Horsleys

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

I object to the proposed in-setting boundary to replace the Green Belt around East and West Horsley. This new boundary includes some valuable green community space such as Kingston Meadow (by EH Village Hall) and Horsley Tennis and Cricket Club which will then be vulnerable to future development. These spaces are valuable amenities and are an essential part of the life of the village.

I object to the lack of understanding of the infrastructure constraints of the proposed new households on the Horsley villages and to the absence of any effort to deal with them

If around 2,600 new houses were built in the Horsleys, Ockham and Wisley airfield this could easily result in around 5,000 more cars within a three mile radius of the villages.

Traffic

This would have a huge impact on local roads which as outlined above have little scope to be widened (e.g. pinch point at Lynx Hill on Ockham Road South and the restricted area on East Lane) or otherwise altered to cater for such an increase.

Although it is proposed to upgrade the current A3 junction at Burntcommon to a full 4-way junction. SCC traffic modelling anticipates increased use of Guileshall Lane, Hungry Hill Lane and Tithebarns Lane (all not suitable for increased traffic volume) for traffic accessing the A3 at Burntcommon in order to travel to Guildford and beyond.

The SCC report states that “consequently, it indicates that further thought may have to be given to managing traffic in this area as part of a transport assessment should the development be progressed”.

A local plan when proposing new housing on a substantial scale must surely plan for the implications of increased traffic both on the major roads such as the A3 and the minor village roads. The current draft local plan has not given such issues enough consideration

Parking
Parking at Horsley & Effingham junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the Horsley medical centre and at the village hall will not be able to cope with this additional demand.

Flooding

The site behind Ockham Road North in East Horsley is partially a level 3 flood risk area, and local residents are well aware of how much standing water there is in their gardens after rain. Building on such land will only exacerbate the problem. Other areas of the Horsleys are also flooded when it rains because the drains are inadequate. Substantially more houses will exacerbate the problem but no attention has been paid to drainage in the local plan.

Schools and medical facilities

Amenities

Local schools and medical facilities are already at capacity.

No extra school places are planned in the Horsleys and the school places proposed at Wisley Airfield will not be planned until many years into the project. 2600 new houses could easily mean 2600 children looking for school place!

I trust the Council will review its Local Plan basing it on a model which is available for inspection and with more attention to the infrastructure implications and use of brown field sites rather than destroy our Green Belt - a precious amenity gifted to us by visionaries from the past.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/838  Respondent: 10641953 / Wiesia Taylor  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I also OBJECT to policies A37, A38, A40 and A41. These involve the excessive expansion of West Horsley, an increase in its housing by 36%. West Horsley is one of the first lines of defence against urban sprawl by the London conurbation. And GBC wants to rip up the rules on protecting the Green Belt to put up some more housing here. This is fundamentally wrong and I OBJECT to it.

My conclusion is that GBC have put a huge effort into creating a monster here which nobody wants except for Guildford’s planning department and maybe a few of Guildford’s councillors who campaigned at the last local election on the basis of protecting the Green Belt. Doesn’t look like it to me, so I OBJECT TO THE LOCAL PLAN,

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1955  Respondent: 10662849 / Garry Walton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT in particular to including Sites A36-41 (East and West Horsley). This is a back-door way to create a mega-village – essentially, a soulless new dormitory town. The Horsleys feel victimised by this plan, which has been masterminded by Council leaders representing Ash and Tongham at the other end of the borough, where (in a flagrant case of political double standards) the Green Belt is actually being extended under Policy P3.\[1\]

Whatever their merits as development sites, the 6 Horsley sites should not be considered individually but for their cumulative impact on the contiguous villages of East and West Horsley.

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

Under the plan, rural West Horsley will take 35% of new homes, Ash and Tongham 16% and Guildford urban area only 11%. The total number of homes in West Horsley will increase by 35%, which is disproportionate when measured against the overall increase in housing across the borough and particularly in Guildford town. If the Council have justifiable reasons to transform a particular community so radically, the plan should present a case rather than sneaking in site proposals as a fait accompli.

These sites will put unsustainable strain on local facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops. For instance:

- Thames Water have advised the Council that the current wastewater network will not cope and that the foul drainage system all the way to the treatment works North of Ripley will need to be upgraded.
- Guildford Council’s Education Review says “expansion options may need to be considered for primary” education in the Horsley area within the first 5 years of the plan, but Surrey County Council has no plans to do so. The Raleigh School is already full. The private Glenesk and Cranmore schools are also at or near to full capacity. The suggestion that schools in Ripley can be used contradicts the plan’s stated intention to reduce traffic on the A3 and strategic aim that primary schools should be within walking distance.
- The plan’s Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C) imagines an “East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme between 2019 and 2023 by Surrey CC” but gives no details. This scheme is just wishful thinking. The proposed housing can only harm the local environment, not improve it.

The harmful impact of these sites is magnified by the proximity of the so-called Wisley Airfield site (Three Farms Meadow), with 2,100 new homes only 2 miles away (see below).

The density of new housing on the 6 Horsley sites is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the locality now.

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

Collectively, these 6 sites militate against NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been a success story in the Horsleys, with the creation of an amenity wood and community garden, the purchase of adjacent fields (East of Ockham Road North) by local residents in order to preserve their open aspect, well-maintained pitches for local football and cricket clubs, public tennis courts, open space for a high-quality campsite (at Waterloo Farm) used by many foreign tourists and the approval of plans for a “Theatre in the Woods” – making West Horsley the only village in Surrey with an opera house. The open nature of West Horsley determined that a long portion of the 2012 Olympic cycle races passed through the village. This route has been adopted by cyclists as a permanent asset, including the annual Prudential cycle race. These and future examples of “positive planning” depend on protecting the Green Belt to maintain the openness and attractiveness of the local landscape and avoiding the urbanisation and traffic congestion that Sites A36-41 will bring.

\[1\] Councillor Paul Spooner and his predecessor, Councillor Stephen Mansbridge.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPA16/466  Respondent: 10668897 / Mary Harris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I object to Horsley being required to provide a disproportionate number of new houses.
The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic.
I object to the plan proposing a substantial increase in road usage in Horsley where the roads are already over crowded.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3901  Respondent: 10669057 / Yvonnes Green  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 objections to the following items:-
The Horsleys being removed from Green Belt as 'the exceptional circumstances' required have not been demonstrated.
Changes to boundaries of the Settlement boundaries.
The proposals to build the additional 533 houses is totally unrealistic without schools, medical facilities, roads and car parks being extended and there is no scope for most of this.
Development on the former Wisley Airfield. The development would cause an enormous impact on the Horsleys bringing so much more traffic into the already overloaded and narrow roads. Also the lack of drainage would cause even more traffic congestion. We have currently an increasing number of vehicles that are too large, this can only result in more accidents and damage occurring.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/316  Respondent: 10701409 / Marilyn Squires  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 above proposal for the following reasons.
Firstly in broad principal I believe the Green Belt is more necessary now than when first implemented as without it, there will eventually be no distinction between town and country as the urban sprawl continues unabated and our countryside is lost forever.

Secondly, in more specific terms, I object to the proposed building of over 500 houses in Horsley as the infrastructure simply cannot cope with such an increase in population. In the winter of 2014/15, in order to walk my dogs locally in Green Lane, I had to wade through raw sewage spilling out onto the road for weeks as the sewers overflowed because they could not cope. A proposed build of 120 homes nearby would obviously cause this to be a permanent and unacceptable problem. Such a large development would also adversely effect the character of the existing village, which seems to have been conveniently overlooked.

The village shops and library already have times when there are no vacant parking places, and many residents do not have access to these amenities apart from using a car.

The doctors surgery in Kingston Avenue (the only GP service in Horsley) obviously struggle to give out appointments within a reasonable length of time already, as I have rung them for an appointment quite recently only to find the soonest they could offer one was in 9 days.

Ockham road north is already very difficult to drive out into or from houses alongside it due to limited vision, narrow width and bends, so any increase in traffic volume which would effectively turn it into an A road instead of a B road would make it even more dangerous.

I would like to point out that finding land on which to build is only a part of a development plan – the infrastructure must be in place to accommodate it, which isn’t the case in Horsley

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

*Attached documents:*

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4485  **Respondent:** 10708513 / John Carroll  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

**As a resident of East Horsley I strongly **object** to much of the the Proposed Submission Local Plan in respect to East and West Horsley.**

I question the Borough housing targets set out in Policy S2. I therefore accordingly **object** to Policy H2.

I **object** to the proposal to inset East Horsley from the Green Belt and request that this proposal be dropped from the Local Plan.

I also **object** to the proposed East Horsley boundary change which cannot be justified.

I **object** to the proposal to designate roads south of the A246 as being within the identified boundary of East Horsley village and to allow limited infilling within this area.

I believe that the failure to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure to meet the current needs of East Horsley is already a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Local Plan and I **object** to the infrastructure proposals on these grounds. I also strongly **object** to the proposals for the East Horsley infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing a timely infrastructure to support the proposed developments.
I consider that the proposed western movement of the East Horsley settlement boundary needed to bring site A39 within the settlement area as unjustified and contrary to NPPF rules. If this boundary movement is invalid, as I believe, then this site remains a part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, as such and with no ‘very special circumstances’ to justify housing development on it I object to Policy A39.

I strongly object to the site allocation policies A37, A38, A40 and A41.

These four policy sites are all located within the Green Belt. One is a partially brownfield development but the other three sites are all used for agriculture and all sit within the current Green Belt at the edge of the Settlement Area. The reasons presented by the consultants to justify these settlement boundary movements appear to me unfounded and in no way meet the requirements of the NPPF.

These boundary movements clearly represent a deliberate pushing back of settlement boundaries in order to provide more greenfield sites for housing development. As such, I consider these proposed movements in settlement boundaries must be reconsidered.

These proposals appear contrary to the principles of the Metropolitan Green Belt.

I also strongly object to Policy A35.

I object to the proposal to to remove Wisley Airfield from the Green Belt and the enormity of the proposed development of it, due to the strain it will place on existing infrastructure and amenity.

I object to Policy E2 insofar as it omits to confer "public transport interchange" status on Effingham Junction Station without good reason.

Obviously I appear to strongly object to many aspects of the Proposed Submission Local Plan which although I appreciate has had much time spent compiling and revising, still fails to address the ‘objective’ in a manner acceptable to the majority of residents affected.

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

Attached documents:
I write to register my strongest objections to the Local plan proposed by Guildford Borough council for excessive housing development in the Horsley village area and I do so for several reasons.

I object to the fragrant disregard to Green Belt restrictions, which will substantially affect the rural setting of the village, the wildlife and outlook, viewed from the Surrey Hills, an area of outstanding beauty. I regard this plan as an outrageous large scale rape of the countryside, which will be irreversible and ruin the village in a number of ways.

The proposed plans will substantially increase the village population and in the process over burdening already stretched local services and infrastructure. Parking is already a problem at Horsley and Effingham stations and likewise at the local shops, the narrow roads (dangerously narrow in parts) will not cope with any increase in traffic, driving through or around the village. The Influx of parents driving their children to our local schools, which are at full capacity, already causes major traffic disruption at school times. The medical services are already over burdened without adding to village population. Drainage is already under pressure and will not cope with the proposed increase in housing, likewise problems with drainage of surface water.

Worst of all, High density of new housing will dramatically effect and unbalance the environment and character of the beautiful villages of West and East Horsley, negatively impacting use of village halls, playing fields, shops and other village Facilities and we will suffer from over crowing. The proposed buildings plan will ruin the quality of quiet village life on a massive and disproportional scale and it is simply unacceptable.

If Wisley Airfield were to be developed, as has been proposed, it would only magnify the above problems for the Horsley’s many times over, which naturally I also strongly object to.

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

Attached documents:
 OBJECTION & COMMENT TO 2016 GUILDFORD DRAFT LOCAL PLAN

I object to the above plan and I am very disappointed that the Green Belt in West Horsley is so under threat and that an increase of 35% of new homes has been proposed by the Guildford Plan, greater than any other single area in the Borough.

We moved to West Horsley fourteen years ago, mainly because of the rural aspect of the area and a lot of this is going to disappear. Over these fourteen years the local schools have become full, the local doctor’s surgery is only just managing to cope, the roads are often flooded and potholes left unattended.

The railway station car park is often full from early morning; the car park behind the shops in East Horsley is extremely busy. East Lane, a major road through West Horsley has no lighting. East Horsley is also marked out for substantial development on two sites, one very close to the local shops and the other on a very busy road by a dangerous bend.

I fear if all this building takes place, West Horsley will never be the same again by any stretch of the imagination.

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

Attached documents:

 Sites

I OBJECT. The NPPF states that most development in the Green Belt is inappropriate. Planning guidance issued in March 2014 states that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt enough to constitute “exceptional circumstances”. There is therefore no justification for removing the Horsleys and other villages from the Green Belt and building housing on Green Belt land.

The number of houses proposed for East and West Horsley (533 in total) is disproportionate to the present sizes of the villages. The houses would be at a much greater density than the present houses – for example, the Planning Officer’s report for a road in East Horsley describes it as “[a] semi-rural residential area comprising a series of essentially two storey medium to large properties on medium to large plots. The properties are generally set away from the boundary lines”. Any new development of the numbers and areas proposed would inevitably be quite different and would destroy the special character of the villages.

Problems with lack of infrastructure have already been described above (Policy I1). Schools are already full, the Medical Centre is full, mains water pressure is low, foul drainage is inadequate (I could go on). Parts of East and West Horsley are subject to flooding on a regular basis, and at least one site (A40 – Waterloo Farm) has been proposed on a flood-prone area.

Ockham Road North, which would be the means of access to site A40 (and is also one of the main routes from the Wisley Airfield site – A35) is narrow, winding and dangerous. Cyclists are at risk from the heavy goods traffic and during the winter the road has been closed due to flooding. It is also subject to ice. The pavement is on one side of the road (but changes from side to side – an additional hazard for pedestrians).
There are brownfield sites within a short distance of Guildford town centre which would be just as suitable for housing. An application to build flats in Walnut Tree Close was refused because of potential flooding problems although it is difficult to see why if building on a flood plain in Horsley is acceptable, building in Walnut Tree Close is not.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/767  Respondent: 10782177 / Elaine Jones  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am writing again to object to the volume of building that is proposed to be built around East and West Horsley villages. Also no houses should be built on land that comes within the Green Belt.

The local infrastructure could not cope with the amount of development proposed. The roads, schools, doctors surgery and the station car park are overflowing.

I know that the planned properties to be built on the land at Wisley airfield are not included in the Horsley plan but it will also have a detrimental effect on our roads etc.

Our roads are very narrow and not in great condition so more traffic along them would cause more accidents in this already crowded area. Because of the Olympic route for cyclists we have a great many riders around our roads that also cause a dangerous problem.

I do not object to the odd small development of small affordable housing and encourage the Council to make more developers build more of this type of property.

I DO hope that Guildford Borough Council will reconsider this new plan and keep this area the joy that is to live in.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3365  Respondent: 10782625 / Heather Alexander  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

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

• Amount of new housing far exceeds local need.
• Housing density excessive when compared with existing development.
• Would transform the Horsleys into a sizable town, something for which no case is made.
• No local support.
• Collective impact of these 6 sites on a small part of the borough not considered. Should not be treated as isolated, separate sites.
• Total amount of new building out of scale with the planned development elsewhere the borough, especially less sensitive urban areas not protected by Green Belt.
• Sites unsustainable. Key infrastructure lacking. No adequate provision is made to increase it – e.g. poor waste water
capacity, lack of schools, absence of traffic management plan, flooding.

• No account taken of additional impact of Wisley Airfield site on Horsleys.
• Extension of settlement boundaries too permissive. Horsleys characterised by streets with development along only one side of the road. Policies allow too many adjacent green fields to be developed by squaring off boundaries and claiming they don’t contribute to Green Belt “openness”.6
• 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:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1502 Respondent: 10784065 / G.R. Turner Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Thank you for your letter of the 200 June, inviting a response to the publication of the Local I:--

I gather that, taking the Two Horsleys, East and West, together, sites for a further 533 houses are designated in the plan, and there would be, presumably, a number of other single sites in addition.

Were these developments to proceed, we can say goodbye to the Horsley we know and love and I register my opposition. Particularly the density of what is proposed, far in excess of anything currently existing, would irretrievably change the character of the village.

I also understand that, with the boundaries of the villages being enlarged, they are to be taken out of the green belt, a move to which I am wholly opposed

I am amazed to see that, despite its having been unanimously rejected by the council, the development at Wisley Airfield has re-appeared in the plan. It is totally pointless to have discussions about the proposals for East and West Horsley, without, at the same time discussing these far larger and totally overbearing developments, because whatever additional facilities are built there, the impact on the Horsleys will be far larger than anything in the local plans.

As you are already aware, the A3 is already drastically over burdened and daily comes to a standstill often by 4.30 in the afternoon. To even consider a development at Wisley before this dire situation has been remedied, is foolish beyond measure. This apart, the traffic along Ockham Road North would be greatly increased, as would use of Horsley station itself.

I am, as you will have gathered, totally opposed to the airfield development and I speak as a resident of some 49 years.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1214 Respondent: 10790593 / E.A. Morgan Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

With reference to your letter of the New Local plan which will influence planning decisions in the Borough, and will have a massive impact on East and West Horsley. I wish to object most strongly.

East and West Horsley have always been in the Green Belt and should continue to remain so. Both villages’ roads are overflowing now with traffic schools are full also the doctors surgeries (and the royal Surrey).

We do not need more houses or more residents.

I have objected to these plans before and wish to make even stronger objections again.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1917   Respondent: 10798913 / Michelle Scott   Agent: 

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

I am a resident of East Horsley village and have been for the past 9.5 years. My husband and I moved out of London because we wanted to live in the countryside and wanted our children to be brought up in a quiet village without the pollution, noise or close proximity of others as you would expect in a town or city.

It has been brought to my attention that Guildford Borough Council have put forward an amended Local Plan proposing to build over 2000 houses on Wisley Airfield, nearly 600 new houses in East and West Horsley and to take East and West Horsley completely out of the Green Belt.

I do not agree to any proposal to take the Horsleys out of the green belt. It is essential that green belt land is maintained at all costs for the sake of flora and fauna. The beauty of the Horsleys is the countryside that surrounds it. It is vitally important to protect the beauty of our green land and the natural habitats it protects. Wisley Airfield is on your Guildford Borough Sites of Nature Conservation Importance and is therefore one of the areas you have promised to protect from Developers. I understand that the "exceptional circumstances " required before taking this action have not been met.

I further object to any attempt to extend the settlement boundaries of the Horsleys or to the re designation of the Station Parade as a District Centre.

In my view it is not possible for the existing infrastructure in the villages of Ockham,West and East Horsley to accommodate the increased volume of housing proposed. In particular:

1. The villages have narrow roads which will not accommodate constructions traffic and traffic from the increased population.
2. The rail services are already strained with commuters having to stand to Waterloo on certain trains.
3. Existing problems with flooding and sewerage systems will be exacerbated
4. The doctors' surgery will not be able to cope with any increased population numbers.
5. The local school in West Horsley could not accommodate any further increases in population. I also object to the proposals being made for a new primary school to be built on existing greenbelt land.

Please do not go ahead with any of the proposals for new housing in the Ockham, West and East Horsley villages as this will only destroy the character of the villages I love so dearly.
I object to the removal of West Horsley Village from the Green Belt on the following grounds:

- The Local Plan is taking West Horsley out of the Green Belt yet the Local Plan Policy 2 contains the statement "we will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt" - this statement is contradicting the proposal.
- West Horsley is a distinctive rural village in a rural setting with many historic buildings and The village's green belt status is essential to ensuring the character of the village remains.
- Government guidelines require exceptional circumstance for removing the village from the green belt which cannot be justified on the basis of unfulfilled housing - what is the exceptional circumstance for this proposal?
- There is no explanation as to why West Horsley has been chosen to be removed from the green belt and no justification for doing so.

2. Objection to the Number of Houses being built in West Horsley

I object to the 4 Proposed Sites - Policy A41/Policy A40/Policy A38 and Policy A37

- The Local Plan has suggested a 35% increase in housing for West Horsley by 2022 and yet only a 11% increase in Guildford town. What is the justification for this?
- The Guildford Borough Economic Strategy document makes no case for locating large numbers of new homes in West Horsley - this is a village with no shops, no post office, no petrol station, no train station, no medical centre and a very limited bus. It also offers no employment opportunities for residents.
- The National Planning Policy Framework requires that new residential development must be limited in quantity by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities - this policy has been ignored in the Local Plan.
- The density of houses on the proposed sites is completely out of keeping with the rest of the village and will change the character of the village forever.
- The National Planning Policy Framework requires that new residential development must respect the character and density of housing in the area - this policy has been ignored in the Local Plan.
• About 10 houses on East Lane (mine included) currently back onto and look out onto open fields green belt land. Policies A38 and A41 allow 135 homes to be built directly behind these houses and 90 directly across the road from these houses- this will completely change the character of the village

• The proposal for the 4 sites do not respect “the character and density of housing in this area”.

1. **Policy A41**

I specifically object to the Proposed Site - Policy A41

• **The Local Plan has included a new site - Policy A41 with a proposal to build 90 homes**
  - This site is open fields green belt land and the land is one of the most important rural aspects of the village
  - The Policy will irrevocably destroy the character of West Horsley village as one of its most important rural features is that on the entry roads to the village (mainly Long Reach in this instance) there is a vista across fields as there is only development on one side of the road
  - The fields included in Policy A41 do not satisfy the criteria for development- they do not abut the currently defined village settlement on any side and so cannot be considered an extension of the settlement or infill
  - Development on a current site of open fields in green belt land surrounded by undeveloped countryside is in breach of the government's guidelines on building in the green belt
  - Residents on East Lane have previously had their planning applications refused on the basis that it interferes with the green belt contained in Policy A41- why has this now changed?

I urge you to consider these objections seriously and reconsider your plans for West Horsley under the Local Plan.

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

Attached documents:

---

1. Objection to the Number of Houses being built in West Horsley

I object to the 4 Proposed Sites - Policy A41/Policy A40/Policy A38 and Policy A37

• The Local Plan has suggested a 35% increase in housing for West Horsley by 2022 and yet only a 11% increase in Guildford town. What is the justification for this?

• The Guildford Borough Economic Strategy document makes no case for locating large numbers of new homes in West Horsley - this is a village with no shops, no post office, no petrolstation, no train station, no medical centre and a very limited bus service. It also offers no employment opportunities for residents

• The National Planning Policy Framework requires that new residential development must be limited in quantity by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities - this policy has been ignored in the Local Plan

• The density of houses on the proposed sites is completely out of keeping with the rest of the village and will change the character of the village forever

• The National Planning Policy Framework requires that new residential development must respect the character and density of housing in the area - this policy has been ignored in the Local Plan.
• About 10 houses on East Lane (mine included) currently back onto and look out onto open fields green belt land. Policies A38 and A41 allow 135 homes to be built directly behind these houses and 90 directly across the road from these houses - this will completely change the character of the village
• The proposal for the 4 sites do not respect "the character and density of housing in this area".

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3765  Respondent: 10811681 / Linda Knight  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the plans to build 595 new houses in the Horsleys and also the development of over 2,000 houses on the former Wisley Airfield. I moved to this area 20 years ago precisely because I wanted to live in a small rural environment. It was not an inexpensive choice, but I decided to spend my hard earned money to purchase a house in a location that I loved. Building such a large number of houses in and around Horsley Village will completely change the character of the village. In addition, it will create new problems such as over-crowding on the local train service and associated parking area. This plan does not take into consideration the welfare of the individuals who already reside in the Horsleys.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3494  Respondent: 10812417 / Lynda Smith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
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 more housing for the above village as proposed in the neighbourhood plan.

Horsley is a village not a town and does not have the infrastructure amenities or facilities to cope with more people (school places, doctor appointments, cars on roads etc)

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3301  Respondent: 10816545 / Kent Atkinson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Scale of the Proposed Developments:
The 593 houses in East & West Horsley will further aggravate the already overstretched infrastructure. The road through East Horsley (Ockham Road North & South) is inadequate even now, and cannot be upgraded. Normal cars have to slow down to pass each other in certain parts, and climb onto the pavement when a truck passes through.

And you want to add further traffic to the area?!!

I understand that there are plans for 2,000+ new dwellings plus considerable related infrastructure on the Wisley Airfield, only two miles from East Horsley. I am of the opinion that the Horsley area will not be able to absorb the increased population, traffic and pollution in the area.

It is not realistic to assume that the new town will restrict itself to the Wisley Airfield area. Their daily routine will spill into the surrounding areas including East Horsley. We do not have sufficient facilities, schools, surgeries and other services. Gas, electricity and telephone services in the area are already operating at full capacity on very old pipes, wires and exchanges. Local roads are too narrow and winding to take the existing traffic, and there is insufficient parking anywhere, even in front of most homes. The local roads were built in the 1930s or before, and are mostly no more than narrow lanes where cars have to slow down to pass each other. The access roads to East Horsley are narrow and winding and are not sufficient to handle even today’s traffic.

The scale of the proposed development is way out of proportion and way out of character to the existing infrastructure and the space available in this small, picturesque old village. The new town will completely destroy the special character of our historic village.

Station Parade a “District Centre”?

There is a clear misunderstanding of the nature of the facilities in our village centre, it would be completely inappropriate to target the area for future urban development. Please, get out of your offices and come and see the village in action on any normal week day and week end, see how the facilities, roads, drainage etc are already overstretched. As a certain tennis player often said: You cannot be serious with these proposals!

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

Attached documents:
I am horrified to hear of the massive proposed house building projects in and around West Horsley and the wider Surrey area. I wish to register my strongest objection to the multiple proposed sites but particularly what's planned to happen around East Lane in Horsley.

These proposed developments will change rural nature of West Horsley Village, and the visual amenity to all of us who currently live here.

I understand there is a local policy to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt against inappropriate development.

I object to removing the Horsleys from the Green Belt. - I can see no exceptional circumstance to justify this action.

Our Roads and services Infrastructure is already overloaded. -

The village suffers from a high water level in the ground and at times water logged fields overflow onto the roads in for example East Lane and the Street in West Horsley. If the fields are built on this will compound surface water problems. This is a particular concern as we seem to have more rain in recent years.

The surrounding roads including A3 and M25 often get gridlocked and many drivers including me have given up on them and started using our village roads as a cut-through instead. So adding 100's of new families into the area will add perhaps 1000 extra cars onto local roads.

The Street and East lane have narrow sections and suffer congestion at either end particularly with drop-offs at Glenesk and Cranmore schools.

The increase in traffic will cause longer queues and congestion and increase risks of road safety and accidents to residents on foot and bikes, and the drivers themselves. The local roads are in a terrible state and more traffic will make things worse.

The increase in population will overload already stretched resources such as a doctors surgery already stretched to the limit and shops and parking. The planned population increase (in excess of Government ONS forecasts) for the Borough will require a major extension of the Royal Surrey Hospital to cope.

The state schools eg Raleigh and Howard of Effingham are overloaded already, so as far I can see there is no planning if infrastructure roads, resources and amenities to support the development.?

These proposed developments each change the local area where they are planned They are over-bearing, out-of-scale or out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity.

I am also concerned that taken together these developments have an adverse effect on Nature conservation in the area.

West Horsley Parish is one of a rich and varied mix of well established low housing density settlements with a considerable number of historic buildings. There are a considerable number of recreational visitors (walkers and cyclists) through the seasons each year.

Overdevelopment: Policy S2 states that provision will be made for 13,800 new homes over the Plan Period 2013 to 2033. The number of homes is too high and unsustainable in Guildford’s villages. The Site Allocations list totals 12,698.

Village expansion is unsustainable. With only one small shop, no post office, a very limited weekdays only bus service through the village, it is clearly unsustainable for the proposed high volumes of new housing development.
The development of 385 homes on the 4 proposed sites are at much higher densities than currently exist in the village settlement and will be totally out of character with the existing mix of different housing styles and layout of the village. The homes building proposals are unsustainable in terms of schooling, drainage, roads capacity, shops, parking in East Horsley (shops and station), public transport.

The Key Evidence document ‘Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2031 makes no case for locating large numbers of homes in West and East Horsley or neighbouring villages.

The need for so many houses to be built in West Horsley over the first 5 years of the Plan period 2018 to 2033 is totally unproven. The West Horsley Parish Council and Surrey Community Action Housing Survey: May 2014, identified a limited need for some 20 affordable homes for local people who want to remain in the village.

Traffic generation from the proposed new housing estates will be considerable. Most households in rural areas as a necessity have 2 cars, many having 3. Journey times on local roads will increase significantly.

There are known sewage overflow problems in the Ockham Road North / Green Lane area. Thames Water has advised Guildford Borough that the area’s waste-water network is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all the proposed developments. The foul drainage system from West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley, will need to be upgraded to cope. Thames Water advise ‘a 2 to 3 years lead-in period’ to install the necessary waste water network and treatment capacity after planning permission for a development is granted.

I appeal to Guildford Borough Council to wake up to their responsibilities to protect their residents and the environment, from this massive reckless plan.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1509  Respondent: 10817121 / Roger Adams  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

---

**Site Policies**

**General Comment**

GBC’s proposed Local Plan proposes:

- 533 houses on large sites in East and West Horsley (The Horsleys)
- 60 houses on small sites in The Horsleys
- 2000 houses on Wisley Airfield
- 400 houses on Burnt Common
- 2000 houses at Gosden Hill Farm (on the A3 near Burpham)

This makes a total of 4,993 houses within a 5-mile radius of The Horsleys, not including many smaller sites in nearby villages.

At the moment there are 2808 houses in The Horsleys (EH 1697, WH 1111).
Thus I calculate that the plan represents:

- A 21% increase in housing stock within The Horsleys.
- A 178% increase in housing stock within a 5-mile radius of The Horsleys.

I can find no argument in the document 'Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2031 for locating such large numbers of homes in The Horsleys or neighbouring villages. Rather the majority of the Strategic Employment Sites proposed in Policy E1 are over 5 miles away from them.

There are serious shortcomings with, and deficiencies in the infrastructure, of The Horsleys currently as I have stated above under Policies I1, I2 and I3. The housing growth for The Horsleys set out by GBC in the Proposed Local Plan will merely exacerbate this problem.

In addition these policies run contrary to NPPF paragraph 17 which specifically states that planning should be about “empowering local people to shape their surroundings”. As I have said earlier, but it bears repeating, comments on local social media sites and discussions with inhabitants of East Horsley lead me to conclude that Site Policies A35-A41 do not shape the surroundings in the way local people would wish. There seems little doubt that the local populace feel victimised by GBC’s policies when The Horsleys will be required to build, in percentage terms, twice the amount of housing than Guildford urban area.

I OBJECT therefore to Site Policies A35-A41.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1510</th>
<th>Respondent: 10817121 / Roger Adams</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

These policies propose a total of 405 dwellings from these six sites. The 2011 Census showed West Horsley had 1,124 dwellings at that time. This represents an increase of 36% over the plan period, a very high proportion by any standards.

These four sites all currently lie within the Green Belt. Development on them requires settlement boundary movements. As I have stated in the objection to Policy A39 above, the NPPF is quite clear that every movement in settlement boundaries must be justified by ‘exceptional circumstances’. I do not believe these policies demonstrate any such circumstances and are therefore unjustified and contrary to NPPF rules. If this boundary movements are invalid then these sites remains a part of the Metropolitan Green Belt. Therefore the housing development proposal would be invalid.

I OBJECT to Policies A37, A38, A40 and A41 as they do not demonstrate the exceptional circumstances required to move the settlement boundaries.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/637</th>
<th>Respondent: 10820833 / R.D. Jones</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 are amazed at the proposals for development in The Borough particularly in relation to the Horsleys and the old Wisley Airfield to which we strongly object.

Firstly we question the basis upon which the need has been calculated, which is further brought into question by our exit from the EU.

Secondly the infrastructure in the area is already overloaded with traffic during the rush hour and it has become dangerous to cross Ockham Road on foot several older people being put at risk, at such times.

This Country is experiencing progressively higher amount of rainfall and local roads are regularly flooded causing more potholes and the dangers associated therewith also making it almost impossible for pedestrians to use the pavements without getting soaked by passing traffic.

At rush hour the A3 is already suffering with serious -delays and jams particularly at the Ripley, M25, Cobham junctions any further increase in traffic (which is inevitable if the proposed developments go 1 ahead) would bring gridlock with all the knock on effects.

Furthermore the proposals take the villages out of the Green Belt, thus making a farce of the whole object of the belt itself: which is totally unacceptable.

People have settled in this area because of its country atmosphere quietness and its general village feeling which will all be destroyed by the proposed developments. People have paid a premium price for their houses in the μ.rea and-who is going to compensate all the residents for the inevitable decrease in property values? ·

The car parking availability at local stations is fully developed, platforms have already been extended and there is very little room for expansion, which will be necessary if the proposals are carried out.

We enclose herewith an article which we trust you will read and note it's relevance and importance.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3946  Respondent: 10828737 / Claire Dawson  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

East and West Horsley proposals.

Unthinkable to remove these precious, tranquil villages from the green belt.

West - the number of proposed houses here would change the very nature of the village forever.

The Narrow lanes without footpaths are completely unsuitable for the proposals.

Imposes an unsupported burden on the current infrastructure and services, totally unsuitable.

Enforces draconian development proposals totally unbalanced and unsustainable dramatically changing the character of West Horsley.
Objections to Guildford Borough Council's new Draft Local Plan

I strongly object to the proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt and to the proposal to extend the boundaries of the settlement areas.

I object to the increased number of houses projected to be built on land currently in the Green Belt, more than double the number proposed per year in a previous plan. The impact on the local infrastructure, already struggling, would be disastrous.

There is already too much heavy traffic on the narrow roads; parking at the stations, shops, medical centre and village hall is at times already impossible. Drainage is inadequate, water pressure at times pathetic.

The increase in the local population would cause too much pressure on the schools, medical facilities and other services.

I also object to the proposal to build 120 houses behind Ockham Road North, land already subject to flooding. It would be irresponsible to aggravate the problem.

I object to the proposed removal of the former Wisley Airfield from the Green Belt and the subsequent development proposed which would have an enormous adverse effect on the whole area, including critically the management of traffic at the A3 junctions.

I object to the whole creeping development stretching from central London to the Horsleys destroying the local countryside so essential to the wellbeing of the population. There are plenty of brown field sites which could be considered for development with far less detrimental effect on the country as a whole.

I trust these objections will be fully and responsibly considered in the consultation.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPA16/871  Respondent: 10833377 / Cynthia Thorpe  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategies and Sites June-July 2016 Consultation

I am a long term resident of West Horsley. An extra 385 extra homes in West Horsley, which is an increase of some 35% on existing, without any improvements in infrastructure, will cause huge problems in the area. As it is, existing schools, medical facilities, road an transport systems, together with drainage and sewage systems to name but a few, are struggling to cope with current strains put on them. What is proposed is insupportable and I wish to object.

The proposed extra 385 homes in West, and 100 in East Horsley, are at variance with the key Evidence document "Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2012-2031." Why? Because it does not argue in favour of locating large numbers of homes in either The Horsleys or neighbouring villages. I object to the proposal for this reason also.

Furthermore, simple arithmetic tells me that such a large number of houses on such relatively small sites will be both out of keeping and of a much higher density that the rest of West Horsley. Please register my complaint on these grounds.

The West Horsley Parish Council & Surrey Community Action Housing Survey: May 2014 indentified a limited need for about 20 affordable homes to enable local people to stay in the village; principally young people and elderly people wishing to downsize. The need for so many houses to be built in West Horsley over the initial 5 years of the Plan period 2018-2033 is totally unproven. Again I wish to register an objection.

I am totally opposed to any change in, or ‘insetting’ of, the Green Belt, so as to permit the proposed developments because no exceptional circumstances have been cited in justification. Again, will you please register my objection. It must be said that if acceptable representations had been made for ‘insetting’ the Green Belt, then I might take a different view.

You will see from the above that I am totally opposed to the proposal to build an extra 385 homes in West Horsley - and for that matter an extra 100 in East Horsley. Please add my name to the list of objectors.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/357  Respondent: 10837217 / Gillian Dobb-Ponds  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I strongly object to the number of houses that are proposed to be built in East and West Horsley, also the 2,000 houses that are proposed at Wisley Airfield.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2876</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10838433 / M.D. Chandler</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 wish to object to the proposed volume of building in the Horsley and surrounding Areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our roads are already disintegrating and are crowded. (Try driving through The Drift)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The doctor surgeries are full.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the schools in the area are full.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital appointments can be up to eight weeks plus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you really think it makes sense to build more houses in this area? Well, I don't.</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: PSLPA16/1666</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10839041 / Maureen Allen</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>We would like to register our objection to the proposed New Local Plan. Fifty seven years ago, we moved to the lovely village of West Horsley and over the years have seen it grow, however, it has basically remained a village,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the proposed developments go ahead, it will become a town, without the infrastructure to support it. If we had wanted to live in a town to raise our family, we would have done so,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is of great concern to us that these developments will increase the population significantly and without due concern to the Green belt which was set up to prevent the spread of towns particularly around London,</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: PSLPA16/893</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10840289 / John Elgar</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategies and Sites June 2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am writing to raise my objections and comments re the above, in particular in respect of its impact on the Horsley and neighboring villages, as follows:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I strongly object to the proposed removal by "insetting" of West and East Horsley villages from the Metropolitan Green. This appears to be indiscriminate and is entirely inappropriate and with no justifiable basis. The Green Belt is established by national legislation for the preservation of the countryside and should only be used for development as a last resort in very exceptional circumstances. I am also concerned by the excessive proposed use of Green Belt for development in general, and consider that greater use should be made of brownfield and redevelopment sites before encroaching on Green Belt land for development.

1. I object to the density and timing of new housing proposed for West Horsley and East Horsley villages. The main proposed Horsley new development sites amount to 533 new homes which is a staggering high increase on existing homes (35% increase in West Horsley) and at a much higher density out of character with the village. This level of development would massively and irreversibly impact on the rural nature of the villages, and is simply unsustainable in terms of the capacity of the local infrastructure (roads, drainage etc) and amenities. The extent of proposed new housing for the Horsley villages is disproportionately high as compared with the Borough as a whole. The proposed timing (between 2018 and 2022) is also inappropriate as non-Green Belt sites should be used first.

1. I object to the massive scale of development (2000 homes) proposed for the Wisley. This is entirely inappropriate for a Green Belt and, especially when combined with the proposed new housing developments in East & West Horsley, would completely overwhelm the nearby infrastructure and villages and including Horsley, Ockham and Ripley.

West and East Horsley villages have a rich historical mainly agricultural heritage, and are characterized by its mix of very old and newer houses surrounded by and interspersed with farmland and woodland. The open character of the Horsley villages makes an important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt hence in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the villages should remain within the Green Belt. It is noted that the NPPF requires new developments to respect the character and density of existing housing and be limited in quantity by availability of infrastructure and local facilities.

The local infrastructure is already stretched to capacity by high volumes of traffic, and the Council struggles to keep up with maintenance of roads and draining as it is. The proposed developments would utterly overwhelm the existing infrastructure, whilst severely and permanently damaging the rural character of the area.

I am concerned by the overall strategy in the Plan of proposed extensive use of Green Belt for development. The primary need for affordable and social housing is clearly in an round Guildford as opposed to the rural areas, yet the plan seems to focus on large scale Green Belt development instead of regeneration and development within Guildford itself. This approach seems fundamentally wrong and would inevitably lead to increased urban sprawl and spoiling of the borough.

It is unclear why it is proposed to remove the Horsley villages from the Green Belt, whilst at the same time creating new Green Belt around Ash and Tongham. This is clearly inconsistent.

I would also question the need for the very high rate of new housing proposed for Guildford Borough overall, being far in excess of actual recent population growth, and see no justification for driving such a dramatically increased rate of population growth in the Borough. My understanding of the need for new homes in the Horsley villages is only for a relatively small number of smaller and affordable homes.

Overall I consider the Plan to be unbalanced in inappropriately using Green Belt for development rural areas, which would be unsustainable in terms of local infrastructure, in preference to first making use of brownfield and redevelopment sites to meet housing needs. The Plan also overplays the need for economic development in rural areas.

Councillor Paul Spooner recently stated that "we have also listened to the what you said in the last consultation" 1. It is disconcerting that after very extensive and constructive comments and objections raised by local residents to the Draft Local Plan published for public consultation in 2014, the proposed New Plan is if anything even worse than before for the Horsley villages.
I trust my objections and comments will be taken into consideration, in particular in retaining the Horsley villages within the Green Belt, and scaling back the proposed Horsley and Wisley developments to a sustainable level appropriate for Green Belt.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3148  Respondent: 10840801 / Carolyn Kurk  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing in response to Guildford Borough Council's new Local Plan.

I most strongly object to the removal of East and West Horsley from the Green Belt and feel it would be disastrous for the character of both villages. Green Belt should mean Green Belt and should not be made available for development.

I object to the number of houses suggested being built in the villages due to the fact that schools, doctors and parking are already at breaking point. The roads would become even busier and they were not built to sustain so much more traffic.

If you are going to build in the Horsleys then I would suggest a residential home, a day centre or something like it for the people of the Horsleys.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/859  Respondent: 10843457 / Kelvin Hayes  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a local resident, I am writing to object most strongly to some elements of the new local plan.

The Horsleys are rural villages and have no infrastructure suitable for 533 new houses and their occupants. The local primary school is already over-subscribed and parking in the village, particularly at the station, is limited.

The Green Belt was set up to protect such places for future generations, it should never be open to negotiation.

I do accept that we have a need for more houses, particularly so called “affordable” properties and those for older residents, but going by recent developments, the houses that will be built in this area will be in the upper price bracket, and as such will not alleviate any housing problems that the wider area may have.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2895  Respondent: 10846497 / Malcolm Folley  Agent: 

Section page number 267 of 599  Document page number 384
Increasing the population of West Horsley by such vast numbers would eradicate the character and charm of what is – and should remain – a traditional village. This letter is to highlight my grave concerns for the future of West Horsley, its inhabitants and the environment.

The scale of this plan is unsustainable for a multitude of reasons:

* The infrastructure is already fraying at the edges. Our roads, through West Horsley and East Horsley, are congested at peak times of the day as commuter and school traffic has become significantly increased in recent years.

*The Raleigh School in West Horsley is full with no room on the site for expansion. The Howard of Effingham Secondary School, traditionally the school that children from West Horsley transfer to at the appropriate age, is also at maximum capacity.

*At school times, when parents deliver or collect their children from the Raleigh Primary School, or the preparatory schools, Glenesk and Cranmore, it is not an exaggeration to describe East Lane, Ockham Road, Northcote Road, Northcote Crescent and Nightingale Crescent as chaotic. It does not bear thinking about how worse these roads would become in the event of an influx of housing on the scale being considered.

*Traffic increases from the proposed new housing estates will exacerbate an already critical overload of cars in the village.

*This congestion then spreads to all the adjacent roads. Furthermore, the state of these roads, and all others within the two villages, are narrow with poor or limited paving. In places, in West Horsley, there is barely room for two four-by-four vehicles to pass; and the presence of trucks, which are seen with greater frequency as our villages are used as cut-through between the A3/M25 and the A246 Guildford-Leatherhead road, causes traffic to slow to a halt. This is also placing pedestrians at risk.

*Also, there are several points in East Lane, in West Horsley, that are repeatedly flooded through the winter. In essence, the pressure on our roads and drainage is at a worryingly fraught level today.

*Parking is already an issue, too. The station car park, serving both villages, is almost full on most days from Monday-Friday. Parking at the three parades of shops is also regularly overloaded.
*The Horsley Medical Centre is operating at what appears to be maximum capacity – again parking to keep an appointment at the surgery is already a game of chance. Other issues are at play here. Like the Medical Centre, the schools have limited scope, or no scope at all, for building development and are at full capacity.

*To this end it is incumbent on the Local Plan that the unsatisfied demand for housing first needs to be established to be a genuine local demand for people born in the locality, or who need to live in the locality as a consequence of their local employment; or are existing residents needing to downsize or upsize.

*In West Horsley, we have watched a succession of smaller, and therefore ‘affordable’ properties, be granted planning permission by the Guildford Borough Council allowing them to be rebuilt into substantially larger, and therefore hugely more expensive homes. Where has the coherent thinking been behind that policy, I wonder?

*I wholly object to the unwritten expectation that all the villages on the A3 corridor will, sooner rather than later, become an urban sprawl linking this area to the suburbs of south west London.

*The importance of maintaining the Green Belt to prevent the urbanisation of Surrey’s rural communities, like West Horsley and East Horsley, is paramount. Our legacy should not be to leave behind a landscape to resemble a concrete jungle – which I fear will be the consequence of the scale of the proposal drawn up by Guildford Borough Council.

*If we are to protect the Green Belt for future generations we need to ensure it is only lost after strict examination against laid down criteria and after all suitable Brown Field are fully utilised.

*Our environment is attractive and of national importance for flora, fauna and geographical issues.

*Erosion of verges and ditches is already a threat caused by flooding and unusual weather patterns of late. The effect of concreting over the Green Belt land will further reduce the natural drainage system and drive water into existing drains that are already at risk of overflowing.

*Our concern about the Cayman Island registered company's promotion on the former Wisley Airfield will have unimaginable and irreversible consequences on all the villages surrounding the site, obviously including West Horsley.

A traditional village life has been maintained throughout our 33 years in residence with strong clubs and associations, as well as an abundance of local businesses, and producers of food local to the area.

There is limited employment within the Horsleys, and the bus service is one designed to meet the needs of ageing, rural community inhabitants; not those seeking to work in Guildford or Woking, for example. The rail service is already
heavily used throughout the week – and the railway station is substantial distance from much of the housing in West Horsley.

It is the duty of our generation to maintain the natural beauty – and significant importance – of villages like West Horsley for the generations of the future. We think we are doing a decent job of that. After all, history has shown that the constructions of 1960’s style development of cheap housing created more problems in rural areas than it solved: rising crime, unemployment, and communities without a soul.

Once farmland has been commissioned for development, we have arrived at a point of no return.

This plan destroys the very essence of Surrey – so attractive not only to those of us living here in West Horsley, but for those that relish the chance to visit and enjoy the Green Belt that has been part of our heritage for a century.

I repeat: this Local Plan proposed by Guildford Borough Council is inappropriate and should be condemned for the damage and destruction that would be wreaked upon West Horsley killing a village that is vibrant, well-maintained and cherished by those who live here.

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

Attached documents:

I am absolutely appalled to hear that in certain areas of Horsley that the green belt has already been changed, once this has happened and carries on our green and wonderful land will be lost forever.

I am totally against any encroachment on the green belt.

I was at the meeting held in your offices about the Wisley Airfield when it was completely outed I now see it has again been included in the plan. It is ridiculous in so many ways and would completely ruin this area forever, for a start the amount of traffic and the roads would be impossible.

The nearest station car parks are already filled to capacity. This is just a total profit making idea for a few people who live in The caymen Islands with no care about the residents who live here and what about you the council? I would have thought it was your duty to protect the local people who by the way pay a lot of money in council tax.

I a resident who lives in Old Lane am really annoyed this has been allowed to carry on and take time money and energy from the council.

I reiterate I would like to know exactly who these people are in the Caymen Islands as they seem to have an agent acting for them I think we should have a right to know.

I feel very strongly about any green belt loss and will oppose it with all my strength.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1405  Respondent: 10852897 / Diana Goddard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

The six development sites listed on the new plan amount to a total of 533 new houses, I am trusting these houses will be affordable housing to enable the younger generation to move back into this area. At the moment every house being built consists of four or more bedrooms, we need smaller homes – not all cramped together either.

Planning for Thatcher’s Hotel I do strongly object to for the following reasons:-

Firstly, The Claudel Hotel, Epsom Road is now a nursing home

Secondly, Bookham Cetange Hotel is residential care

Thirdly, Preston Cross Hotel will also be nursing care homes which leaves only one hotel for the whole area, I do feel this Hotel could still have a future, it has quite a lot of history going back to the days of a tea-room, a lot more thought needs to be put into this, I’m sure someone could make it into a thriving business

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1078  Respondent: 10858273 / S.M Southall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Your papers also contain comments on the type of housing that you would wish to see in the Horsleys. Here again your approach is flawed as 533 new homes of the type you describe would be wholly out of keeping with the village. It is an observable fact that many Horsley houses are large and on large plots and that is why people have bought them. Furthermore, you reflect this fact in the heavy Council tax bills we pay from which Horsley residents derive few benefits.

You need a major re-think and a concentration on the more than adequate brownfield sites in the Borough.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2013  Respondent: 10858945 / C P Faithful  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Removing Horsleys from Green Belt status.

Changing the settlement boundaries in the Horsleys.

Planning with no regard to the infrastructure necessary.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3261  **Respondent:** 10859393 / Teresa Neasmith  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**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 Local Plan for East and West Horsley.

I believe that the Horsleys should remain as Green Belt. The exceptional circumstances required before taking this action have not been demonstrated.

There are no sound reasons for the boundaries of the settlement areas to be changed.

Infrastructure in Horsley is already overloaded. Local schools are full, drainage is inadequate, roads and car parks are overloaded.

Station Parade should not be designated as a District Centre. The nature facilities in the village centre have been misread.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1725  **Respondent:** 10860353 / B Jenkins  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

**RE GUILDFORD BOROUGH PROPOSED SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN:STRATEGIES AND SITES 2016**

I am writing to object to the local plan for the Horsleys. My oppositions are as follows:-

485 additional dwellings-How many extra residents will this mean Another 1,500?

Added to the proposed development of Wisley airfield of another 2100 dwellings and around 8000? It appears this plan is to cram as many people as possible into this area, whilst destroying much of the environment.
If the Horsleys are taken out of the Green Belt, I feel it will lead to extra development in the future. Finally, the present infrastructure will not support this plan. The Medical Centre will be under severe pressure. The schools will be full to overflowing (as they are already). No shops in West Horsley (remaining shop due to close next month) leading to extra pressure on East Horsleys parking for shops and station. The roads, which are for the most part country lanes, will be horrendous, with traffic. The drainage system will be unable to cope. There will be tremendous impact on the wild life. I do not object to a reasonable number of new affordable homes in the Horsleys, as I realise there is a need for them, but this local plan does not take into account the cost to the environment, or to the taxpayers.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3875  Respondent: 10860417 / Paul Parmenter  Agent:

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

Having attended my local meetings to review the updated plans for the expansion of the available housing stock in the Horsleys I have some serious reservations. The housing density per allocated plot in no way reflects the current density per area in West Horsley. How can this be considered a balanced approach? If using the formula for housing expansion that would normally be applied to a town means that the intention is really to turn the Horsleys into a small town then please come clean about the intended outcome.

Some of us that have left towns to find the joys of living in a village community will have to accept the fact we are being driven out to find ourselves another village to live in until the dreaded developers arrive on our doorsteps again in the future. Mentioning the greenbelt seems of little point either.

Throwing the "lungs of London" away doesn't seem of any concern to anyone with their greedy hands in the housing money pot. Schooling and Doctors places will need expansion. This is very "undefined" as a strategy at present. As for the removal of all of the extra human waste, both bodily and refuse, this seems to be far off in the distance with all of the focus just on "Build, Build, Build". Has anyone done a risk analysis, forecast projection, or even a plan???

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1679  Respondent: 10860993 / Peter and Fiona Armitage  Agent:

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

In more specific terms I object strongly to the proposed development of 533 houses on six sites in the Horsleys. East Horsley is an attractive independent rural village and not an extended suburb of the South West area of London. It must remain that way. As before, you are very light on the increased infrastructure that will be needed to accommodate

1) an additional 700 cars on narrow poorly maintained roads, some without pavements

2) an additional 150+ children in local primary schools that are absolutely full already
3) an additional 3000 people for medical care when the local Medical Centre is full already.

Where is the thought through strategy taking into account the interests of the existing residents of the area who you are meant to represent?

You also ignore the adjacent East Horsley Conservation Area when you propose the development at Thatchers Hotel. I object to this and the other development proposals in the Horsleys.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/352  Respondent: 10864193 / Roy Smithers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

After reading through the Guildford Plan proposals my objections to this are based on the fact that without the protection of the existing green belt area, once the first section of land is built on there will be no protection left for the complete infill of the remaining area. This will turn Horsley villages in to an urban zone with the resulting damage to both the natural environment and quality of life for the existing residents. The pressure from the increase in the local population will also have serious knock on effects on the nearby North Downs area which is classified as an area of outstanding natural beauty. One section of this AONB is the Sheepleas which is already suffering from an exponentially increasing number of visitors due to its proximity to the existing village. To turn this area in to what will be essentially a large town will cause huge pressure on the environment leading to a decline in quality of life for all people in the area including the newcomers and the destruction of its many rare and varied species of wildlife.

The effect on the existing roads and infrastructure has not been taken in to proper consideration. The roads in this area are in a disgraceful condition due to lack of investment both from local and national government. In years when there is little rain this area gets very short of water and suffers hosepipe bans and although some of the water is supplied from boreholes in the North Downs supplementing them with abstraction from the local rivers would be difficult without the risk of them drying up completely in drought conditions. This country still has a duty to take into full account all of these problems before rushing into a reckless decision to build houses in unsuitable areas such as Horsley and the surrounding villages. The local roads such as the A3 and A246 which are the main roads used by commuters to their places of employment, and schools for their children are already overloaded or become gridlocked in rush hour and this will only become much worse if these proposals go ahead.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the South East of England is a desirable place to reside due to its proximity to the Capital. It is unsustainable in the short term to even consider building huge numbers of houses in this area. Housing and jobs are required in other parts of the country which have high levels of poverty, social deprivation and unemployment. The South East in general is exhausting its supplies of natural resources such as the supply of sustainable drinking water due to over abstraction and adding to this problem would be very unadvisable. The local sewerage works are already close to capacity and the problems arising from untreated effluent entering the rivers during flood conditions would have a serious effect on the ecology of the local rivers and streams. This problem was serious on the river Wey catchment during the late 1970s when it became much polluted with raw untreated sewage. We will be destined to repeat this if we increase the number of houses to the levels proposed in this ill though out plan. The local council need to reconsider the whole of these proposals as they could cause irreparable harm to the whole area which would be impossible to overcome once the damage is done. It is recognised by the majority of right thinking people that sometimes limited infill is necessary in order to provide a few houses for local residents to stay in the local area if they have family connections, but this proposal will destroy the whole fabric of the local community and destroy the villages in this area forever.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I am writing to object to the proposal under the local plan to remove the Horsleys from the green belt.

This would be totally unsuitable and a dangerous precedent. If it were to be agreed, I can foresee you or your successors in 10 years time being pressured to take further sites out of the green belt and then more still until eventually only a few pockets would be left. Future generations would be faced with the worst urban sprawl that the post-war planners had tried their utmost to prevent.

I also object to any proposal to build hundreds of new houses in east and (particularly) West Horsley. The problem is the infrastructure. The doctors surgery can take few, if any, new patients and the school have barely enough places for the existing children in the area. Any proposal for new houses running into hundreds must include new medical facilities and new or enlarged schools.

There is also the problem from heavier traffic on our narrow, often winding, and already hazard-strewn roads, which serve the villages. In addition, parking will become an increased problem with hundreds of new people in West Horsley coming into East Horsley for shops, station, etc. This will all make life far from ideal for the newcomers and lasting residents alike. Please do not allow developers to proceed with these proposals as they currently stand.

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

Attached documents:
• The roads in the adjoining areas of Ripley, Ockham and the Horsleys struggle even now to cope with the demands placed upon them and are quite unsuitable to carry the considerable amount of additional traffic required to construct the developments and service them in use.
• The single track access to some sites (e.g. site A40) is wholly unsatisfactory and the significant infrastructure changes all around the district required to facilitate the developments are not proposed with consequential damage to the local amenities, undesirable levels of noise, pollution and nuisance.
• Neither too is it proposed to enhance all the other infrastructures necessary to support a significant increase in the local population (e.g. public transport, shopping, schools, medical services and utilities).
• The extent of developments proposed (notably in the Horsleys and surrounding areas) is significantly and disproportionately higher than other areas in the borough; it is also planned for these to be at a very much higher level of density than the locality presently supports which will place an unsustainable burden on the local community.
• The proposals lie near an area of great beauty, and near sites of ‘Interest for Nature Conservation’ and a site of ‘Special Scientific Interest’
• The proposals will detrimentally and irreversibly affect the rural character of the local areas of Wisley, Ripley, Send, Ockham and the Horsleys.
• The damage to the amenity presently enjoyed by visitors and the local community for walking and rambling, cycling, horse riding and general enjoyment of the natural charm of the area will have an adverse effect on the economy of the area.

I trust these matters will be given the most serious consideration before these wholly unpalatable and undesirable proposals go any further and that they are recognised for the considerable social and environmental threat that they pose. I ask that they be rejected as totally unsatisfactory.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3583  Respondent: 10868513 / Tom Stevenson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of East Horsley I write to object to your target in the Draft Local Plan of at least 533 more houses in East and West Horsley, and to possible developments at the former Wisley Airfield.

Whilst a small amount of infilling in the villages may be acceptable, the sheer numbers under consideration cannot be accommodated without a massive improvement in the local infrastructure (roads and footpaths, parking, public transport, telecoms, flood prevention, schools, medical services, etc.) which would further destroy the character of these rural villages.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/75  Respondent: 10869633 / John & Jacquie Sharman  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I am writing to save the character of our Horsley village from future development.

I do not think the village areas should be removed from the Green Belt.

I am objecting to the building of a further 533 new houses in The Horsleys.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

I wish to inform you that I am deeply concerned about the massive increase in the number of developments planned for the village of West Horsley. The residents have no idea how this figure was achieved and Paul Spooner is unwilling to discuss. We have been informed on numerous occasions that the green belt policy would not be effected and sadly this promise has been ignored. With the present plan proposed we do not have the schools GP surgeries Car parks Transport.

I had to go to London last week and could not find a parking space at the station.

Our roads are in a disgraceful condition some as bad as third world countries. Yet the council have made little attempt to re surface or repair potholes. What will they be like with the use of more traffic. We will be sinking and not driving.

Horsley has severe problems with flooding and this has caused a lot of problems over the years.

I am surprised as property prices are so expensive in Horsley how any affordable houses can be achieved.

Finally no consideration has been given to the residents of Horsley. I feel during construction process which will be going on the noise dust traffic will have a profound effect on peoples quality of life, with an increased respiratory conditions due to pollution etc. We pay a high council tax to leave in this area and we do have a say at what is going on

The draft proposed housing plan is completely unrealistic and not acceptable

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

**Attached documents:**

---

I have been reading about the local plans for the Horsleys and Wisley Airfield and have various objections which I hope you will consider:

- I appreciate you have to build new houses but the number in the planning proposal is too vast. It needs to be reduced greatly.
• East and West Horsley needs to remain within the Green Belt for our generation and for our future generations to protect the heritage of the area.
• The impact of the number of houses on our roads, schools, medical services, utilities etc is too great. The current facilities will not be able to cope.
• I know there is a lot of opposition and I don't feel the planners are taking notice and ploughing ahead without considering the huge concerns.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4096  Respondent: 10870913 / Douglas Clarke  Agent:

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

We are writing to you in order to voice our concerns and objections to the building proposals and changes which will we believe will be damaging our village life and destroy the character of our villages forever.

Our family moved to West Horsley 10 years ago. We moved from a really busy area (Walton-on-Thames) which has grown considerably since we first moved there in 1976, and We have witnessed the change in what was a ‘small town’ into an extremely busy large town, and not all for the better! This now seems to be the ‘future’ for The Horsleys.

• We moved to West Horsley village specifically for the green belt which surrounds us, this is now to be eroded, and you are taking us out of the green belt area! and the reasoning is for ‘exceptional circumstances’ which has not really been made clear.

We cannot believe that this type of development is being considered when in fact you have neglected (for many years) the current state of our roads in the village and I am especially referring to East Lane. We pay considerable council tax rates which have not been reflected in your surfacing and upkeep of the surrounding roads, and yet you:

• Propose an infrastructure for future development of the area which will certainly overload the capacity of the village (you can’t even keep the current roads in good repair so I cannot say I have much faith in the council!) This proposal will overload our villages.
• Many streets flood when we have torrential rain in the area and the drainage is inadequate at best – so with additional housing this will be a major problem.
• What will happen to our parking facilities in the village with all these extra cars (perhaps two per household).
• The GP surgery will be overloaded.
• Your estimated new housing numbers arising from a SHMA do not exactly match up to what appears to an inflated number of new houses needed which has grown considerable from your original plan. I understand that this is 70% higher that the official national estimate for population growth in the Borough. WHY!
• What effect this will have on the services in the villages. West Horsley households is estimated to increase by 35% this appears to be higher than any other single area in the Bourough. WHY!
• The development of 2,000 housing forming a village on the former Wisley Airfield will be enough in itself to overload our Horsleys.
• What will happen to East Horsley Village Centre if it is to be designated a ‘District Centre’ I fear this will make us very vulnerable for even future development. We will no longer be two villages but a small town, as you have also decided to blur the boundaries of the villages.

We do hope that our fears and those of our family and other residents will be taken into consideration before you demolish our villages; our way of life and extend the boundaries of the Settlement areas of Horsley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Local Plan for West and East Horsley

I write yet again to express my objections to the local plan which has been put forward by the Guildford Borough Council. Especially in the proposed removal of East and West Horsley for the Green Belt area and the extension of the boundaries of the settlement areas of the Horsley’s.

Overall I understand that there is a need in the borough for new homes and do not oppose development providing it is in keeping, in proportion and does not fundamentally change the character of the area. It is obvious to me that the current plan for East and West Horsley is neither in proportion nor in keeping with the character of the local area.

Why the planners believe that this is reasonable and will not destroy what is a classic village, is beyond me.

Surely it would be much better to focus the development in Guildford which already has good infrastructure and amenities? The brownfield areas of Guildford should be utilised first, where high density building fits and would be desirable. Expanding the boundaries of Guildford, where people have elected to live in a town, would not fundamentally change the character of the area. This could then be supplemented by smaller developments spread out throughout the villages of Guildford Borough, which would not have the detrimental effect that the proposed large developments in Horsley and Ockham would have.

My concerns regarding the plan are as follows:

- Why are you planning to build on the green belt when not all brownfield areas have been utilised and other less contentious areas are available for development? Losing the green belt means this land is lost for ever and opens the door to never ending expansion. Should we prepare for a large retail park is built next on the outskirts of the village?
- The building of such high density houses in the village in quite a concentrated area will destroy what is a quiet and rural village, which has been in existence for hundreds of years. These developments clash in style and density to the existing character of the village and will change the village forever. These developments equates to an increase of approx. 35% in the number of the existing West Horsley households, an increase larger than any other in the Guildford Borough.
- Nowhere in the plan is there any provision for any additional infrastructure. With 533 houses, based on current demographics, will mean a huge leap in demand for public services which cannot cope. These will include:
  - No singular development is large enough to ensure the developers invest in any of the infrastructure of the area.
  - Schools place both Primary and Senior: If 50% have 2 children, where are the 533 additional school places going to be when the schools are already heavily oversubscribed?
  - Transport and parking: If 40% of homes have a commuter to London (212 people), where are they going to park? There is no room at the station car park and here is one bus every two hours! In addition, at peak time the trains are already very busy.
  - Drainage: Although an element of investment has been made to improve drainage in West Horsley the roads still flood. The already fragile drainage just will not cope and we will have road closures for weeks again into the village.
  - Roads: The roads in the village are not build to carry more traffic, a 20% plus increase in traffic will not only lead to significant congestion but damage to the environment. Currently the roads ar ein poor condition and deteriorating, how will it support the doubling of traffic around the village?
• Lighting: There are approx. 235 new homes planned for on or just off East Lane, with the increased proportion of children in the area the roads will be highly unsafe as there is no street lighting and completely inadequate foot paths.

• Medical: The doctor’s surgery is already bursting at the seams, if the mix of older people and families, as I would expect, moving to the new homes this is going to going to result in much more than 20% increase in patients.

• The Ockham development with 2000+ homes is almost going to double the number of homes, while there has been limited mention of infrastructure, this has not extended to the impact on road and load public transport network which will be swamped by the additional traffic.

Again it appears that the plan has been made, which is lacking in detail and thought for the current village feel. While these developments may help the housing shortage, it will destroy the villages of East and West Horsley by over-developing them and irreversibly changes the character of them forever.

I trust that you will take my views and that of the other local residents into serious consideration when finalising the plan.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2807  Respondent: 10871425 / Tim Collins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I object to the size of size of the development proposed

The need for nearly 14,000 proposed new houses is not supported by evidence based research or scientific study. The figures supplied by the council are flawed in many respects and to this day serious questions are yet to be answered on the validity of the model used to calculate the area’s housing need.

I am especially concerned about the damage that will be caused to small local communities, in particular, West Horsley, East Horsley, Normandy, Ockham, Ripley, Send and Clandon. The number of new houses proposed for these villages is out of all proportion to the existing settlements.

I object to not protecting the Green Belt

The Green Belt concept was put in place to protect the countryside and provide space and enjoyment for all. To infringe on the Green Belt between the borough’s existing settlements will lead to a merging of towns and villages, removing open space and robbing future generations of our beautiful rural areas.

Over 70% of the proposed development is on Green Belt and flies in the face of the principle of the Green Belt. I’m extremely suspicious of the motives of the local council in their pursuit of this ill conceived plan and more so the ‘exceptional circumstances’ justification

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of planned road infrastructure

The A3 and the village roads around Horsley are already congested. Many of the roads in Horsley are narrow, without pavements for pedestrians. To add more vehicles into the mix would have a damaging effect on the character of our rural areas.
I object to the expansion of commercial land in the urban area losing the potential for further housing.

There are sites available in Guildford Town Centre earmarked for further commercial and retail development which could instead support affordable small houses and flats for young buyers, close to the town’s amenities and existing infrastructure. The council have not demonstrated a need for further retail space when increasing numbers of shoppers are buying on line and the need for first time buyer’s properties is much greater.

I object to Brownfield sites not being re-developed for housing

Existing Brownfield sites and unoccupied properties must be developed for housing rather than reducing the size of our Green Belt.

I object to development without improvements to local infrastructure

Local facilities eg doctors, schools, transport facilities in Horsley are already stretched. Any development planned must take account of required improvements to local infrastructure. The number of homes currently planned for West and East Horsley is entirely unsustainable.

I would support limited new development in West and East Horsley, WITHIN the existing village boundaries and on existing developed sites like the Ramada Thatcher’s Hotel (Ref A36, ID 2044) and the Bell and Colvill Garage (Ref A37, ID 16) as long as the local infrastructure is improved to cope.

I would NEVER support the building of homes on the Green Belt and I object to the village boundaries being extended to increase the availability of land for housing. However, I would support the building of a new Raleigh School in East Lane (Ref A41, ID 2063) as I believe this need to be exceptional (the current site is not sustainable for the existing population of the village) and there is no other local site previously developed which would be large enough or suitable for a new school.

I urge the council to revise the local housing needs and amend the Local Plan so that development of Brownfield sites is undertaken and the Green Belt protected for future generations.

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: PSLPA16/3891  Respondent: 10874241 / James Grzinic  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 extension of the boundaries of the settlement areas of the Horsleys because I do not believe that any sound reason for this to take place has been given.
2. I object to the increase in pressure on our local infrastructure. The local schools are full, it is virtually impossible to get a doctors appointment without a wait of at least several days, roads and car parks are already in poor condition and overloaded.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3351  Respondent: 10874273 / Margaret Pearce  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

SITES. I object to all policies involving building in the Greenbelt as NO EXCEPTIONAL circumstances have been shown, excessive numbers of houses have been proposed, and the clearly expressed views of residents have been ignored. I especially object to Policies A36, A37, A38, A39, A40, A41. The number of houses far exceeds local needs, and the density is excessive. There is no local support for these. The COLLECTIVE IMPACT of these together with the WISLEY development has NOT been considered. Key infrastructure is lacking. There is no adequate provision made to increase the waste water capacity. There is a lack of schools, and health centres. The doctor’s car park is always full. Most of the local roads are narrow with no pavements or only a single one. Already we are frequently forced to drive onto the pavement when lorries are driving through the village. Cycling is very dangerous and we have many cyclists coming from London at the weekends and during the week practising for the Prudential road race, or just for the pleasure or cycling the Surrey Hills.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/594  Respondent: 10875937 / Mark Tottman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am writing again to register my continued and very strong objection to your plans for housing development in the Horsleys in response to the Proposed submission local plan: strategies and sites June 2016. As a long standing resident of West Horsley, I continue to be appalled by your plans for our village and the surrounding countryside. My objections
are:

- Housing Numbers - our village infrastructure cannot meet the proposed additional number of dwellings. Our drains, our water supply and our roads cannot cope with the proposed number of new homes. Building this number of homes will lead to significantly increased flood risk - we already suffer from this issue now. In addition, more cars, means more pollution, and more queuing for local amenities.

- Negative impact on services. Our local schools are already full so local people would have to send their children outside the area to go to school. That is unacceptable. Our medical centre is full, one has to wait for an appointment if you are ill. Building more homes in the village will make this worse. That is unacceptable and ill thought through.

- Green Belt - This proposal would fundamentally change the character of the village. My understanding of The National Planning Policy Framework is that it requires any change of Green Belt boundaries to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Unmet housing need is not an exceptional circumstance in law. So the Green Belt boundaries should not be changed. To remove most of the Horsleys (and other villages in the Borough) from the Green Belt would change the nature of this area of countryside forever and would eventually merge historic and separate villages. This is outrageous and unacceptable.

Brownfield Sites - there is considerable land available in Guildford which could be used for housing (e.g. Surrey University, vacant commercial sites, derelict land. This should all be used up before any consideration is given to destroying the character of our village(s).

In summary, you have got this wrong. The NPPF requires that any new residential developments respect the character and density of housing in the area and should be limited by the availability of local infrastructure and facilities. For the reasons I have given above, you are not complying with the policy framework. I continue to 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: PSLPA16/2868</th>
<th>Respondent: 10876769 / Grahame T Sewell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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? ( )

My wife and I have lived in West Horsley for a combined 35 years and we wish to provide you with our comments on the Local Plan.

Overall, while we accept that more houses need to be built in the Guildford Borough, we believe very strongly that the Proposals are way beyond what is reasonable and will place an enormous strain on the existing infrastructure in East and West Horsley.

For example, to highlight just a few **EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE CHALLENGES:**

- It is already impossible on occasions to find a parking place at Horsley Station and Effingham Station on a work day. There is no public transport available as an alternative to get to the Stations.
- Driving along the B2039 between the A246 and the centre of East Horsley village is already often very difficult with the large number of wide vehicles and part of the road is only wide enough for one vehicle, requiring lorries frequently having to drive along the pavement. The pavement is itself narrow in parts and we know of pedestrians who have been hit by passing vehicles.
- The Horsley Medical Practice is already at over-capacity.
- Car parking within East Horsley is already at capacity and there appear to be no alternative sites for car parking allocated or available.
GENERAL COMMENTS

• We agree with the response from East Horsley Parish Council – EHPC Response to GBC Local Plan – which has already been sent to you.
• We believe it is wrong to remove the villages from the Green Belt. We moved to Horsley and brought up our family here in order to live in a Green Belt area. If that is removed, we will never get it back either for existing residents or future generations.
• It is wrong to enlarge the village boundaries.
• It is completely wrong to plan for up to 533 new houses in the Horsleys.
• The proposed development of Wisley with 2,068 houses has been long debated. We object to the proposed development there as it would generate an enormous amount of traffic in the Horsley area and create even more pressure on the existing infrastructure. Again, beautiful countryside will be lost to development.
• It is wrong that 65% of new houses in the Borough will be built in the Green Belt – the Council must find more appropriate sites.
• If this Local Plan is approved, the Horsleys will become just another area of concrete and buildings in a continual stretch of development from London and to the south west beyond the M25. This will result in more pollution and lower quality of life for existing and future residents.

We look forward to hearing in due course that the proposed Local Plan has been thrown out – as the vast majority of residents in the Horsleys wish to happen.

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

Attached documents:

As a resident of Horsley for many years, I am now extremely worried about your plans to nearly double the size of our village. My worries are as follows:

1. The proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt is a disaster. The Green Belt was designed to benefit not only the villages surrounding it but also the city of once this land has been built on we can never go back, no matter what the consequences of this foolish decision. Only in the very exceptional circumstances when all other solutions have been exhausted should we even contemplate diminishing the Green Belt.

2. The local infrastructure as it stands can barely deal with current demands from the existing population of the Our schools are full and many parents are having to send their children out of the village to be educated which also increases the already heavy traffic on our narrow roads. With regard to our roads, they are narrow, in poor condition and in many places do not have the luxury of pavements alongside them. With further increased traffic pressure this is going to make it even more dangerous for any parents and children who choose to walk to and from school rather than sit in the queues of traffic. With extra houses come extra cars that need to park as well as travel on the roads. In Horsley parking is extremely limited especially for the commuters who use the railway station. Even if most of the new residents wish to travel by train how are we going to extend the car parking facilities? More residents will only increase the need for extra parking for people to attend the village hall, the doctors surgery and the local shops (the few that we have!) Road side parking is not an option and the local car park is very small.

3. The local development at Wisley airfield if it goes ahead will certainly impact on our village as the residents from this development will surely wish to use Horsley Station which again doubles or even trebles the traffic problems in Horsley.
4 I doubt that we really need such a large increase in the number of houses in this. We certainly don't need more 4 and 5 bedroom houses for current needs but you are trying to lure the people from London here to line the developer's pockets. If any houses need to be built, we need serious numbers of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom properties, some of high end spec to attract a number of elderly residents who currently are living in very large houses and would like to downsize to more compact but never the less extremely nice houses. We also need small houses for the younger people to enable them to live in the area in which they have been brought up in a property that they can afford.

5 In Horsley we have one medical centre to cope with all the needs of the residents of the village. How are they going to cope with a large increase of patient numbers? Also all the extra developments in surrounding villages are going to mean that our local hospital, The Royal Surrey is going to face huge problems in the not too distant future.

6 Surely you should be looking at developing any Brownfield sites within the Guildford area before invading the Green Belt!!

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3014  Respondent: 10878017 / Angela Day  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I wish to register my strong objection to the local plan, which will have a severely detrimental impact on our neighbourhood. I object in particular to -

1. The density of proposed additional housing in East and West Horsley. To add 593 houses to already overcrowded schools, medical facilities and the railway will have a major negative impact on the daily life of local residents.

2. The proposal to remove the Horsleys is outrageous. No "exceptional circumstances" have been demonstrated. The Council has a duty to protect the Green Belt for future generations.

3. No sound reasons have been given for the proposed extension of the settlement areas of the Horsleys.

4. The development of the Wisley airfield site in Ockham would have an absolutely massive impact on the area, entirely changing the environment for existing residents and blighting daily life for all concerned. Public facilities are already overloaded. The heaviest impact would fall on the most vulnerable, especially the elderly.

The local plan would, in short, destroy the village community and turn the area into yet another bleak commuting dormitory.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1805  Respondent: 10878785 / Ivy Bennett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Local Plan.

I am very disappointed that the points that I raised on the July 2014 draft plan have not been addressed.

Whilst I understand the need for more houses the scale of increase is totally out of proportion to the size of West Horsley village. West Horsley has around 1,100 houses - the plan to increase this by 35%, and within the 5 year plan will destroy the village and change it into another urban sprawl.

More houses are needed in the urban areas where people work not in the country which results in additional commuting which will only worsen the pressure on all the infrastructure services and particularly the roads. The plan does not address these issues and it is crucial that it does.

My main concern is with regard to the roads and parking. At peak times they are currently inadequate and will become totally congested with the likelihood of a further 800+ cars in the village associated with the planned new housing. Car parking is already very difficult and there is very little scope for further parking or road improvements. The station car park

is also inadequate and often at capacity. The paths are already narrow and very dangerous in places, particularly along the main Ockham road and East Lane.

Some additional housing is needed but this is not more of the large four/five bedroomed houses that have been built over the past few years. There needs to be more smaller housing for first-time buyers and for those 'downsizing' such as the housing of Weston Lea, and this needs to be with easy access to the local shops and services.

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

**Attached documents:**
4. The Raleigh school in West Horsley has insufficient room for children from the Horsleys at all levels, with children from outside the immediate area compounding the difficulties. More homes in Horsley will make matters even worse. The site for the Raleigh school is extremely cramped and the school is currently feeling forced to search for an alternative site. With any greatly increased population in the village the relocated school is likely to end up oversubscribed once more. Any new homes will just make a bad situation even worse.

5. The current provision of Medical and dental facilities are seriously stretched - they are insufficient for the existing communities. It is extremely problematic to get a Doctor’s appointment when most needed and almost impossible to get on a list for a National Health Service Dentist. Additional homes would put extra stress on the existing facilities.

6. West Horsley has just one shop; the other was closed and converted into flats. No provision has been made for additional shops and services alongside the new homes in the local plan. The shops at Station Parade, East Horsley are mainly visited by car by the local residents and people from the surrounding countryside. The parking at these shops is limited, in addition some people consider it perfectly alright to park on the double yellow lines outside the supermarket causing blockages and impeding junctions - the traffic situation at peak times is already unsuitable, parking for the shops and services in East Horsley could not cope with the influx of new homes/residents.

7. Although it is possible to walk along the Ockham Road along the pavement to visit the shops this is not a the rural experience expected of Horsley but one of a walk along a busy road of vehicles passing close and at times faster than they should. This road is insufficiently wide for two larger vehicles to pass and often wing mirrors of these vehicles overhang the pavement very close to pedestrians. I am aware of one pedestrian who was hospitalised as a result of being struck by a wing mirror whilst on one of these pavements and one of my children has been struck by a car wing mirror whilst walking along the pavement on the Ockham road. The greater increase in volumes of traffic generated by the proposed development and afterwards with the increase in vehicles heading for the village will make it even less likely that people will be safe on these pavements.

8. The waste water facilities would be unable to cope with any additional homes – it can’t cope with the number of homes that are already in the village, overflowing in Ockham Road North, Green lane area.

9. Some of the proposed sites have inadequate surface water drainage as it is – the land gets flooded. Building on such land is just asking for the houses to be flooded.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPA16/1314  Respondent: 10881569 / Nicola Douet  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Roads:

The roads in West Horsley would struggle to cope with the increase in traffic. For example, The Street is the only entry into West Horsley from the A246. It is narrow in places and it would not be possible to widen it and it can be very difficult to pass large vehicles such as lorries, tractors, buses and school buses, which frequently use this road.

Pedestrian traffic does not fair any better. In most cases it would not be possible to widen pavements. The increased traffic levels would be hazardous for pedestrians. Traffic will increase considerably as a result of the proposed housing estates. Most houses have 2 cars and some have 3. Journey times on local roads will increase considerably. No detail on roads and transport infrastructure in West Horsley has been found in any of the Local Plan documents.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/567  Respondent: 10882785 / Stephen Fleming  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I object to all sites in West Horsley for over 5 homes. The proposed sites will merge the villages of Ockham, West and East Horsley creating urban sprawl.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/237  Respondent: 10884929 / Kim Mackenzie  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I have written before about the various proposals issued so far for the local development plan, especially concerning the East and West Horsley area where I live.

My views have not changed.

Whilst I understand the need for modest and appropriate development, I do OBJECT to:

- The overall extent of the currently proposed development (500+ houses in the 2 villages) and the impact on us of 2000 houses on Wisley Airfield.
- The fact the current infrastructure (roads and other services) cannot cope now with the loads placed upon it, and no clear plans to enhance these in the future
- The loss of green belt land around the villages. These village boundaries should NOT be extended.
I have worked extensively in recent years for the local community (including running the Horsley Community Bus), and have gained a strong sense of the preferred way forward for this area, which is NOT the way implied by the present proposals.

Please TAKE STEPS to keep this as a RURAL area before it is too late

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1871  **Respondent:** 10885313 / B. Hazel  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

We would like to make the following comments on the new Guildford local plan.

We object to the proposal to remove the Horsleys from the green belt.

The local infrastructure such as local schools and medical facilities are already over stretched. Roads and car parks are overloaded especially the Ockham road south. We see no reasons for the extension of the boundaries of the settlement area of the Horsleys.

We object to the proposal to build over 2000 houses at the former Wisley Airfield as its less than 2 miles away from the village.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3821  **Respondent:** 10889825 / Suzanne Tyler  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am a resident of East Horsley and wrote in detail with my objections to the 2014 Local Plan. My concerns remain considerable and are summarised below:

The "exceptional circumstances" which need to be demonstrated before removal from the Green Belt have not in fact been demonstrated. Similarly the extension of the defined settlement boundaries have not been justified but appears to be an attempt to by-pass planning control for future unspecified additional development.

The existing roads (in particular the very narrow stretch of the Ockham Road North between Pennymead and the junction with the A246 by the Duke of Wellington pub) are already dangerously overused by the current volume of cars and large lorries (often from the construction trade) and an increase of a projected 6000 cars (based on 2 cars per household if permission is granted for all the proposed new developments) will inevitably lead to an increase in accidents and deterioration of already dilapidated and constricted roads, which cannot physically be widened to make them safer. It has become increasingly difficult to park in the village, either in marked bays or even the car parks, and this lack of parking will be exacerbated by the disproportionate increase in new housing.
The current infrastructure is already at breaking point in East and West Horsley - the village state and private schools are over subscribed and it is already very difficult to see a GP promptly at the village medical practice. The increase in pollution from the extra houses and car emissions will increase asthma symptoms and other allergies also leading to an increased use of and strain on the Medical Centre and its staff. An increase of 35% in the number of West Horsley households will place a further strain on the inadequate drainage and will worsen the already significant flooding that occurs regularly on East Lane and beyond the Barley Mow pub.

The increase in housing, demolition of existing long standing landmark sites in the Horsleys and removal of the green belt status is fundamentally changing the nature of a rural Surrey village, that current residents have chosen to live in: the Chown houses and Lovelace historic buildings will be detracted from and, in time demolished no doubt to make way for lucrative new developments. Horsley Towers will lose its setting as houses are built adjacent to it and Thatchers hotel is demolished, leaving the historic Chown frontage looking out of place surrounded by modern houses. The disproportionate number of houses is changing a village into a suburb of Guildford and, without the fields and green spaces for which it is renowned, it will soon morph into urban sprawl and the treasures of the National Trust at Hatchlands and Clandon Park will be mere islands in a suburban landscape which few outside the area will wish to visit.

There is a much stronger economic, infrastructure and social case for building houses on such a vast scale on the University side of Guildford, which is in need of redevelopment, no green space will be sacrificed and where existing transport links are strong and appropriate already.

I sincerely hope the views of local, long-standing residents of the Horsleys will be given due consideration and that further consultation locally will take place before the character of the village is corrupted in perpetuity.

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

Attached documents:
Schools and Medical facilities - local schools are already at capacity. Has any thought been given to where all these new children will go for their schooling? No extra places are planned in the Horsley's and any new places on the Wisley site will not be available for many years into the project. The same question has to be asked about medical facilities - where are the new home owners going to go to see a doctor or dentist?

Flooding - why has a site (site behind Ockham Road North) been chosen which is partially a level 3 flood risk when it is known what happens after prolonged rain. Generally everyone knows that the drainage system in this area cannot cope - please come and see the local roads after heavy rain.

Pollution - the great increase in traffic volume which will result from the proposed new housing will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment. This is already a serious concern for certain areas in the borough. How can you allow such a situation to get worse?

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1938  Respondent: 10903617 / Judith Moseley  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

As a resident of West Horsley I have taken great interest in the proposed developments outlined in the Guildford Submission Local Plan. After careful consideration I wish to make the following objections.

Firstly, the roads in the surrounding area are, at present, not fit for purpose. They require an enormous amount of investment to even bring them up to a reasonable condition for the present traffic but the amount of people and vehicles which the plan would bring to the area would result in further deterioration and in places, particularly during rush hours, complete gridlock. The prime example of this is the junction at the end of East Lane, Ockham Road and the Drift.

Secondly, the area A39 is to be built on land which allows houses at present in the area, to be free of standing water during inclement weather. Whilst I am hopeful that future planners would be aware of that, will it be taken into account? Experience tells me not to assume! The proposed development would be affected badly without doubt.

Lastly, I have grandchildren who also live in the area and attend local schools. Knowing the state of the system at present, where will the "new" schools for the "new" pupils be built because schools locally are up to capacity, or are the planners intending to use other schools not within the district to take the overflow? The resultant traffic from the movement of these children will add to the problem hugely.

The doctors surgery will be overwhelmed, the local shops unsupported as there will be no parking and I could go on. The general lack of common sense and thought about the people of the area is staggering. I hope some good sense will prevail and the plan will be completely revised.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4380  Respondent: 10910785 / Clare Curtis  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The proposed expansion of West Horsley village is unsustainable. With only one small shop, no post office, a very limited weekdays only bus service through the village, it is clearly unsustainable for the proposed high volumes of new housing development. The development of 385 homes on the four proposed sites are at much higher densities than currently exist in the village settlement and will be totally out of character with the existing mix of different housing styles and layout of the village. The homes building proposals are unsustainable in terms of schooling, drainage, roads capacity, shops, parking in East Horsley (shops and station) and public transport.

The need for so many houses to be built in West Horsley over the first 5 years of the Plan period 2018 to 2033 is totally unproven. The West Horsley Parish Council and Surrey Community Action Housing Survey: May 2014, identified a limited need for some 20 affordable homes for local people who want to remain in the village, i.e. for young people and for elderly people who wish downsize to a smaller home.

There is a continuing lack of state primary school places in the village. The Raleigh School which serves both East and West Horsley is full every year and this has been the situation for many years. Secondary school places are also limited in number at the Howard of Effingham School and other secondary schools involve greater travel times and further distances. Glenesk and Cranmore private schools are well supported by many families living in Guildford and other villages up to 14 miles away. Each of these private schools during term time, receives high volumes of traffic going to and from the schools at the beginning and end of the school day, on Ockham Road North and the A246, respectively, already causing congestion.

Kingston Avenue Medical Centre, serving all of East and West Horsley and areas beyond, is always extremely busy and residents experience difficulty in making appointments. The planned population increase (in excess of Government ONS forecasts) for the Borough will require a major extension of the Royal Surrey Hospital to cope.

Whilst Horsley station has frequent trains to London and Guildford 7 days a week, the station car park is normally full on weekdays. An increase in village population will increase pressure on station parking and traffic movements to and from Horsley station to drop off and collect travellers to London and school children going to Guildford and Leatherhead.

The increased level of traffic from the proposed new housing estates will be considerable. Most households in rural areas as a necessity have 2 cars, many having 3. Journey times on local roads will increase significantly.

There are known sewage overflow problems in the Ockham Road North/Green Lane area. Thames Water has advised Guildford Borough that the area’s wastewater network is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all the proposed developments. The foul drainage system from West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley, will need to be upgraded to cope. Thames Water advise ‘a 2 to 3 years lead-in period” to install the necessary waste water network and treatment capacity after planning permission for a development is granted.

It is for these reasons that I strongly object to the GBC Local Plan.

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

Attached documents:
Having studied the "Draft Guildford Borough Local Plan – Strategy and Sites, June 2016” I write to you in objection to a number of the policies, herein stated below.

**Policy H1: Homes For All, Policy H2: Affordable Homes**

I object to the above policy. The proposed development of 531 homes over Green Belt sites in West Horsley is out of proportion with the current number of houses in the village. This is also completely out of character with the village with regards to style and layout, and is unsustainable on existing services and amenities. The village is served by one local convenience store, a part time newsagents, and one small MOT garage.

There is a very limited bus service, which runs through the village, and Horsley Station is already a busy commuter station hitting capacity for car and bike parking. The only school in the village, The Raleigh, is already oversubscribed and additional population would mean existing residents would be further stretched for places meaning traveling to other villages/towns for schools.

In addition, the West Horsley Parish Council 2014 Housing Survey indicated a requirement for merely 20 affordable houses for the young or elderly wishing to enter the housing ladder or simply down size. This contradicts the proposed 531 houses for the village.

**P2: Green Belt and the countryside**

I object to the proposal to remove West Horsley from the Green Belt. There appears to be no justification for insetting these Areas from the Green Belt so I object to West Horsley's Defined Settlement Area boundaries being extended. According to the National Planning Policy Framework, in order to build on Green Belt sites, there must be "exceptional circumstances". There are none stated for this particular case.

Building into the Green Belt area will change the character of West Horsley village. Land and green space will be lost, create damaging environmental changes, all of which increase the risk of West Horsley morphing into another busy, densely populated, concrete, suburban town. Building into the Green Belt area will change the environment with adverse, damaging and permanent affect and will have impact on the Surrey Hills AONB, which attracts a great number of visitors each year.

**Policy D4: Development in urban areas and inset villages**

I object to new developments in inset village, due to the fact the volume of proposed houses will not compliment nor respect the existing grain and pattern of the areas. The layout and scale will be completely disproportionate to the existing scale of the village. It will also have an overwhelm,ing negative impact on the amenities and residents of the existing buildings.

**Policy A37: Land at and to the rear of Bell and Colvill, Epsom Road, West Horsley**

40 homes is unsustainable and unbalanced for this delicate and attractive environment in West Horsley village.

**Infrastructure and delivery**
The increased population would bring with it increased village traffic, higher requirements for public transport, and oversubscription for the local school which already runs to maximum capacity.

The volume of traffic through the village will be damaging on the noise levels and air quality, add increased risk and dangers on the roads, and will further add to the damage on the tarmac the residents already experience on East Lane. Both drivers, cyclists and pedestrians safety will be compromised. The children’s nursery Footprints on Longreach and the primary school on Northcote Road will be highly impacted with the increased volume of traffic with the proposed sites around East Lane. Plus, journey times would increase with the increased traffic on these narrow village roads.

The existing facilities already feel the pressure of the village population: the medical centre in East Horsley struggles to make appointments for the local residents; the drainage infrastructure already has a capacity issues, with overflow problems in the Ockham Road North/ Green Lane area; and the rail station runs to capacity with a daily full car park.

Thank you for considering my appeal and objections and I look forward to the response in the near future.

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

Attached documents:
I have yet to see Guildford Planning authority give a justifiable case and evidence of such exceptional circumstance, to use so much Green Belt land. I see no evidence that clearly shows that all brownfield and other sites have been completely scrutinised to the nth degree and that there is no other options to consider.

Guildford Borough Plan seems to believe that they can just change the Green Belt boundaries thus removing the status of areas of Green Belt to aid developments which are opposed by local committees it is supposed to protect and serve.

Thus this makes the proposed Policy 10: Green Belt and the countryside and Policy 8: Surrey Hills Area of outstanding Natural Beauty and the study's flawed. There is no sound case in changing due to exceptional circumstances the green belt boundaries.

Changing the Green Belt boundaries and developing large numbers of homes around Villages that have only a finite resources of limited shops, schools, transport links, roads and public services will change the character of many villages.

Clearly expansion plans to the villages of East and West Horsley are unsustainable and putting more pressure on Areas of Natural Beauty.

Policy 9: Villages & Major previously develop sites and policy 18: Sustainable Transport for new developments.

Where is the Evidence or Studies of "Can these villages sustain such growth without plans to improve the infrastructure required" If not where is the infrastructure upgrade plan.

I believe also in the plan there will be homes for all and affordable homes. Which is a good thing but the large amount of homes indicated on three Green Belt sites at a high density plan will change the character of the village. It will also put an ever increasing strain drainage, roads, schools, transport links, shops and parking. I also wondered how affordable this homes will actually be in this area.

I believe the number of homes for this area is over subscribed and that infrastructure should be vastly improved before any such numbers are though about. Even the telecoms and broadband services are under strain and that super fast Surrey is still struggling to offer fast broadband to all its homes. All the schools seem to be full in the area. The infrastructure is clearly not going to be able to sustain the growth.

From the points and comments above to Guildford Borough Councils Local Development Plan for East and West Horsley I therefore object to all developments in the area proposed.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3994    Respondent:  10915681 / Karen Bushnell    Agent:
Document:    Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I wish to object to various points in the latest Guildford Borough Council local plan.

1) My first objection is to the proposed removal of the villages of East and West Horsley and other borough villages from the Green Belt. This would appear to be in contradiction to your section Policy: Pt 3 Our Vision and Ambition. This states "To protect and enhance the environment .......". The Green Belt is not Guildford Borough Councils to give away as it is for the benefit of existing and future generations of Londoners as well as local residents. I agree with Guildford Greenbelt Group that once it is gone it is gone forever.
2) I particularly object to the extent of proposed development of 533 new houses within the Horsley's. Our roads are already congested at peak times, it is difficult to park by our village shops, our Medical Centre and local schools are over stretched. We are unable to accommodate an increase in our population of this size.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2138</th>
<th>Respondent: 10921537 / Lesley Whitehead</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing to object to your local planning policy. My objection is to the 2016 Draft Local Plan

- I object to all erosion of the Green Belt
- I object to any “in setting” (ie removal) of any villages from the Green Belt
- I object to the disproportionate amount of development in one area of the borough.
- I object to the limited consultation period
- I object to last minute inclusion of new sites with less than 2 weeks’ notice. This is a devious way of conducting business
- I object to the lack of any evidence for the alleged housing need numbers
- I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools
- I object to the lack of any immediate provision for doctors surgeries
- I object to the 40 houses and two travellers pitches at Send Hill. This land is not fit for anyone to live on as it is landfill land and I believe has asbestos buried in it
- Also who on your council would have travellers pitches next to their houses? The truth is none! Examine your consciences please

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3285</th>
<th>Respondent: 10921825 / Guy Broadest</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing to strongly object to the new Local Plan and in particular the proposal to remove the Horsley’s from the Green Belt.

I can see no sound reason for the Horsley’s being included in an urbanisation of land outside the M25. This is wholly inappropriate and unjustified. The Horsley’s have from early times been a rural village and in the 1920’s developed into a rural retreat with dormitory accommodation for London business workers.

The village infrastructure is unable and unsuited to support any further expansion.

1. The transport links are at capacity
   1. The trains into London are full to capacity well before they reach their destination at commuter times and the train companies keep extending the travel times to London in order to meet the timetable.
2. The train station car park is full to capacity already and there is no scope for increasing capacity.
3. The M25 from junctions 8 to Heathrow and beyond to the M40 are some of the most congested roads in the country and increasing housing supply at or near junction 10 at the Horsley’s, Wisley, Burpham and Clandon is wholly inappropriate and ill conceived.
4. The Local roads are unsuitable for increased capacity. The B2039 Ockham road north and South is already too narrow for existing traffic with pinch points at Bishopsmead Parade, Conisbee’s butchers and just south of Station Parade and before Forest Road on Ockham Road South where traffic is reduced to single file if a lorry or coach is on the road. Furthermore the Rail Bridge on Ockham road south has recently been the subject of a Lorry collision as it is a low bridge.

2. The Village infrastructure is already stretched to capacity.
   1. The local state schools are at capacity the Raleigh and the Howard of Effingham. There is no longer a guarantee that parents resident in the Horsley’s wanting their children to attend these schools are able to get them enrolled.
   2. The Medical centre is already at capacity and there is inadequate parking for patients.
   3. The local shops on Station parade have insufficient car parking capacity for existing residents and there is no room for expansion of parking facilities.

3. The proposed increases in capacity have not been thought through correctly. A 35% increase in housing capacity exceeds the increase of any other borough. This combined with the proposed developments in neighbouring areas of Wisley, Burpham, Clandon and Effingham is wholly inappropriate and unsustainable for both Local infrastructure and the National M25 that serves the area. We do not need to urbanise our Greenbelt and gridlock our countryside, when high speed rail networks can spread the population expansion away for the already overcrowded South East.

I strongly object to the Local plan for 2016.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1748  Respondent: 10923265 / Colin Lewis  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In summary the Horsleys should remain in the Green Belt.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1967  Respondent: 10926017 / Phlippa Holmes  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My husband and I have lived at the above address since 1987, our two children have attended the Raleigh primary and Howard of Effingham secondary schools, we are both busy in village activities and I am now in receipt of a pension after 15 years as a teaching assistant at the Raleigh School.
Suffice to say I am appalled at the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites: June 2016 which proposes a new site for 90 homes opposite Greta Bank which is in addition to the 385 previously proposed in the Horsleys. Accordingly, I would like to raise my objections to this large expansion in village population, particularly in West Horsley, on the following grounds:

1. Both local state primary and secondary schools are at capacity with no guarantee that children living in West Horsley will be able to attend in the future. Extra stress on these high performing schools from additional numbers without increased resources and extra facilities will lower standards. In addition, the transport of young children to other schools in other places will diminish the quality of the children's educational experience and add to existing road traffic problems.

2. The Horsley Medical Centre already has difficulties in providing early appointments with doctors for patients with medical issues so additional villagers, both young and old, would make the situation The alternative of attending the A&E Department at the Royal Surrey County Hospital only transfers the problem elsewhere on an already over-stretched NHS.

3. The Street and East Lane are already congested with early morning road traffic due to on-street parking, a single lane chicane and numerous school There is thus the serious risk of injury to schoolchildren and cyclists from increased traffic at a time when drivers can be tempted to rush to their early morning destinations.

4. Flooding on The Street and East Lane is already a problem after heavy rain The loss of natural drainage with land use change and additional household waste water will aggravate this problem.

1. The inhabitants of West Horsley currently enjoy "green" areas and a relatively tranquil environment which make important contributions to their quality of life Both would be diminished by the proposed development. In particular, the loss of the green space to the south between The Rectory and the railway bridge and to the north between Long Reach and the railway bridge should be strongly resisted because, unlike other proposed sites in the Horsleys, these fields do not abut the currently defined village settlement on any side so should not be considered an "extension of the settlement or 'infill'".

It is disappointing that, despite a recent survey in which almost all respondents agreed that "West Horsley should retain the open aspect and strategic natural space along East Lane, The Street, Ripley Lane, Epson Road and Long Reach, which reinforce the village's rural nature", and several representations to GBC Planning department, the GBC not only persists but has actually enlarged the area of land proposed for new housing in the village.

This letter is a plea to respect our wishes for significant revision to this latest proposal. No boundaries should constrain the argument, even to the extent of having the GBC challenge the basic need for adversely affecting the historical character of West Horsley and other Surrey villages with the Government. Why are there not proposed restrictions on ownership of second homes to release additional housing from the current stock? Why are brownfield sites not being effectively developed first? Why, at the national and regional levels, is there not an effective policy for some control of immigration and the population in small local areas? Addressing such questions would help to reassure the villagers of West Horsley that, whatever the proposal, there would at least be a sound basis for accepting some adverse effects on our quality of life. At present there is none. The proposed Plan should be withdrawn.

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

Attached documents:
into the village. The Street has limited access at the Bell and Colville roundabout and near Edwin road it is reduced to single file traffic. From the North Ockham Road North is a narrow country road which can’t take two lorries passing. Old Lane is narrow, with a number of hazardous bends and a difficult junction into Cobham road. From the West The road from Cobham is the best route into Horsley but it is restricted at the railway bridge on Forest road. This road takes a lot of traffic as it is the access road from Horsley to supermarkets at Cobham. From the East A series of narrow roads provide access from Burntwood but none are capable of sustaining significantly increased traffic. b) Retail Structure The retail environment at Station Parade consists of 25 premises plus 3 at the bottom of Cobham Way, including a library, post office, chemist, 5 restaurant/cafes, butcher, baker and 2 mini supermarkets. The largest of these units are approximately 170-200 sq. m. There is no room for expansion of retail premises nor for the provision of extra parking places. This cannot be expanded or developed to a worthwhile retail centre. Bishopsmead, to the south of East Horsley is much smaller and similarly constrained. West Horsley has virtually no retail presence. c) Infrastructure There is already pressure on school places, doctors surgeries and parking. The Horsleys cannot sustain a significant increase in demand. In addition, there is limited space for expansion of any of these facilities. d) The Geography of the Horsleys The Horsleys lie just north of the A246 which runs to the north of the North Downs. Rainfall on this area flows north and causes periodic flooding in heavy rain. There are frequent problems with storm drains flooding in the Horsleys. Green belt land in and around the Horsleys is needed to absorb this water run off. Further building will exacerbate this problem. SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS 1. I OBJECT to the basis on which the housing requirements have been calculated. As they are not transparent they lack credibility. 2. I OBJECT to the final target housing number (based on a mathematical model which has not been disclosed) which is almost 70% higher than the official national estimates for population growth in the Borough.

I OBJECT to the lack of understanding of the infrastructure constraints of the proposed new households on the Horsleys villages and to the absence of any effort to deal with them. If around 2,600 new houses were built in the Horsleys, Ockham and Wisley airfield this could easily result in around 5,000 more cars within a three mile radius of the villages. Traffic This would have a huge impact on local roads which as outlined above have little scope to be widened (e.g. pinch point at Lynx Hill on Ockham Road South and the restricted area on East Lane) or otherwise altered to cater for such an increase. Although it is proposed to upgrade the current A3 junction at Burntcommon to a full 4-way junction. SCC traffic modelling anticipates increased use of Guileshall Lane, Hungry Hill Lane and Tithebarns Lane (all not suitable for increased traffic volume) for traffic accessing the A3 at Burntcommon in order to travel to Guildford and beyond. The SCC report states that “consequently, it indicates that further thought may have to be given to managing traffic in this area as part of a transport assessment should the development be progressed”. A local plan when proposing new housing on a substantial scale must surely plan for the implications of increased traffic both on the major roads such as the A3 and the minor village roads. The current draft local plan has not given such issues enough consideration Parking at Horsley & Effingham junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the Horsley medical centre and at the village hall will not be able to cope with this additional demand. Flooding The site behind Ockham Road North in East Horsley is partially a level 3 flood risk area, and local residents are well aware of how much standing water there is in their gardens after rain. Building on such land will only exacerbate the problem. Other areas of the Horsleys are also flooded when it rains become the drains are inadequate. Substantially more houses will exacerbate the problem but no attention has been paid to drainage in the local plan. • Schools and medical facilities Amenities Local schools and medical facilities are already at capacity. No extra school places are planned in the Horsleys and the school places proposed at Wisley Airfield will not planned until many years into the project. 2600 new houses could easily mean 2600 children looking for school place! I trust the Council will review its Local Plan basing it on a model which is available for inspection and with more attention to the infrastructure implications and use of brown field sites rather than destroy our precious Green Belt.

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

Attached documents:
1. Sites in East and West Horsley

I OBJECT in particular to including Sites A36-41 (East and West Horsley). This is a back-door way to create a mega-village—essentially, a soulless new dormitory town. The Horsleys feel victimised by this plan, which has been masterminded by Council leaders representing Ash and Tongham at the other end of the borough, where (in a flagrant case of political double standards) the Green Belt is actually being extended under Policy P3.15

Whatever their merits as development sites, the 6 Horsley sites should not be considered individually but for their cumulative impact on the contiguous villages of East and West Horsley.

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

Under the plan, rural West Horsley will take 35% of new homes, urban Ash and Tongham 16% and Guildford urban area only 11%. The total number of homes in West Horsley will increase by 35%, which is disproportionate when measured against the overall increase in housing across the borough and particularly in Guildford town. If the Council have justifiable reasons to transform a particular community so radically, the plan should present a case rather than putting forward site proposals as a fait accompli.

These sites will put unsustainable strain on local facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops. For instance:

- Thames Water have advised the Council that the current wastewater network will not cope and that the foul drainage system all the way to the treatment works North of Ripley will need to be upgraded.
- Guildford Council's Education Review says "expansion options may need to be considered for primary" education in the Horsley area within the first 5 years of the plan, but Surrey County Council have no plans to do so. The Raleigh School is already full. The private Glenesk and Cranmore schools are also at or near to full capacity. The suggestion that schools in Ripley can be used contradicts the plan's stated intention to reduce traffic on the A3 and strategic aim that primary schools should be within walking distance.
- The plan's Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C) imagines an "East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme between 2019 and 2023 by Surrey CC" but gives no details. This scheme is just wishful thinking. The proposed housing can only harm the local environment, not "improve" it.

The harmful impact of these sites is magnified by the proximity of the so-called Wisley Airfield site (Three Farms Meadow), with over 2,000 new homes only 2 miles away (see below).

The density of new housing on the 6 Horsley sites is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the locality at present.

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

Collectively, these 6 sites militate against NPPF paragraph 81's encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been a success story in the Horsleys, with the creation of an amenity wood and community garden, the purchase of adjacent fields (on the eastern side of Ockham Road North) by local residents in order to preserve their open aspect, well-maintained pitches for local football and cricket clubs, public tennis courts, open space for a high-quality campsite (at Waterloo Farm) used by many foreign tourists and the approval of plans for a "Theatre in the Woods"- making West Horsley the only village in Surrey with an opera house. The open nature of West Horsley determined that a long portion of the 2012 Olympic cycle races passed through the village. This route has since been adopted by cyclists as a permanent asset, including the annual

"14 E. Gallagher Homes v Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283
"15 Councillor Paul Spooner and his predecessor, Councillor Stephen Mansbridge.
"16 Even some property developers complain about the Council's bias in favour of oversized developments, e.g. Dandara, whose relatively small 

Prudential cycle race. These and future examples of "positive planning" depend on protecting the Green Belt to maintain the openness and attractiveness of the local landscape and avoiding the urbanisation and traffic congestion that Sites A36-41 will bring.

By surrounding Waterloo Farm campsite with 120 new houses, Policy A40 on land to the North of West Horsley will make this rural tourism amenity unviable. This may accord with developers' plans, since the site would then be vulnerable to infilling with yet more housing.

Site A40 is subject to an unacceptable flood risk from a combination of a high groundwater table and the lack of surface water run-off. This is flat, clay land on the downhill side of the Horsleys where floodwater from new development will accumulate and back up onto existing properties nearby. I can provide photographs proving how badly these fields already flood at present. These problems will only get worse with the increase in extreme weather events associated with climate change. The "appropriate mitigation" suggested in Policy A40 exists only as an abstract notion. It should not overrule the need for Green Belt "exceptional circumstances".

Policy A40 underestimates the problems of safe access and egress. Firstly, Ockham Road North was closed for several weeks in 2014 because of flooding, and still floods regularly. Secondly, access problems are not confined to flooding and are not addressed by the proposal to extend the existing 30mph zone past the site entrance. Repeated attempts made by Ockham Road North residents to extend this zone have been turned down by the local authorities, Highways England and Surrey Police, even though data collected in 2015 show that traffic has doubled over the last 15 years and that the average speed in the 40mph section of this road is 52mph, with maximum recorded speeds of over 80mph. No traffic calming measures have so far been achieved. Additional housing will add to several hazards along this stretch of road, including:

- Its use by pedestrians, especially children (using the Raleigh and Glenesk schools and catching school buses to Guildford and Howard of Effingham), pensioners living in the string of bungalows at the northern end of the road, and visitors from the Waterloo campsite who are unfamiliar with the area.
- The existence of a narrow footpath on only one side of the road in any one spot. The layout means that walking half a mile between Green Land and East Lane requires crossing the road twice.
- The road's increasing use by recreational cyclists (see above).
- Its winding nature, poor sight lines (especially when interrupted by summer vegetation) and dangerous, concealed driveways. Most of these were built in the 1930s. Some have been widened but many are too narrow for modern traffic. Since a deep ditch runs along most of the road, vehicles have to swing out dangerously when entering or leaving.
- The prospect of additional traffic, including 19,000 HGV movements (90 a day over a long period) if Surrey County Council approves the Drift Golf Course's planning application to re-landscape its site using bulk waste transported from London.

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

Attached documents:
I OBJECT in particular to including Sites A36-41 (East and West Horsley). This is a back-door way to create a mega-village—essentially, a soulless new dormitory town. The Horsleys feel victimised by this plan, which has been masterminded by Council leaders representing Ash and Tongham at the other end of the borough, where (in a flagrant case of political double standards) the Green Belt is actually being extended under Policy P3."15

Whatever their merits as development sites, the 6 Horsley sites should not be considered individually but for their cumulative impact on the contiguous villages of East and West Horsley.

Building 533 new houses on these 6 sites, plus at least another 90 on small sites is (a) excessive in absolute terms and (b) disproportionate relative to the rest of the borough. It will destroy the rural character of these communities."18

Under the plan, rural West Horsley will take 35% of new homes, urban Ash and Tongham 16% and Guildford urban area only 11%. The total number of homes in West Horsley will increase by 35%, which is disproportionate when measured against the overall increase in housing across the borough and particularly in Guildford town. If the Council have justifiable reasons to transform a particular community so radically, the plan should present a case rather than putting forward site proposals as a fait accompli.

These sites will put unsustainable strain on local facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops. For instance:

- Thames Water have advised the Council that the current wastewater network will not cope and that the foul drainage system all the way to the treatment works North of Ripley will need to be upgraded.
- Guildford Council’s Education Review says "expansion options may need to be considered for primary" education in the Horsley area within the first 5 years of the plan, but Surrey County Council have no plans to do so. The Raleigh School is already full. The private Glenesk and Cranmore schools are also at or near to full capacity. The suggestion that schools in Ripley can be used contradicts the plan's stated intention to reduce traffic on the A3 and strategic aim that primary schools should be within walking distance.
- The plan's Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C) imagines an "East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme between 2019 and 2023 by Surrey CC" but gives no details. This scheme is just wishful thinking. The proposed housing can only harm the local environment, not "improve" it.

The harmful impact of these sites is magnified by the proximity of the so-called Wisley Airfield site (Three Farms Meadow), with over 2,000 new homes only 2 miles away (see below).

The density of new housing on the 6 Horsley sites is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the locality at present.

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

Collectively, these 6 sites militate against NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been a success story in the Horsleys, with the creation of an amenity wood and community garden, the purchase of adjacent fields (on the eastern side of Ockham Road North) by local residents in order to preserve their open aspect, well-maintained pitches for local football and cricket clubs, public tennis courts, open space for a high-quality campsite (at Waterloo Farm) used by many foreign tourists and the approval of plans for a "Theatre in the Woods"—making West Horsley the only village in Surrey with an opera house. The open nature of West Horsley determined that a long portion of the 2012 Olympic cycle races passed through the village. This route has since been adopted by cyclists as a permanent asset, including the annual

"14 E.g. E. Gallagher Homes v Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283

"15 Councillor Paul Spooner and his predecessor, Councillor Stephen Mansbridge.
"16 Even some property developers complain about the Council's bias in favour of oversized developments, e.g. Dandara, whose relatively small Green Belt sites on the A246 (Epsom Road) in West Horsley is not considered in the plan.

Prudential cycle race. These and future examples of "positive planning" depend on protecting the Green Belt to maintain the openness and attractiveness of the local landscape and avoiding the urbanisation and traffic congestion that Sites A36-41 will bring.

By surrounding Waterloo Farm campsite with 120 new houses, Policy A40 on land to the North of West Horsley will make this rural tourism amenity unviable. This may accord with developers' plans, since the site would then be vulnerable to infilling with yet more housing.

Site A40 is subject to an unacceptable flood risk from a combination of a high groundwater table and the lack of surface water run-off. This is flat, clay land on the downhill side of the Horsleys where floodwater from new development will accumulate and back up onto existing properties nearby. I can provide photographs proving how badly these fields already flood at present. These problems will only get worse with the increase in extreme weather events associated with climate change. The "appropriate mitigation" suggested in Policy A40 exists only as an abstract notion. It should not overrule the need for Green Belt "exceptional circumstances".

Policy A40 underestimates the problems of safe access and egress. Firstly, Ockham Road North was closed for several weeks in 2014 because of flooding, and still floods regularly. Secondly, access problems are not confined to flooding and are not addressed by the proposal to extend the existing 30mph zone past the site entrance. Repeated attempts made by Ockham Road North residents to extend this zone have been turned down by the local authorities, Highways England and Surrey Police, even though data collected in 2015 show that traffic has doubled over the last 15 years and that the average speed in the 40mph section of this road is 52mph, with maximum recorded speeds of over 80mph. No traffic calming measures have so far been achieved. Additional housing will add to several hazards along this stretch of road, including:

- Its use by pedestrians, especially children (using the Raleigh and Glenesk schools and catching school buses to Guildford and Howard of Effingham), pensioners living in the string of bungalows at the northern end of the road, and visitors from the Waterloo campsite who are unfamiliar with the area.
- The existence of a narrow footpath on only one side of the road in any one spot. The layout means that walking half a mile between Green Land and East Lane requires crossing the road twice.
- The road's increasing use by recreational cyclists (see above).
- Its winding nature, poor sight lines (especially when interrupted by summer vegetation) and dangerous, concealed driveways. Most of these were built in the 1930s. Some have been widened but many are too narrow for modern traffic. Since a deep ditch runs along most of the road, vehicles have to swing out dangerously when entering or leaving.
- The prospect of additional traffic, including 19,000 HGV movements (90 a day over a long period) if Surrey County Council approves the Drift Golf Course's planning application to re-landscape its site using bulk waste transported from London.

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

Attached documents:
Extension of boundaries of settlement areas of the Horsleys....no sound reason has been given for the proposed changes.

INFRASTRUCTURE. . . There is no scope to improve the width of our roads, they are already being ruined by large lorries using them. The schools, medical centres, shopping areas are already overloaded.

DISTRICT CENTRE for station parade...this classification would be an entirely ridiculous reading of the nature of the facility. The traffic up and down Kingston avenue is impossible at present, let alone if it was increased to a District Centre.

2000 houses on former Wisley Air field / 2000 houses Gosden Hill Farm...... The impact on the Horsleys of these developments would be HUGE . There is no infrastructure to support them and no way that roads drainage can be extended. Are there plans for more schools, medical facilities, shop etc?????? Public transport would need increasing, Horsley station is already overloaded.

I hope you will consider these objections

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

Attached documents:
The proposed development of 533 homes on Green Belt sites, at much higher densities than currently exist, would be
totally out of character with the existing houses and village layout. These developments would also be unsustainable in
terms of drainage, roads capacity, schools, medical facilities, shops, parking and public transport.

LAND AT FORMER WISLEY AIRFIELD

The proposal to build approximately 2000 homes at this site is in effect the creation of a New Town in the Surrey Green
Belt. This development would be a severe contravention of Metropolitan Green Belt policy and would have a major adverse impact across a widespread area, including East Horsley.

CONCLUSION

I object to the Proposed Submission Local Plan. The Council should be directed to amend the Local Plan by using
brownfield and previously used land for housing instead of encroaching on Green Belt land.

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

Attached documents:
3. Housing need in the Horsleys

The number of houses planned over the next twenty years at the 6 main sites in the Horsleys is 533. (At least 90 further houses could also be developed on smaller sites, according to the Horsley Countryside Preservation Society.) Development on this scale would damage irretrievably the semi-rural character of the Horsleys, the principal attraction of these villages for their existing residents and taxpayers, to whom the Council is sup posed to be accountable. The main centre of employment and future economic growth in the Borough is Guildford itself, yet the Horsleys (and other surrounding Green Belt villages) appear expected to take a disproportionate share of expected new housebuilding.

Approximately 65% of the planned new housing is to be built on Green Belt land. Ade quate consideration of reasonable alternatives, such as focussing on high density develop ments within the curtilage of Guildford itself, does not appear to have been undertaken. The Plan is therefore not compliant with NPPF (para 182.)

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1116  Respondent: 10943137 / M Malthouse  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
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 building more houses in the Horsley and Ockham area - we need to preserve the Green Belt.
We don't need any more houses as we are overloaded already with cars, shops, station, doctors and schools- We cannot cope with a whole influx of more houses- our needs are already too busy.
I have lived in Horsley for over 50 years and have seen the expansion of all these facilities- more would be impossible.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3213  Respondent: 10944961 / Margaret Prevost  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
My wife and I are resident at [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998]
The B 2039 Ockham Road North/South is already being used like an A road! The structure of the road is not suitable for the current volume of cars, heavy goods vehicles and coaches which has increased dramatically since we arrived here in 2017. If 500+ new houses are built in the Horsleys alone the result will be unbearable. If the so called Wisley Airfield plan was also allowed the result would be absolute chaos.
Our local schools, the Horsley Medical Centre, the Horsley railway station car park and the parking facilities at the 2 shopping areas are already operating at maximum capacity.
There do not appear to be any proposals which would address these problems.

The inclusion of these sites in the proposed local plan is therefore contrary to Policy 13 (Suitable Transport for new developments) and Policy 11 (Infrastructure and Delivery).

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/668  Respondent: 10945537 / Neill Ebers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

We write with reference to the new local plans for further housing in East & West Horsley ('The Horsleys'). The plans, as we understand them, are for the Horsleys to have 533 new houses introduced into the area as well as 2,000 new housing development of the Wisley Airfield. Should our understanding be correct then you are looking to introduce 2,533 new houses into an area spanning 3 miles around The Horsleys.

We are unsure if you have experienced the congestion on the A3 between Guildford and the M25 (JJO) junction turn off at Wisley. The congestion starts from 6.30am in the morning until around 9am and then starts again from 4.30pm until around 7pm with the tail back on some days going back a couple of miles. The A3 and the surrounding area are already experiencing difficulties in handling the existing traffic volumes which will only increase with the proposed new housing.

Outside of the traffic congestions mentioned above we are of the belief the following impacts will be felt to the area:
1. Further road blockage around the surrounding areas of The Horsleys.
2. A further taxation on the children capacity and resources of the local schools.
3. Reduced parking spaces (which has already become a problem).
4. Additional pollution to the area.
5. An impact to the Green Belt status of the area.
6. More accidents in the area.
7. A further drain on the NHS resources in the area (which are already stretched).
8. The potential devaluation of house prices.

We were attracted to the Horsley area some 10 years ago because of its' accessibility, beauty, schooling availability and the local community & village. We have seen a number of changes over the years most of which have been negative, we believe what you are proposing will be of further detriment to the place we originally fell in love with and will negatively impact our young family.

We oppose your plans and wish our objections to be noted.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3368  Respondent: 10946177 / Graeme Verra  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
DEVELOPMENT IN EAST AND WEST HORSLEY

The proposal to develop nearly 600 houses in East and West Horsley would place an unsustainable burden on the local facilities and infrastructure including schools, roads and other essential local facilities needed by the community. Many of these are already being used at full capacity. Also as was clearly demonstrated at the start of 2014 when the area experienced flooding including road closures, any additional development would exacerbate these problems. The designation of Station Parade as a “District Centre” falsely represents its status and seems designed to justify other proposals in the Local Plan. The resignation is spurious and should be rejected.

We also note that the target outlined represents a 25% increase in the housing stock of the borough, which is in excess of the Office of National Statistics (“ONS”) projection of a population increase of 15% for Guildford Borough over this same period.

The proposal to change the Settlement Boundaries to include additional housing must therefore be rejected.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2986  Respondent: 10947105 / Brenda Shaw  Agent:

We object to the Proposed Submission Local Plan which Guildford Borough Council GBC has now published for public consultation on the grounds articulated and submitted by East Horsley Parish Council, the East Horsley Action Group, Guildford Green Belt Group and Horsley Countryside Preservation Society, which we fully support.

We are concerned that the infrastructure proposals are inadequate even to meet the needs of what is there at the moment, let alone the proposed developments in the Local Plan. The current infrastructure and facilities around the Horsleys barely cope with current demand to support the local population and it seems that the proposed changes to infrastructure will do little if anything to ease this, let alone cope with an increased population resulting from the excessive number of new houses proposed in the area.

The roads and pavements in the Horsleys area are inadequate, the roads are narrow and there are no pavements along large stretches of roads. For example, the Ockham Road (North and South) is one of the main roads in the Horsleys; this road and the pavements are already dangerous due to the road and pavement widths and the large number of large vehicles (lorries, vans, buses etc) which travel at speed along this road. The proposed alarming increase in housing will only exacerbate this dangerous situation.

The Local Plan's proposed increase in the number of new houses in the Horsleys is quite alarming and the resulting increase in population cannot be supported in this area.

We sincerely request that GBC radically re-assess its own policy objectives rather than force through the Council a Local Plan which clearly does not have the wider support of the residents of Guildford Borough.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3057  Respondent: 10947169 / Gordon Shaw  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
We object to the Proposed Submission Local Plan which Guildford Borough Council GBC has now published for public consultation on the grounds articulated and submitted by East Horsley Parish Council, the East Horsley Action Group, Guildford Green Belt Group and Horsley Countryside Preservation Society, which we fully support.

We are concerned that the infrastructure proposals are inadequate even to meet the needs of what is there at the moment, let alone the proposed developments in the Local Plan. The current infrastructure and facilities around the Horsleys barely cope with current demand to support the local population and it seems that the proposed changes to infrastructure will do little if anything to ease this, let alone cope with an increased population resulting from the excessive number of new houses proposed in the area.

The roads and pavements in the Horsleys area are inadequate, the roads are narrow and there are no pavements along large stretches of roads. For example, the Ockham Road (North and South) is one of the main roads in the Horsleys; this road and the pavements are already dangerous due to the road and pavement widths and the large number of large vehicles (lorries, vans, buses etc) which travel at speed along this road. The proposed alarming increase in housing will only exacerbate this dangerous situation.

The Local Plan's proposed increase in the number of new houses in the Horsleys is quite alarming and the resulting increase in population cannot be supported in this area.

We sincerely request that GBC radically re-assess its own policy objectives rather than force through the Council a Local Plan which clearly does not have the wider support of the residents of Guildford Borough.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPA16/4396  Respondent: 10952193 / Chrissie Beard  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I strongly object to the removal of the Horsleys from the Greenbelt and I do not believe that their are any genuine 'exceptional circumstance' for doing so.

I further object to the proposed density of house building. The proposed building is far beyond what is required to meet the needs of local people.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1890  Respondent: 10953217 / Tim Gordon  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 planning proposals for new housing in Horsley.

It seems that the local plan does not make the necessary inclusions for the local infrastructure. Schools, doctors, parking facilities etc. It is just housing. The infrastructure is already pushed to the limits. This situation is only going to make it worse.

The green belt should also be protected. It is very important to the future of our children and their children's children.

Also with the current drainage and flooding issues already encountered, more housing is only going to make this worse.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3606  Respondent: 10954049 / Melanie Grant  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am writing to place my strong objection to the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategies and sites: June 2016 which includes removing East and West Horsley villages from the Green Belt by "insetting". As a permanent resident of West Horsley for almost 5 years I am very unhappy about the proposal of losing the green belt status that made us want to live here in the first place. Within P2 there is no declaration of support for protecting the Green Belt contrary to NPPF and government statements and there has clearly been no evaluation of the value of local Green Belt as an asset. The excessive level of development proposed is in breach of views expressed in the last consultation and Conservative party manifesto commitments in last election.

The existing village infrastructure has NO capacity for extra housing and the additional people/vehicles that brings - the roads are already too busy, many in need of significant repair due to extent of use (for example East Lane) and many (in
particular Ockham Road North) experience significant flooding when there is any continual rain indicating drainage is already at capacity. Additional housing with paving/driveways etc made way for by removing fields, trees, vegetation will only exacerbate this further. There is no way the existing roads can be expanded to take additional capacity - the majority already have housing plots and narrow pavements on both sides. The local primary school is already at capacity and I have no interest in additional schools being added - I want my children to be able to attend the existing reputable local village school and further down the road the Howard.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3034</th>
<th>Respondent: 10955777 / Sarah Hewton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Over density of New Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The local schools do not have the capacity to take in all the expected children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Send Surgery is already oversubscribed making it difficult to get an appointment, additional residents would exacerbate this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The traffic through Send and Ripley already causes gridlock at certain times of the day additional vehicles would again exacerbate this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Potential building on Send flood plains will enhance the risk for flooding in local areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Consider loss of the green belt and the requirement of additional houses now that we are leaving the E.U, which should reduce the immigration figures coming in to reside in the UK</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: PSLPA16/2230</th>
<th>Respondent: 10957857 / Adam Aaronson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 in particular to including Sites A36-41 (East and West Horsley). The Horsleys feel victimised by this plan, which seems to have been masterminded by Council leaders representing Ash and Tongham at the other end of the borough, where (in a flagrant case of political double standards) the Green Belt is actually being extended under Policy P3.[3]

Whatever their merits as development sites, the 6 Horsley sites should not be considered individually but for their cumulative impact on the contiguous villages of East and West Horsley. It is crazy to consider them independently and the must be considered as a whole.

I consider that building 533 new houses on these 6 sites, plus at least another 90 on small sites is (a) excessive in absolute terms and (b) disproportionate relative to the rest of the borough. It will destroy the rural character of these communities.[4]

Under the plan, rural West Horsley will take 35% of new homes, urban Ash and Tongham 16% and Guildford urban area only 11%. The total number of homes in West Horsley will increase by 35%, which is disproportionate when measured...
against the overall increase in housing across the borough and particularly in Guildford town. If the Council have justifiable reasons to transform a particular community so radically, the plan should present a case rather than putting forward site proposals as a fait accompli. Basically the plan is dumping a disproportionate quota of the borough’s housing need on the Horsleys.

These sites will put unsustainable strain on local facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops. For instance:

- Thames Water have advised the Council that the current wastewater network will not cope and that the foul drainage system all the way to the treatment works North of Ripley will need to be upgraded.

- Guildford Council’s Education Review says “expansion options may need to be considered for primary” education in the Horsley area within the first 5 years of the plan, but Surrey County Council have no plans to do so. The Raleigh School is already full. The private Glenesk and Cranmore schools are also at or near to full capacity. The suggestion that schools in Ripley can be used contradicts the plan’s stated intention to reduce traffic on the A3 and strategic aim that primary schools should be within walking distance.

- The plan’s Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C) imagines an “East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme between 2019 and 2023 by Surrey CC” but gives no details. This scheme is just wishful thinking - another fairy tale. The proposed housing can only harm the local environment, not “improve” it.

The harmful impact of these sites is magnified by the proximity of the so-called Wisley Airfield site (Three Farms Meadow), with over 2,000 new homes only 2 miles away (see below).

The density of new housing on the 6 Horsley sites is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the locality at present.

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

Collectively, these 6 sites militate against NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been a success story in the Horsleys, with the creation of an amenity wood and community garden, the purchase of adjacent fields (on the eastern side of Ockham Road North) by local residents in order to preserve their open aspect, well-maintained pitches for local football and cricket clubs, public tennis courts, open space for a high-quality campsite (at Waterloo Farm) used by many foreign tourists and the approval of plans for a “Theatre in the Woods” – making West Horsley the only village in Surrey with an opera house. The open nature of West Horsley determined that a long portion of the 2012 Olympic cycle races passed through the village. This route has since been adopted by cyclists as a permanent asset, including the annual Prudential cycle race. These and future examples of “positive planning” depend on protecting the Green Belt to maintain the openness and attractiveness of the local landscape and avoiding the urbanisation and traffic congestion that Sites A36-41 will bring.

By surrounding Waterloo Farm campsite with 120 new houses, Policy A40 on land to the North of West Horsley will make this rural tourism amenity unviable.

Site A40 is subject to an unacceptable flood risk from a combination of a high groundwater table and the lack of surface water run-off. This is flat, clay land on the downhill side of the Horsleys where floodwater from new development will accumulate and back up onto existing properties nearby. I can provide photographs proving how badly these fields already flood at present. These problems will only get worse with the increase in extreme weather events associated with climate change. The “appropriate mitigation” suggested in Policy A40 exists only as an abstract notion. It should not overrule the need for Green Belt “exceptional circumstances”.

Policy A40 underestimates the problems of safe access and egress. Firstly, Ockham Road North was closed for several weeks in 2014 because of flooding, and still floods regularly. Secondly, access problems are not confined to flooding and are not addressed by the proposal to extend the existing 30mph zone past the site entrance. Repeated attempts made by
Ockham Road North residents to extend this zone have been turned down by the local authorities, Highways England and Surrey Police, even though data collected in 2015 show that traffic has doubled over the last 15 years and that the average speed in the 40mph section of this road is 52mph, with maximum recorded speeds of over 80mph. No traffic calming measures have so far been achieved. Additional housing will add to several hazards along this stretch of road, including:

- Its use by pedestrians, especially children (using the Raleigh and Glenesk schools and catching school buses to Guildford and Howard of Effingham), pensioners living in the string of bungalows at the northern end of the road, and visitors from the Waterloo campsite who are unfamiliar with the area.

- The existence of a narrow footpath on only one side of the road in any one spot. The layout means that walking half a mile between Green Land and East Lane requires crossing the road twice.

- The road’s increasing use by recreational cyclists (see above).

- Its winding nature, poor sight lines (especially when interrupted by summer vegetation) and dangerous, concealed driveways. Most of these were built in the 1930s. Some have been widened but many are too narrow for modern traffic. Since a deep ditch runs along most of the road, vehicles have to swing out dangerously when entering or leaving.

- The prospect of additional traffic, including 19,000 HGV movements (90 a day over a long period) if Surrey County Council approves the Drift Golf Course’s planning application to re-landscape its site using bulk waste transported from London.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4377 Respondent: 10958561 / James Grant Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I'm writing to state my continued rejection of the proposed local plan by Guildford Borough Council, with specific reference to the East and West Horsley borough.

My objections centre around a number of key themes:

- **The Greenbelt status of East and West Horsley**
  - *I am completely opposed to the removal of West Horsleys Greenbelt status by the method of 'insetting' and the subsequent extension of the Local Plan Settlement area boundaries (2003).*
  - The **Greenbelt status of West Horsley** is one of the key reasons people live here - we are located approximately 8 miles from Guildford, 8 miles from Leatherhead and 8 miles from Dorking - if I wanted to live in an urban centre dwelling I would, and i would choose one of those large towns. I actively choose to live in the Greenbelt and moved to West Horsley 4.5 years ago (from Guildford) for the precise reason that the Greenbelt was first created - because the green area and countryside act as my daily 'lungs' to a working life in the metropolis of London.
  - There are **no exceptional circumstances**, nor is it clear what GBC propose those circumstances to be, in order to justify new Greenbelt boundaries. I cannot see any reason why the Greenbelt areas are being targeted, outside of developer pressure.
  - It is clear that expressed views of residents are being ignored - whether in previous consultations (2014) that I understand are not presented to the Independent Planning Inspector, or in council elections where the emergence of newly formed resident parties (Guildford Greenbelt Group), or finally in General Elections where the local Conservative MP - Paul Beresford had to acknowledge that the Greenbelt was
of higher concern to constituency members than the economy (http://www.dorkingandleatherheadadvertiser.co.uk/general-election-2015-meet-candidates-vying-votes/story-26017300-detail/story.html). At what point will GBC listen to its residents?

- Finally, the Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2031 makes no case for proposed housing development in large volumes within East or West Horsley or even the surrounding villages. I understand this to be a Key Evidence document and urge it to be considered as such.

- **Infrastructure (Policy I1 - Infrastructure and Delivery)**
  - **Schools.** The current state Primary school (The Raleigh) is oversubscribed, with an annual intake of 60 new pupils a year. Whilst an excellent school it has already reached the limits of its current site, and having been over-subscribed for many years it is clear that the current policy for state school primary education is inadequate today, let alone with proposed expansion, and certainly not at the levels suggested by the Local plan as part of the insetting process. Within the village there are also two private schools that cater for primary school education and they both operate with high class numbers. Furthermore, there is a significant traffic issue caused today by all three schools within the area - there is insufficient parking for the Raleigh and the Glenesk school, and Cranmore school causes traffic volume issues and jams on the A246. With regards to senior schools the Howard of Effingham also operates at capacity, and there are no plans to develop that school (planning permission for expansion has been rejected) or to build an additional facility. Furthermore the villages of both Effingham and Bookham are also subject to Local Plan initiatives and proposed housing, which will increase the capacity issues on the Howard and potentially even move West and East Horsley out of the catchment area for the Howard of Effingham. Indeed the current situation is so dire that I question where on earth GBC propose the current children in the village will be going to school for the next 5/10/15 years? I am yet to see a plan to cope with the current turnover of home sales as older generations downsize to young families moving out of London, all of which is adding pressure to existing school facilities and without any housing development.
  - **Medical facilities.** The Doctors surgery in the village (Kingston Avenue Medical Centre) is full! It is very difficult to get an appointment in advance with a typical waiting time of at least two weeks. Emergency appointments entail waiting for up to three hours for a slot to open, in the winter this situation can typically be worse with an increase in young children/older residents requiring increased attention. The local hospital is based in Guildford (the Royal Surrey) and is also a medical facility under stress. Whilst an excellent hospital it manages high numbers today but would be expected to manage a huge population increase should the multiple developments in the Local Plan (not just the Horsleys) go ahead. The medical facilities operate under duress within todays population, the proposed Local Plan development would prove too much, and there are no plans for increased facilities.
  - **Train.** Within the last 5 years there has been a significant shift in the commuter patterns on the stopping service that runs from Horsley to London or Guildford. There is a marked increase in the number of commuters who access the train at both Clandon and Horsley, which means the trains capacity is typical full by the time the train has passed through Cobham and Stoke D’Abernon. Whilst anecdotal evidence it appears that the villages on this train line (Clandon, Horsley, Effingham and Cobham) are all undergoing a demographic shift as older residents move out of the area and young families who require commuter access to London are replacing them. The station at Horsley is currently manned for half a day (till 1pm) on weekdays, it has no toilet access after 1pm on weekdays and none on the weekend, it has no wheelchair or buggy access to Platform 1 (which serves London) and the car park facility is full every weekday. If you also consider that Horsley station is situated on the 'Suburban' line, there is also an issue with the service - the trains do not have toilet facilities, this means that a typical journey (45 mins fast train or 53 mins standard train) can entail 1-1.5 hours of travel with no toilet access once combined with a walk or drive commute (as the husband of a wife who has experienced two pregnancies whilst also commuting to work in London I can assure you that this is not a laughing matter), there is also no air conditioning on the trains, and finally - the Suburban line always has to give way to the faster ‘A’ line (which serves Guildford, Basingstoke and Woking), you can see that the current train service is not suitable for large scale development. And certainly not the development of an additional 35% of new homes when compared to the current number of homes.
  - **Road.** Some of the B roads around West and East Horsley are some of the worst road surfaces I have ever known. Indeed, the junction of East Lane and Ockham Road South may be the very worst (in East Lane), and this is one of the roads that serves both the Raleigh and the Glenesk primary schools - indeed it is only a matter of time before there is an accident (car or bike) that is attributable to the road...
The village also has a problem with speeding drivers - the Ockham Road is used as an access road to the A3 and as such sees high volumes of traffic, at high speeds, during commuter hours. The railway bridge serving the station has also suffered lorry strike multiple times in the last 3 years, even with updated visibility measures that were added in the last two years. Increasing traffic volumes with the addition of new housing will only serve to exacerbate all of the existing issues that are faced on the road.

- **Flooding.** Every winter the village experiences some flooding issues, most notable on the Ockham Road exit onto the A3/Ripley roundabout and also on East Lane in between two of the proposed development sites (A38 and A40). The development of the A38/A40 sites will remove natural flood countermeasures and exacerbate surface water run-off and only further impact the safety of the road during the winter, but the proposed development will also increase the volume of traffic in the village and create further issues across all sites that experience flooding and high water run-off.

- **Sustainable development.**
  - The proposed development of 385 homes on the 4 proposed sites are at much higher density levels than the current village settlement, and will have a big impact on the character of the village, not to mention the infrastructure points addressed above.
  - **Sustainable transport (Policy i3).** Developers are only expected to propose travel plans for development, and contribute to transport arrangements for the able and disabled. This is completely unacceptable - as detailed above the current transport infrastructure is under pressure and will not be able to cope with development, either during the work or after. It is completely unacceptable for GBC to propose that local residents (already opposed to the Local Plan) must suffer disruption and chaos to travel during the works, and then 'put up' with reduced transport infrastructure post the development. There is clearly no intention within the Local Plan to force developers to pay for infrastructure development.
  - **Village expansion is unsustainable.** With limited shopping facilities, limited public transport facilities (bus network and train/train station facilities), limited public parking (already under pressure) high numbers of young families in the area it is simply inconceivable that the village has the capacity to undergo expansion, limited or significant. I see no case for Policies S1 in favour of Sustainable development.

Finally, I note also that the development of Wisley Airfield continues to feature in the Guildford Local Plan, with a proposed 2,000 houses on that site. Located under two miles from the Horsleys it is impossible to see how GBC plans to develop either, or both, of the proposed settlements without significant impact on the Horsley villages as per all of the points above. Wisley Airfield will also contribute to huge traffic issues on the A3/M25 junction (10), notwithstanding the issues that already exist - I invite the Planning Inspector, and the GBC Councillors, to start queuing from the A3 onto the M25 during rush hour every weekday morning - the queue starts at 7am and doesn't abate until after 8.30am. Furthermore I would ask that the Inspector request information from the Highways Agency on the number of times a year that they have registered delays between Junction 9 and 12 due to the high volume of traffic joining/exiting the M25 onto the A3.

The development of Wisley airfield is also unsustainable for all of the reasons mentioned above - that development will also impact the Horsleys. I also struggle to see how it can be justified when only 15% of the airfield is designated as brownfield site.

I hope that the Independent Planning Inspector will be able to view and validate the concerns I raise above, and I hope that the Local Plan is rectified as required and the proposed housing developments are moved to areas that are more suitable, preferably not part of the Greenbelt and in parts of Guildford where the infrastructure can sustain population growth.

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

**Attached documents:**
I am only commenting on the plan for the Horsleys where I live.

Not one scheme appears to allow any improvement to the main roads, which are little more than the lanes of years ago.

Development will only put money in the pockets of the builders, and will not solve the housing shortages. Any housing will cost beyond the reach of most people, so occupants will probably work in London, using the train, with inadequate parking at stations.

If ‘affordable’ houses are built will still no be affordable by most people of working age. They will probably go to the buy to rent market.

It would be better to build council houses going to locally listed families, with local jobs.

Parking, Schools, roads, Doctors and Hospitals are all stretched to the limit at the moment.

The sensible policy would be to encourage work and housing prospects in the rest of the country, and allow Guildford to remain more or less as it is now, and not spoil the existing green belt for future generations.

Large numbers of ‘save the green belt’ signs are now appearing, so it is obvious that these policies are against the wishes of the majority of local people.

Just commenting briefly on the town centre and the ‘pop up shops’. Nobody is rushing to provide a proper development on this site. How about a ‘pop up road widening and a ‘pop up’ parking area?

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

Attached documents:
local State schools are full. We also have the possibility of a huge increase in demands on local services from related
development in the borough which will spill into our living space such as at the Wisley Airfield. There will also be a need
for more trains to cope with increased users - something which Southern Rail seem unable to cope with already.

-The Green Belt: It does not seem to me that this should happen as per Policy P1 & Policy P2 - The first line of Policy P2
states, “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt against inappropriate development.” No exceptional
circumstances or other justification is made for the new Green Belt boundaries that will result from the proposed insetting
of the two parts of the village from the Metropolitan Green Belt. This is a precious Area Of Outstanding Beauty and
every effort should be made to stop it from being over run with infilling and commercial development which will
ultimately benefit a favoured few rather than the massive number of people who currently live and travel to this area to
enjoy the surroundings.

As a longstanding resident in the area I am very concerned at the lack of detailed thought regarding the points above and
also that the place where I live with my family and love for all the characters that it has would be changed dramatically
by 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: PSLPA16/4403</th>
<th>Respondent: 10966369 / Chris Ingram</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 am writing to express my strong views against the above proposed local plan.

In general terms I cannot understand how the plan for proposed new homes has 64% of them in the Green belt

At this level it suggests you have given up trying to protect the green belt. You must be able to do better than this!

Additionally, there is no clear rationale as to how the volume of new homes to be built (13,800) was arrived at. With a
decision as important as this, it is not enough to say that ‘we commissioned independent consultants to conduct a survey’.

What was the methodology? We should be able to see their report – surely there is nothing to hide?

Turning to my own area, West Horsley, I cannot understand why West and East Horsley need to be removed from the
Green Belt except for the reason of jamming in an unacceptable volume of houses.

To plan to increase the houses in West Horsley by 35% and at a denser level than the existing housing stock obviously
affects the character of the Village. But this is about much more than aesthetics:

1. Education: The Raleigh Primary School is already full and so is the Howard of Effingham Secondary School.

The Surrey County Council has produced no plans for increasing school places in the Horsleys.

1. Infrastructure: The local roads can barely support the existing level of traffic and parking spaces are already
inadequate.

1. Drainage: Thames Water has already advised GBC that their current wastewater network will be unlikely to
support the extra housing load.

2. Medical Facilities: Kingston Avenue Medical Centre struggles to serve the Horsleys already and residents
complain about the difficulty in obtaining appointments. The planned population increase can only exacerbate
this problem.
There seems to be no thought applied to how these problems will be resolved and they would only arise if the Guildford Plan goes through as currently shown. Unless solutions to these very real problems are found now, I do not see how this level of additional housing can be justified in the Horsleys.

I hope that you take these arguments into consideration.

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

Attached documents:

---

I live in West Horsley and once again I object to the Guildford Local Plan on a number of grounds but in main to the ridiculous and unjustified number of houses at 13,860 with a completely unjustified increase in houses near to and within the Horsley's:

i.e. 533 houses on larger sites, with 60 on smaller sites;
over 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield, already rejected but still INCLUDED in the plan;

This is just about DOUBLING the size of the horsely’s with absolutely no new infrastructure. The current roads FLOOD regularly, the roads are terrible to drive on, the drainage cannot cope, there is no real transport links, schools, doctor’s surgeries are full. All of this against a plan which proposes taking the villages out of the green belt for no other reason than concreting them over. Planning regulations do not allow for this except in EXCEPTIONAL circumstances and taking the villages out of the greenbelt to build on them is not a valid reason.

I OBJECT to the number of cars that would obliterate the local roads, using an average of 2 cars per house this is nearly 6,000 extra cars in a village with extremely poor roads, drainage, infrastructure. The plan makes no provision for improvements.

I OBJECT to the plan on the grounds of the level of pollution introduced by these extra cars, houses etc.

I OBJECT to the plan on the grounds of the infrastructure will increase flooding where we already have flooding every year.

I OBJECT to the plan on the grounds that there is no provision for extra school places within the Horsleys in the plan despite swamping us with extra houses.

I OBJECT to the plan on the grounds of the lack of facilities proposed such as doctor’s surgeries, public transport.

I OBJECT to the plan on the grounds of transport - no real increase in public transport and the train into London each morning is now already almost full with standing room only from a few stations from Horsley.

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 a resident at [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] West Horsley, Surrey, and have lived at this address for over nine years having lived within the county for close to 40 years.

I strongly object to the proposed plans for building within the West Horsley village, the scale and density is completely out of keeping with the density of the village housing currently and will fundamentally over crowd and negatively impact the character and setting that the current villagers enjoy and are entitled to.

The village does not have the infrastructure to cope with a 35% increase in housing, drainage is poor with frequent flooding, there is almost no public bus service with transport primarily to and from London resulting in a dormitory increase rather than local jobs and enterprise.

The NPPF requires that plans MUST respect character and density and these proposals clearly do not and they should be rejected in there entirety.

For these reasons the villages should not be removed from the green belt and the plans do not offer sufficient justification for such a reclassification having failed to prove 'very special circumstances'; there are alternatives as outlined below.

The increased housing would be far better placed in and around GUILDFORD itself, transport links exist, public amenities, park and rides, large supermarkets and local schools. Increases in GUILDFORD homes would add a positive dimension to the local businesses in the city, increase enterprise and job creation as the infrastructure would be able to cope.

There appears to be a disproportionate burden being placed on West Horsley with a 35% increase in homes whilst Guildford itself has a plan for 11%, this would appear to fly in the face of common sense and the actual situation on the ground with regard to suitability. The actual fully costed proposals to build this volume of homes in West Horsley, once infrastructure is accounted for, will be far higher than in Guildford and that's before the loss of the village and its unique character is accounted for. In this time of austerity the council would be wasting public funds that should be spent on essential and much needed services elsewhere.

Based on my daily experience living in the village I would make the following observations:

1. The roads are already overcrowded and cannot take additional traffic.
2. The station car parks are at capacity now.
3. Village parking is at capacity now
4. Surgery is at capacity now.
5. Schools are at capacity now.

In summary the proposals do not take into account how the current population will be impacted NOR how the proposed new residents would have to deal with the inadequate setting they would find themselves in.

It therefore serves neither of the core stakeholders it is intended to.

The Raleigh School

The proposed move and redevelopment of this school should be opened to a public consultation.

In my view the school, whilst very good, has lost sight of its core purpose which is to serve its local community rather than have children driven in from Cobham and other towns further afield. If these children were educated in their own towns there would be no over crowding issues at the Raleigh. The issue for the council is to address educational needs where people live rather than increasing traffic and cost to all by not proactively dealing with the problem at source.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to this policy.

The above sites are within the designated Green Belt area.

Per NPPF, “inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances”. The proposed developments are inappropriate by their scale and nature, especially within Green Belt. It will make the Horsleys a town, not a village, so perhaps, the Council should think of consulting the residents on a proposal to change the status first.

There is nothing in the above policy proposals to demonstrate the required “exceptional circumstances”.

The proposed increase in the housing stock is considerably above of the current level of 15% population increase. Our infrastructure and local facilities and amenities are already under a lot of strain, our roads are not able to cope with any further increase in traffic - all of which need a considerable investment even without the proposed developments. If the Council struggles to find the funds now, what state of these would be following a dramatic jump in the population resulting from the proposed developments?

The proposed developments will make an irreversible footprint on the environment, forever destroying the natural beauty that is so much cherished and enjoyed by everybody who lives or visits our area.

While I appreciate the need for new dwellings, available brownfields should be allocated to meet this need in the first instance. The proposed plan however has not demonstrated sufficient consideration of the available brownfield sites potential.

I am very concerned that the local authorities, having already held a consultation in 2014 resulting in a high number of registered objections, still continue with the outlined proposals in what appears to be a single-minded and dictatorial style of approach. I strongly object to all proposed developments in policies A36-A41 and hope that my voice will be heard.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the local plan because it will completely change the character of this historical village for the worse.

I object to the local plan as the infrastructure of the village cannot support this amount of development. The drainage is already problematic and there has been no consideration for this.

I object because the doctors is always busy and it is difficult now to get an appointment and there is barely enough parking when I do go.

I object because the Raleigh School and The Howard School are already at full capacity.

I object because the local pre-school nursery is not able to provide any more than two days a week for my daughter.

I object because parking for the local shops is always a challenge, often having to drive round and round to find a space.

I object to the local plan because there is already traffic congestion in the village at peak times.

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

Attached documents:
Having looked at the proposals put forward by Guildford Borough Council in the new Draft Local Plan, I would make the following points and objections regarding the plans to develop sites at:

Thatchers Hotel, East Horsley (ref A36, ID 2044)
Ockham Road North, East Horsley (ref: A39, ID 240)
Bell & Colvill Garage, West Horsely (ref: A37, ID 1 6)
Ockham Road North, West Horsley (ref: A40, ID 975)
Manor Farm, West Horsley (ref: A38, ID 1 5)
East Lane, West Horsley (ref: a 41, ID 2063)
Wisley Airfield site

My concerns and objections to the proposals to develop these sites are as follows:

**Loss of Green Belt land**

The Green Belt is a very precious resource and without the strong protection it offers against most forms of development, the countryside will be consumed by urban sprawl and the character of our village and surrounding area will be irreversibly eroded. Allowing development in the Green Belt assumes that this land is only valuable if built on, a flawed assumption in my view. Maintenance of the Green Belt is needed now more than ever.

**Traffic and parking**

The negative impact on local roads will be tremendous. Parking at Horsley & Effingham junction train stations is already full on most days. There is very little parking for the shops along Station Parade and Bishopsmead at present. Parking for the Horsley Medical Centre and at the village hall is likely to be impossible.

**Pollution**

The large increase in volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment – already a cause for concern for health and to the environment in several areas in the Borough.

**Flooding**

The site behind Ockham Road North in East Horsley is partially a level 3 flood risk area. Building on such land will only exacerbate the problem. Local roads already flood when it rains as the drains are unable to cope.

**Schools**

Local schools are already at capacity and yet no extra places are planned in the Horsleys, and the school places proposed at Wisley Airfield are not likely to be available until many years into the project as far as I understand.

**Medical facilities**

I assume the Horsley Medical Centre is already at capacity as we are often quizzed by the receptionists as to whether or not we are full-time residents of the Horselys. Students (as part-time residents) are already treated particularly badly due to the existing overcrowding of this facility.

**Transport**
The Draft Local Plan is likely to give rise to misery for commuters, with nowhere to park and full trains at commuting times. It is bad enough now, let alone if the 500+ houses under consideration for the Horsleys and the 2000 houses at Wisley Airport are approved and built.

**Enormous scale of building programme**

I am very concerned about the enormous scale of the proposed building program which seems to overestimate the rise in population in the area within the 2013-2033 time scale when compared to the Office of National Statistics projection for the same period. This would also lead to years of living in the midst of a building site with all the heavy trucks, road congestion, noise pollution and disruption that this would involve.

I trust you will take my views into consideration.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3737  **Respondent:** 10991841 / Abbey Jarman  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 for the following reasons:

I object to the village’s removal from the Green Belt or extending the 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area boundaries.

West Horsley’s settlement boundaries don’t need to be extended.

We have a rich mix of low density housing and historic buildings. It sits partly within the Surrey Hills AONB and is enjoyed by visitors, such as walkers and cyclists.

Housing should be near economic development sites on the opposite side of the borough.

The key evidence document (Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2031) doesn’t make a case for a large increase in housing in West or East Horsley.

13,800 new houses (built between 2013 and 2033) in the villages surrounding Guildford, particularly in West Horsley, are excessive and unsustainable.

In West Horsley we have one small shop, no post office, and a very restricted bus service. This is inadequate for the proposed increase in housing. Already you can’t park outside the shop half the time!

Local infrastructure can’t cope as it is; there is a lack of schools and shops; drainage is overloaded; parking is in short supply. The station car park in East Horsley is often full already and will just lead to people parking on the sides of the roads, many of which are narrow. This would entirely spoil the look of the existing rural nature of the village. We do not want all our roads lined by cars!

There is no proof that this number of homes to be constructed during the first 5 years is needed. The West Horsley Parish Council and Surrey Community Action Housing Survey: May 2014 said that 20 additional affordable homes to cater for young people and local elderly people who wished to remain in the village by down-sizing to smaller homes would be required. There are enough smaller sites where this can happen.
Guildford Council hasn’t shown to my satisfaction that a large number of houses can’t be built in the town centre/brownfield sites instead. It’s clearly cheaper for developers to build on greenfield sites and this is an utterly unacceptable reason for West Horsley to be taken out of the Green Belt.

Developers have been asked to propose facilities for the elderly, disabled, or those with small children, (best served by developments/transport within towns and close to extensive amenities, including health care) which is not the same as ‘will be REQUIRED to deliver’.

The Raleigh School has been oversubscribed for several years.

Pupils attending the Howard of Effingham School (which has very limited places) have to make a significant bus or car journey to get there.

There is already heavy peak-time traffic to the two private schools of Glenesk and Cranmore.

It’s already difficult to get an appointment at the doctors’. An increase in patients will just make this even worse.

There are trains to London and Guildford, but the station car park is normally full during the week. It won’t be possible to extend the car park. Why build houses out in the country if people have to then get a train into Guildford? Build the houses in Guildford in the first place!

Because of the West Horsley’s location most households have at least 2 cars. The proposed housing will increase traffic on the already third-world roads, which are in a shocking state as it is.

Sewage often overflows in Ockham Road and Green Lane.

Thames Water has told Guildford Council that drainage network probably won’t be able to cope with any increased proposed population increase demand. Apparently the foul water drainage system connecting West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley needs upgrading and Thames Water suggests 2-3 years lead-in following planning permission if given.

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

Attached documents:
I am writing with reference to the 2016 Draft version of the Local Plan. In particular I would like to **object** to the proposed expansion in the Horsley’s.

- **Congestion** – The A3 ad M25 are already at capacity at peak times. Any increase in housing will exacerbate the congestion in and around the Horsley’s.
- **Local Facilities** – the local facilities cannot take any additional capacity. There are limitations at the local primary and local senior schools. The Horsley doctor’s surgery already has a problems servicing the existing community. There is also already a major problem with parking. I don’t believe that there is any infrastructure plan to accommodate the increase in housing – how can that possibly work?
- **Safety** – the roads cannot accommodate an increase in traffic – there are already significant problems with pot holes and with narrow pavements it would be an issue with people’s safety. There are a huge number of cyclists passing through who are already at risk and any additional traffic will put them in even more danger.
- **Roads** – there is a significant issue with flooding in and around the area.
- **Greenbelt** – why do you have to build on greenbelt and why are you not finding a site where you could create a new town with all the amenities required?
- **Out of character** – the density of the proposed new developments means they are significantly out of character with the existing villages.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

I am writing to provide you with my views on the draft local plan as part of the current consultation. A large number of elements of the plan are, as far as I can tell, inconsistent with a number of national level and local policies and I would like the Council to consider these as part of the further development of the plan.

**Size and density of proposed developments**

The 2011 census indicated that West Horsley comprised of 1111 households. The proposed development in the local plan table summary on page 125 includes 485 new households in West Horsley – a 44% increase. Within this, the northern end of West Horsley village has approximately 400 households and the local plan includes 445 new households – an increase of over 110%. The current housing density within West Horsley settlement boundaries is around 10 dwellings per hectare, while the local plan assumes a housing density of 14-20 dwellings per hectare – up to a 100% increase in density. Needless to say, doubling the number of houses and doubling the density of housing would completely change the character and day-to-day life of this area of the village, permanently destroying the current community and way of life.

As such, the proposed development in the local plan is a proportionally very large increase in housing, and at a much higher density than the existing village. Both of these elements contradict the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF) in many of its policies. One specific major example is policy 9 – villages and major previously developed sites – which states that development should be commensurate to the size, character and function of existing settlements.

I believe that the local plan therefore needs to see a very significant reduction in the number of proposed new houses in West Horsley and a significant reduction in the proposed housing density in order to be consistent with national guidelines.
I understand that the borough does need to increase housing stock and support this aim, as long as it is done in a way that is fair and appropriate to the local areas impacted; however this is not the case across the borough and certainly in West Horsley. It is very clear from the plan that the development level is not fair in the case of West Horsley – for example there are 5 development sites (A37 – A41) and 485 homes proposed for West Horsley as opposed to 1 site (A36) and 48 homes, on an existing built area, for East Horsley, which is a bigger and more dense village currently with 1,343 homes. The existing parish settlement boundaries clearly separate East and West Horsley and therefore the two should not be considered together, these boundaries are the basis for previous and existing development, infrastructure, etc and are demonstrated in the council tax levies which are separately administered for East Horsley and West Horsley. It is also not appropriate for the local plan to redefine settlement boundaries unilaterally to support proposed development.

The plan overall in section 2.3 provides figures showing an 18% increase in population is expected over 22 years across the borough, but East Horsley is expected to contribute a 3.5% increase in homes over 15 years while West Horsley is expected to contribute a 44% increase in homes over 15 years, and the northern portion of West Horsley a 110% increase in homes over 15 years: this huge disparity is clearly unreasonable, and unacceptable to residents and should be unacceptable to Council Representatives too.

**Green belt re-designation**

The local plan is built on the premise that the area to be developed in West Horsley will be removed from the green belt. However, the NPPF and related parliamentary directives state that re-designation of the green belt is only permissible in exceptional circumstances, and that meeting housing targets cannot be considered exceptional. Furthermore, West Horsley is an attractive village with much history and character – it is visited by many cyclists and walkers for this reason and this is a major reason for the decision of many residents to live in West Horsley – and therefore removing parts of West Horsley from the green belt is in contravention of the elements of the NPPF which specifically state that villages with character make an important contribution to the green belt. The plan itself, in section 4.3.12, acknowledges that villages with open character contribute to the green belt, and it could certainly be argued that West Horsley has an open character in this way, especially those sections of West Horsley that are marked for possible development. I do not believe that any part of West Horsley can justifiably be removed from the green belt for these reasons, and I do not believe that the local plan makes a supportable case for this re-designation.

**Sustainable development**

The NPPF states that development must be sustainable, and elements of the local plan do not seem consistent with this ethos. Specifically, the area of Policy A38 contains a number of elements that conflict with the message of sustainable development:

1. The site currently contains a growing and high quality nursery school which provides both employment for a large number (approx. 30) of primarily young women and also provides an essential service for village residents. Without this business, the character of West Horsley would change significantly, valuable jobs would be lost or removed from the village, and some residents would be forced to travel by car to other villages and/or move away from the village as a high quality nursery school is an essential part of their lives and the ability for both parents to work, which provides local and national tax income. I note that the plan includes a general statement that the nursery would be maintained, however it is not possible that the current character of the nursery – next to a farm and open space, which children crave – will survive amongst 135 homes of up to a high density. The plan must ensure the nursery school is maintained, and further that it has room to grow to accommodate new residents (especially required under this plan), with safe access and maintenance of its countryside character
2. Policy A38 also contains good agricultural land and as such a principle of sustainable development would favour other sites such as brownfield sites in urban areas over this one
3. Policy A38 also contains a grade II listed farmhouse

**Infilling**

The five proposed development sites in West Horsley are generally of very large size when compared to the existing settlements, and are not consistent with national and local approaches of limited, sustainable infilling of settlements. In addition to the issue of size, the boundaries and shapes of the proposed sites A38 and A41 in particular can clearly not be described as infill, as in both cases parts of the proposed site are only bounded on two sides by existing parts of the
village – the northern and north western portion of site A38 and nearly all of site A41. The Northern and north western portion of site A38 appears totally unsuitable for development based on infilling with high density housing, as in most places it is only bounded on one side by existing houses, which are of low or very low density, and if the farm house and nursery are preserved as stated, the whole northern end of this development area will be separate from the southern infilled end and should justify it’s own case for development – which it clearly cannot on the grounds of infilling.

SANG space

The local plan includes the re-designation of ‘Bens Wood’ in West Horsley to SANG space, and this availability of amenity space is an important part of the proposed developments in West Horsley – without sufficient amenity space the developments are not permissible. However, this re-designation of Bens Wood as SANG appears to be a unilateral statement which does not appear to be justified or appropriately approved, and requires a full assessment of current usage to assess spare capacity. As this area is also already well used as an amenity space and the spare capacity is not sufficient for the proposed development in the local plan (as the proposed development requires SANG space greater than the total size of Bens Wood even if it were totally unused), I believe that the local plan should not be agreed on the basis of Bens Wood being designated as SANG until a full assessment is carried out, and that the size of development area or number of proposed houses should not be agreed until the spare capacity has been established, and the proposed number of houses is appropriately reduced. A unilateral presumption that Bens Wood can be considered sufficient SANG for the scale of development in the local plan appears to be totally incorrect and will result in failure to secure sufficient SANG space for development later in the planning process.

The additionally identified SANG space in West Horsley (SANG8 in the appendices) is currently farmland which has recently been acquired, likely tactically by developers to support their plans. It would require redesignation from valuable agricultural use. The proximity of SANG8 to Area A38, which is extended way beyond an infill, as stated above, appears to possibly be a way to provide developers with sufficient housing space to develop to that they can fund the significant costs of a SANG development. This negative cycle of development requiring more and more room is greatly to the advantage of developer profits and greatly to the disadvantage of local residents, who see even more housing being developed just to provide funding for a SANG space to justify a base level of housing to be developed.

Facilities and Transportation

The scale of development proposed in West Horsley is enormous compared with the current scale of the village. This proposal would require a full study of many elements of facilities and transportation, and it is likely that many of these elements would cause significant challenges for development. These include, but are not limited to:

- **Primary schooling** – the Raleigh school has little room for expansion and is already oversubscribed. I believe that one of the development areas for housing proposed in the plan directly conflicts with a possible new site for the school which of course makes doing both impossible
- **Secondary schooling** – there are no secondary schools available in either West or East Horsley as it is, with long car journeys, buses, and capacity issues with the Howard of Effingham school, which itself is already over capacity and seeking a new home. Having so much housing in an area with no local secondary school does not seem sustainable
- **Pedestrian facilities** – in West Horsley, many roads do not have pavements or have small pavements, and most streets are not lit
- **Roads and parking** – traffic is already significant in the Horsley station area, roads are small and often not of good quality (for example, Long Reach); parking is an issue at Horsley station, Effingham Junction station (which would be totally overwhelmed by any development at Wisley Airfield) and the shops in both East Horsley and particularly West Horsley. Some high use roads such as East Lane and the Drift are inappropriate for additional traffic, with dangerous narrow sections which already cause blocks and accidents
- **Transport** – three of the four proposed development sites are not within walking distance of Horsley train station and no/few regular buses are available, meaning a sharp increase in road usage throughout the village from the proposed developments

Policy A38
This proposed development area provider for 135 homes in the North West Part of West Horsley, a huge increase compared to the current housing in the immediate area, which is approximately 130 homes between the relevant sections of Long reach, East lane, and Northcote Road. This huge increase in a small area with a close local community would entirely change the character of this area, especially with the density of housing which will need to be high to accommodate the number of homes. It will also cause problems for infrastructure, surface water flood risk, and green infrastructure. This development area is in addition to others sited very close such as A39, A40, and A41, which will compound these negative effects.

Conclusion

Many parts of the local plan for West Horsley appear to have significant, and in some cases, insurmountable, issues for the proposed development. In particular, West Horsley is a small village which would see massive expansion of a size and scale and density that is totally inconsistent with the existing settlement, and this expansion would also cause many issues with infrastructure and amenity space, much of which is already stretched. In short, the local plan does not appear to provide anywhere near the sufficient justification for removing parts of a village with significant character, in the case of West Horsley, from the green belt and for including developments which could be in part be challenged as to whether they are sustainable or consistent with national planning guidelines. West Horsley is a village with an open character, by which definition should be maintained in the green belt according to the local plan itself – however the proposed development sites in this plan will themselves destroy the open character of the village, in particular by more than doubling the housing in the northern end of West Horsley. It is entirely inappropriate and inconsistent with national guidelines for the plan to deliberately destroy the open character of a green belt village, as this proposed plan would.

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

Attached documents:
Firstly I am totally opposed to East and West Horsley being removed from the Green Belt as there is no justification for this status to be changed and the Key evidence document ‘Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2031’ makes no case for siting large numbers of new homes in this area.

There are no exceptional circumstances for West Horsley’s Defined Settlement Area boundaries to be extended and the incredibly important Green Belt be developed - once it is gone it is gone and the whole purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent the disappearance of our hugely valuable countryside.

West Horsley village amenities would not cope with the increased influx of people using the one small village shop, no post office and a limited bus service, not to mention the increased volume of traffic. Nor would the amenities of East Horsley be able to cope with the limited shopping facilities, already crowded train service let alone the further proposals to build 2,000 houses at Wisley aerodrome which would likely also also use and rely upon both East and West Horsley’s facilities.

The area attracts a lot of walkers and cyclists throughout the year as we are at the foot of the Surrey Hills and also have a great deal of historic buildings. It is well renowned for being a beautiful area which we have a duty to preserve, the proposed housing development would be totally out of character with the general character of the area and ruin it forever which is entirely unacceptable and unnecessary.

As previously mentioned the area could not sustain the proposed amount of new homes due to the lack of services, but equally as important the lack of drainage which is a real problem in the area at present (with flooding occurring in both summer and winter, often severe), not to mention the increased need for more school places at the local school which is always at full capacity. The increased need for parking spaces would also make using the villages and parking for the Raleigh school incredibly difficult. The doctor’s surgery would also be impacted negatively, it is already difficult enough to get an appointment and sometimes impossible to park at the surgery due to large volumes of traffic.

To summarise, the area simply cannot cope with the amount of new homes provided with lack of services, parking spaces, insufficient school places, the extra burden on the doctors surgery and local hospital, inadequate drainage and is totally at odds with the character of the area in general. These are all very serious considerations which will severely impact the Horsleys but above all the Green Belt simply has to be protected.

I seriously question why the proposed sites are being considered when there is an existing and highly sustainable local town, namely Guilford, where there is a fully workable and tested infrastructure, undeveloped brown sites, the space to do so and it is NOT the Green Belt.

I trust my comments will be taken seriously and the due amount of consideration is used when making this crucial decision.

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

Attached documents:
My wife and I live in Weston Lea and will be directly affected by The Guildford Plan. Our home, our views and our social lives will be greatly impacted by the imposition of The Guildford Plan and, in our view with no beneficial consequence to the residents of Horsley.

The Green Belt status is imposed for the purpose of controlling urban growth and in order to maintain agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure. Its purpose is to prevent unnecessary urban sprawl and can and will be resisted vigorously.

The objectives of The Guildford Plan is clearly based on economical gain for the council and will bring no benefit to residents and visitors to this part if Surrey. The construction of extra homes will impose on the countryside views that West and East Horsley have to offer. It will increase traffic flow and population and diminish the exquisite characteristic of each part of the village.

I am sure you are aware of the consideration you must pay to the National Planning Policy Framework which states that The Green Belt ensures; access to the countryside, outdoor sport and recreation, retention of landscapes, improvement of damaged land, nature conservation and retention of agriculture. It is design to prevent; the sprawl of built up areas and the merging of neighbouring towns. It is also designed to safeguard the countryside from encroachment and preserve the setting and character of the town.

The proposals thus far have indicated a clear desire for financial gain alone. The economical cost of The Guildford Plan must also be considered. These will include; the unsustainable burden on the drainage system, the road networks, medical services, schools, parking and public transport. There is no proposal to support and expand these areas and if there are, no doubt the cost of such things will be borne out in our council tax charges. In my view, these areas are already overwhelmed evidence by the over populated schools and medical facilities.

From my perspective, my view of the countryside and forestry will be removed and replaced with a development site resulting in the brick work of the newly constructed homes. The impact on my light will not be known until planning permission is applied for by which time, we as the residents will have already lost this beautiful Green Belt Land.

Horsley was not given so much Green Belt status for it to be removed by a council suffering financial difficulties at a time of economic downturn. Finances and the increasing of profit is clearly outweighed by the need to preserve and protect nature and character and thus the proposed changes should be refused.

I hope that my representations are considered favourably and a response is provided as soon as possible.

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

Attached documents:
The Green Belt status is imposed for the purpose of controlling urban growth and in order to maintain agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure. Its purpose is to prevent unnecessary urban sprawl and can and will be resisted vigorously.

The objectives of The Guildford Plan is clearly based on economical gain for the council and will bring no benefit to residents and visitors to this part of Surrey. The construction of extra homes will impose on the countryside views that West and East Horsley have to offer. It will increase traffic flow and population and diminish the exquisite characteristic of each part of the village.

I am sure you are aware of the consideration you must pay to the National Planning Policy Framework which states that The Green Belt ensures; access to the countryside, outdoor sport and recreation, retention of landscapes, improvement of damaged land, nature conservation and retention of agriculture. It is design to prevent; the sprawl of built up areas and the merging of neighbouring towns. It is also designed to safeguard the countryside from encroachment and preserve the setting and character of the town.

The proposals thus far have indicated a clear desire for financial gain alone. The economical cost of The Guildford Plan must also be considered. These will include; the unsustainable burden on the drainage system, the road networks, medical services, schools, parking and public transport. There is no proposal to support and expand these areas and if there are, no doubt the cost of such things will be borne out in our council tax charges. In my view, these areas are already overwhelmed evidence by the over populated schools and medical facilities.

From my perspective, my view of the countryside and forestry will be removed and replaced with a development site resulting in the brick work of the newly constructed homes. The impact on my light will not be known until planning permission is applied for by which time, we as the residents will have already lost this beautiful Green Belt Land.

Horsley was not given so much Green Belt status for it to be removed by a council suffering financial difficulties at a time of economic downturn. Finances and the increasing of profit is clearly outweighed by the need to preserve and protect nature and character and thus the proposed changes should be refused.

I hope that my representations are considered favourably and a response is provided as soon as possible.

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

**Attached documents:**
The Guildford Council always inform us that they do not have the resources for repairing the roads, how is increasing the amount of cars using the roads going to help this. East Lane and the Street has not been repaired for several years. All we get is the odd pot hole filled in when it reaches a depth of six inches and becomes dangerous but the general road service of both these roads is breaking up.

The council states that the train service will be used. With Southern cutting 341 trains, how long will it be before that situation affects South West Trains and the roads become more congested?

All of this pays a big part in the health of the current occupants with pollution reaching levels that our government are trying to reduce.

Since the last major floods, drainage has been improved, but Ripley Lane still floods on a regular basis. With the addition of more houses many of the underground streams will have their flow compromised and more flooding will be the result. Would you wish Surrey to become another Somerset?

We have been informed that the council has plenty of brownfield sites that could be regenerated but the council seems determined to ignore these.

Every time the people of Guildford and surrounding areas show their objection for building on Green Belt land the more determined the council appears to ignore their wishes.

In conclusion we strongly object to the Local Plan in that it does not give enough thought to the current residents standard of living, inflicting hardships that when moving into the area they never thought they would have to endure.

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

Attached documents:
further increase in traffic - all of which need a considerable investment even without the proposed developments. If the Council struggles to find the funds now, what state of these would be following a dramatic jump in the population resulting from the proposed developments?

The proposed developments will make an irreversible footprint on the environment, forever destroying the natural beauty that is so much cherished and enjoyed by everybody who lives or visits our area.

While I appreciate the need for new dwellings, available brownfields should be allocated to meet this need in the first instance. The proposed plan however has not demonstrated sufficient consideration of the available brownfield sites potential.

I am very concerned that the local authorities, having already held a consultation in 2014 resulting in a high number of registered objections, still continue with the outlined proposals in what appears to be a single-minded and dictatorial style of approach. I strongly object to all proposed developments in policies A36-A41 and hope that my voice will be heard.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/344</th>
<th>Respondent: 11008833 / Brenda Ackerman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 have attended a presentation at East Horsley Village hall and discussed the impact of the local plan with several of your officers who were there. The only amendments to the rejected Wisley airfield project was a slight expansion of the area with no increase in additional housing To which I strongly object.

The other development issues in the local plan are still the same as before. You want to cram houses into some fields (533 I counted) in East and West Horsley, plus 2200 at Wisley and Ripley is under siege as well. I have protested in the past, but as this is a theoretical amendment, I am objecting again. Sites 38, 39, 40, and 41 are unsuitable. The village is small and the roads are narrow. The required lorry and construction traffic will jam the entire area for years and once it is completed will overwhelm the local facilities. You cannot get a doctor’s appointment for several days at the moment and another 1500 residents certainly won’t help and that’s without the Wisley Development. Local schools are already under pressure and Secondary schools particularly. There is no provision for road improvement in Horsley.

The Ockham Road North development by the railway bridge will put hundreds more cars a day onto a difficult road, with narrow pavements, single file in places and significantly increase the risk of a pedestrian being struck by a passing car or lorry wing mirror. The road also floods easily and regardless of flood risk controls in building, the water will continue to fall and has to go somewhere. You can’t just keep adding to a 1930’s infrastructure. The whole thing needs to be rethought if you are doing something like this. I did note that none of the Council representatives live in the area!!!

The other 2 proposals in West Horsley are also overkill. You may have noticed that there is a stop and go bit of road where it is too narrow for cars to pass and only one lane can go at a time. East Street is certainly not suitable for an increase in traffic of this magnitude.

The final proposal in Ockham Road North is at least a bit further out, but still adds a significant volume of traffic to an already over busy road. I have live there for 27 years and the traffic increase is amazing in that time. It frequently takes several minutes to get out of my driveway and of course there is the mother’s jam at Raleigh and Glenesk schools.

In addition I have repeated the very well thought out objection to the Wisley Airfield below and there is nothing significant in the new plan which changes that situation
Specific Sites in Local Plan

As an East Horsley resident:

- I am not opposed to development of Site A36 and Site A37. I believe these are supportable development sites.
- I am opposed to development of Site A39 as the site is currently in the Green Belt and in a flood zone area.

I am opposed to development of Site A38, A40 and A41 as all three currently sit in the Green Belt and will completely swamp West Horsley village.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2349  Respondent: 11009281 / David Foot  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

In the earlier drafts of the Plan, no options were presented on this proposal and you appear to have ignored the huge number of objections made on this matter at the earlier stages of this consultation. The character of the East and West Horsley villages as it exists today is a direct consequence of the protection afforded by their Green Belt status for more than 50 years. Generations of central government and local authority officials and politicians have respected this highly successful post-war planning policy mechanism. Its existence has not prevented organic development of the villages over the years, but has enabled this development to take place in a controlled way. It is surely not beyond the imagination of your Council to make proposals for continued organic development of the villages by appropriate provisions and shaping of policies within the Green Belt rules.

I object to the introduction of a new planning designation that would allow "limited infilling" within an extensive area to the south of the A246 in East Horsley. This might have been acceptable in the context of a more imaginative approach to planning (see comment above) but if you are determined to remove the Green Belt status of the village, then it makes no sense to pick away at the edges.

In the context of the above, you will not be surprised to hear that I also object to the Sites Policies set out in the Local Plan, more particularly in respect of the numbers of houses envisaged for building on each site. If the Green Belt designation of the two villages is to be removed, then all the sites listed for the two villages will have an inappropriately high density of housing, not consistent with the existing character of the villages. To take one example, the proposal to put 48 houses on the Thatcher's hotel site is far too high a density, being more than twice that of adjoining housing. Furthermore, this site is currently occupied by a busy hotel that brings many visitors to the village. This is our only hotel in East Horsley. How can it be consistent with your Economic policy to remove our one and only healthy hotel business? I object to the inclusion of the Thatcher's Hotel site.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4503  Respondent: 11010081 / Julian Colborne-Baber  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

West Horsley sites:

With respect to the four sites located in West Horsley:

(i) Policy A37 – Land at and to the rear of Bell & Colvill, Epsom Road, WH (40 homes / 1.4 hectare / 28.6 dwellings per hectare)

(ii) Policy A38 - Land to the west of West Horsley (Manor Farm, between East Lane and Long Reach) (135 homes / 8.4 hectare / 16.1 dwellings per hectare).

(iii) Policy A40 - Land to the north of West Horsley (Waterloo Farm at rear of Ockham Road North) (120 homes / 8 hectare / 15 dwellings per hectare).

(iv) Policy A41 - Land to the south of West Horsley (on East Lane) (90 homes / 4.8 hectare / 18.8 per hectare).

Whilst I am not opposed to new housing in West Horsley per se; the scale of this proposed development in West Horsley is excessive and as set out above not reflecting need in any way. In particular I am most strongly opposed to site A41. This site is critical to West Horsley’s semi-rural identity and character and it is vitally important that this open green aspect is maintained through what is, in so many ways, the centre of the village. Adoption of A41 would enable this open space to become the only development of any significant depth along the whole of the southern side of the East lane / The Street corridor and would severely compromise this ‘green gap’ between the northern and southern parts of West Horsley.

This is contrary to at least two of the five essential purposes of Green Belt as defined at NPPF paragraph 80 (namely to check unrestricted sprawl and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment – functions which this part of the Green Belt, including this site, is recognised as performing at paragraph 8.2 of the Guildford Green Belt and Countryside Study).

This site had not previously been include as a potential development site within previous draft versions of the emerging Local Plan and assessment of this site, in background studies forming the evidence base for this Site Allocation, is based on incorrect information.

Two key incorrect bases are:

1. In the Guildford Borough Land Availability Assessment (LAA) 2016 – Page 388 in respect of site reference 2063 (‘the site of East Lane’) it states under ‘summary of land designations’ – “Green Belt adjoining settlement boundary”. This is incorrect. Unlike any of the other three sites proposed in West Horsley, this site currently has no boundary that adjoins the village Settlement boundary as defined in the GBC Local Plan 2003.

2. Also, The Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study produced by Pegasus Planning Group, Volume III – Appendix VI – Sustainability Walking Distance Plans for Land Surrounding the Villages refers to the above site, plus the field beyond that the Council now propose removing from the Green Belt (together with a section of Lollesworth Wood) as site D. All assumed walking paths to (i) Nearest Local Centre, (ii) Healthcare Facility and (iii) Railway Station are presuming that access could have been gained to Lollesworth Lane via the undesignated (save that it has been proposed to be removed from the Green Belt) field to the south and fronting
Lollesworth Lane. This field is currently used for grazing sheep and is owned by Mr & Mrs. Richard Wills of Lollesworth Farm and they have advised me and others that they would not permit such access route across their field, therefore the assumption used by Pegasus Planning Group is incorrect and may well have a material effect on their conclusions.

Furthermore, any development on A41 would not be consistent with the distinctive settlement pattern of the village and the important relationship between the built environment and the surrounding landscape (i.e. development on one side of the route only). In my opinion, it will harm important views of the village from surrounding landscape (from Lollesworth Lane) and from within the village of local landmarks (of Lollesworth Wood), contrary to Policy D4 of the Proposed Local Plan.

Allocation of the site will not “promote sustainable patterns of development” and the wildlife / environmental amenity loss of this site is likely to result in a significant detriment to the village’s character. Furthermore it will cause harm to the biodiversity and natural environment of the adjoining Lollesworth Wood SNCI. Indeed, this is contrary to Sustainability Objective 1 of the Sustainability Appraisal framework set out at Table 4.1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal.

Policy I4: Green and blue infrastructure; states 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.” Local Sites are earlier defined in the policy as including Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI).

Furthermore, there is no reason at all for the amendment to the Greenbelt behind the field beyond site A41 other than to prepare for a potential second phase development in the next Local Plan and surely it cannot be considered to be justified by “exceptional circumstances” when no alternative use is currently proposed and its current and historic use is as pasture?

I strongly object to the alteration of the Greenbelt around A41 and the field beyond and to the inclusion of A41 in the Local Plan.

Across any of the adopted sites in West Horsley, careful consideration must be given to the proposed density of any future developments. The current proposed density is not appropriate for such rural and semi-rural village location and are out of character for the village as it currently largely comprises low density housing, with a considerable mix of ages and housing styles.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4198</th>
<th>Respondent: 11011617 / Pamela Holt</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 have read through the above document and wish to express my concern that my village of West Horsley will be changed out of all recognition if these proposals go ahead. No exceptional circumstances have been made to justify removing the village from the Green Belt. (Policy 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development of 385 homes on the 4 proposed sites which are at a much higher density than currently exist in the village. Little firm policies with respect to infrastructure and essential facilities are given.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current facilities would not support such a large increase in housing with its associated population and needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
West Horsley struggles with inadequate medical, schooling and retail facilities with poorly maintained rural lanes.

Public transport is currently inadequate with no link to train times to enable residents to travel to work in a more environmentally friendly way. The proposal to increase the population of West Horsley with so many new homes will only exacerbate the currently woeful situation of crammed car parks and clogged lanes.

The fact that several village shops have been allowed by Guildford Borough Council to be developed into flats and small bungalows demolished to make way for 4 and 5 bedroom homes, gives little confidence that the proposals for preserving the historic environment, protecting the countryside and creating sustainable facilities will be honoured.

The Guildford Plan policies are totally inappropriate for this rural village and I urge you to reconsider this proposed submission.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/160  Respondent: 11011617 / Pamela Holt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I object to the intention to remove my village of West Horsley from the Green Belt and the plan to create inappropriate housing developments without the appropriate infrastructure.

The rural nature of the village would be irreparably damaged with a consequent loss of openness.

The projected need for housing has been shown to be inaccurate therefore this 2017 plan is flawed.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3380  Respondent: 11013345 / Nicola Hughes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I write to detail my objections to the Guildford Borough Council (GBC) Local Plan 2016.

My comments are frequently linked to my own locality, since I clearly have most experience there. However, it seems that GBC wishes to pursue a policy of forced growth across the whole borough, without the support of the residents, based on the ineffective experiences of objecting to the GBC Local Plan 2014.

Whilst I am a resident of West Horsley, my property shares borders with East Horsley, and my comments often therefore refer to both villages, since proposals to both are pertinent.

Unbalanced Development

Having reviewed the areas for proposed development I object to the unbalanced distribution of the sites across the borough. The sites seem to be focused on the north eastern side of Guildford, swamping existing rural villages and
destroying large areas of countryside without planning for the necessary infrastructure that everyday life requires. In particular, an increase of 35% housing in West Horsley is excessive.

**Loss of Green Belt**

I wholeheartedly object to the use of current Green Belt land for development via the plan. The establishment of Green Belt was for the protection of the countryside for future generations. There has been no exceptional circumstance established for the removal of, or alteration to, boundaries of East or West Horsley from the Green Belt.

In addition GBC claims in it's own publication "About Guildford" Summer 2016 (pg4) that following feedback the total number of development sites on green belt has been reduced. This is most certainly not the case in East and West Horsley.

**Traffic and road network**

The roads in and around East & West Horsley are in poor condition and very narrow in places, and unable to support the current level of traffic using them. They are certainly not capable of increased usage and I object to any development that generates additional traffic. This is supported by the recent incident of a lorry getting stuck under the railway bridge at Horsley station, where Ockham Road North and South meet. The incident caused disruption to the rail system and roads for multiple days. It would be dangerous and foolhardy to develop the area A39, noted on Map Horsleys (East Horsley) page 348 of the plan, creating additional traffic on such constricted roads.

In addition my journey to work at The Royal Surrey County Hospital using the A3 is frequently hampered by slow or stopped traffic, particularly around the Burpham area. I object to excessive development within the Borough when the main roads are unable to support the existing level of traffic.

**Parking**

There is insufficient parking at the West Horsley parade of shops, West Horsley Village Hall, East Horsley Village Hall, Horsley station and Station Parade in East Horsley. I object to the excessive local development proposed in the local plan, both around East and West Horsley villages and the Wisley Airfield site which would compound the matter due to increased numbers of car users.

**Flooding**

I object to development that increases waste water in East and West Horsley. The water drainage systems in the area are unable to cope with the current level of waste water. The local roads are often flooded in winter, and increasingly at other times of the year also. My daughters walk along Ockham Road North to access the station for their journey to school. During periods of wet weather I am often forced to drive them in the car, as the road is so flooded it becomes impassable on foot. Development that increases both traffic and waste water in this area (such as site A39, pg348) would have an extremely detrimental effect.

In addition my back garden, which borders the proposed site A39 pg348, is often flooded in winter, and with a recent period of wet weather even in June. The winter streams are not able to cope with the current amount of water from the field and I object to any development of this site that will increase run off.

**Schools**

The Raleigh School is already at capacity, and unable to accommodate more children. This is also the case for the Howard of Effingham. I object to development in East and West Horsley and Wisley Airfield that will create additional schooling requirements.

**Medical facilities**

The current medical facilities at Kingston Avenue in East Horsley are at capacity and difficult to access. I object to any development that increases demand on these services.
In conclusion, the GBC Local Plan 2016, does not provide the community with a plan that fits with the needs of its residents, and should be dismissed.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1943  **Respondent:** 11013889 / Richard Curtis  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

**Guildford Borough Council Proposed Local Plan**

I am writing to object to the Local Plan proposed by Guildford Borough Council.

I am opposed to the village's removal from the Green Belt by insetting and extending the 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area boundaries. No exceptional circumstances or other justification has been made for the new Green Belt boundaries that will result from the proposed insetting of the two parts of the village from the Metropolitan Green Belt.

Policy S2 states that provision will be made for 13,800 new homes over the Plan Period 2013 to 2033. The number of homes is too high and unsustainable in Guildford’s villages.

The proposed expansion of West Horsley village is unsustainable. With only one small shop, no post office, a very limited weekdays only bus service through the village, it is clearly unsustainable for the proposed high volumes of new housing development. The development of 385 homes on the four proposed sites are at much higher densities than currently exist in the village settlement and will be totally out of character with the existing mix of different housing styles and layout of the village. The homes building proposals are unsustainable in terms of schooling, drainage, roads capacity, shops, parking in East Horsley (shops and station) and public transport.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3654  **Respondent:** 11014145 / John Brown  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am writing in response to the proposals set out for West Horsley in the 2016 Guildford Draft Local Plan. My concerns focus upon the strains that would be imposed upon an already creaking infrastructure in this area, and the erosion of the Green Belt.

The detailed arguments relating to the impact upon the various elements of the infrastructure have been well rehearsed elsewhere. Suffice it to say that transport (road, rail and parking), medical, educational and shopping facilities are already under considerable strain. The increased volumes of traffic that would arise from the proposals have the potential to generate considerable hazards to local schools, pedestrians and junctions. The Raleigh School is oversubscribed and the Medical Centre is inundated. The addition of a significant number of new dwellings to the area would be unsustainable.
As I understand it the Green Belt may only be challenged in exceptional circumstances. No-one would view building on the Green Belt in West Horsley an exceptional circumstance when there are viable options for additional housing throughout the borough.

The scale of the proposed developments in the Horsleys would have a detrimental impact on the rural characteristics that define life in this Surrey village. Any development needs to be proportionate in scale and not be at the expense of the quality of life of those of us already resident here.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/744  **Respondent:** 11014881 / Linda Peters-Smith  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

2 Sites in East and West Horsley (sites A36-41)

I object.

The council leaders representing Ash and Tongham (where the Green Belt is actually being extended) are pushing a disproportionate allocation to this area which will create a mega-village and ruin what is currently two lovely villages.

The number of homes in West Horsley, a rural village will increase by 35% which is also I understand 35% of new homes in the plan with urban Guildford taking only 11%.

The infrastructure and schools, doctors, shops can't take the strain of this together with the c. 2,000 houses planned at Wisley airport.

It would damage local tourism.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1654  **Respondent:** 11015009 / Laura Fletcher  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I object to the proposed building of 533 new houses in East and West Horsley (an increase of 35%). This amount of housing will completely change the rural character of the villages. The high density proposed would not reflect the existing character of the area and would create suburban housing estates in this rural setting. There is no justification for developing Green Belt land, except in very special circumstances. No ‘special circumstances’ have been put forward by the Council. We need to protect the Green Belt and stop our countryside from being destroyed. This is particularly true of the proposed development at Sites A41, A39, A38 and A40.

It will also place huge pressures on: local schools, doctors surgery, drainage infrastructure, road network, parking at local shops and rail stations. The Council has not considered the infrastructure needed to service this level of development,
Despite the fact that the National Planning Policy Framework states that new residential development must respect the character and density of housing in the area and be limited in quantity by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3962  Respondent: 11015329 / Nick Riederer  Agent:

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

The environmental impact of the vast number of new residents commuting in and out of the area would put a massive additional burden on the existing road networks and transport infrastructure that is already buckling under the weight of lack of investment or maintenance by Guildford County Council – Have you tried driving down ‘Long Reach’, ‘Ripley Lane’, ‘The Street’, ‘East lane’?

New residents on the proposed scale would put an unsustainable strain on the local schools – I remember what a struggle I had getting my son into the local Primary School and there are annual arguments over catchment areas between the local villages just to get children into the geographically nearest Secondary Schools. The proposals do not address these problems adequately they would just make them worse and mean parents would have to drive their children to schools many miles away putting further strain on the inadequately maintained road system and further increase pollution of the local environment.

The increase in housing will also strain the services infrastructure, local sewage and drainage requirements are overloaded as can be seen after a heavy downpour water floods over Ripley Lane and The Street between the Railway Bridge and Long Reach due to many natural springs in the area. Localised flooding will of course be compounded by the proposed new homes the plans take no account of this.

It should also be noted that during the building of these new houses what is left of the local roads will quite literally be destroyed, a year ago heavy construction lorries were employed at Jury Farm for a couple of months in Ripley Lane and the Road was structurally damaged as a consequence and has still not been satisfactorily repaired. Building in the local area on the scale proposed will never be made good by the construction companies lining up to build on nice Green Field Sites. It will be the local Tax payer that picks up the bill and endures the years of misery during and following the extensive construction.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4545  Respondent: 11015425 / David Jenne  Agent:

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

West and East Horsley is also a green belt area and the Surrey Hills an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and as such must be protected. As a residents of West Horsley I totally oppose the village’s removal from the Green Belt or the change in its status. The Green Belt and Countryside Study is flawed with no sound case whatsoever for justifying changes to the Green Belt boundaries laid down many years ago by national legislation. The evidence document
‘Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2014’ makes no case for siting large numbers of additional homes in West and East Horsley or neighbouring villages.

In summary I am totally opposed to the proposal of hundreds of homes on Green Belt areas in West and East Horsley and indeed the villages around including Ockham and Wisley which is a planned population growth well in excess of the Government 2014 forecasts. This would be totally out of character with the existing mix of different housing styles and layout in the village and would be unsustainable in terms of infrastructure, such as drainage, road capacity, schools, shops, parking and public transport and the supposed need for so many houses over the Plan period is not proven. Indeed, West Horsley’s own Parish Council through a 2014 Housing Survey is able to confirm a limited need for up to 20 affordable homes for local people who want to remain in the village, i.e. for young people and for elderly people wishing to downsize to smaller homes.

The additional plan to build over 2000 homes in Ockham on the former Wisley Airfield, less than 2 miles away puts an utterly unsustainable strain on the infrastructure of West and East Horsley and all the surrounding small villages, not to mention a detrimental effect on the day-to-day village life for current residents. The Plan also infringes my understanding of Government policy to protect the Green Belt and I attach a letter from Brandon Lewis MP dated, 17th February 2014 regarding Ministerial Guidance on the Green Belt. Finally, these plans are being considered before other Brownfield sites are prioritised, which are stated to be more sustainable in order to avoid the irreparable damage to the Green Belt.

The Plan is ill judged, unnecessary and unproved and will damage a Green Belt area of outstanding natural beauty and affect the lives of current residents who are already having to tolerate poor roads, lack of state school provision, congestion and poor local and council services, and poor infrastructure.

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

Attached documents:
The New Local Plan

Objections to proposals Ref. 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, & 41

Nicholas Proctor of 12 Holmwood Close, East Horsley, Surrey KT24 6SS

I am extremely concerned about the extent of the proposals in your Local Plan as they affect our villages and the apparent attack on the Green Belt. My main objection is that your Plan will irrevocably change the character of the Horsley villages. I have lived in East Horsley for all my life and it is very understandable why it is such a sort after place to live. People are prepared to pay a premium for houses in this quiet rural setting. Other specific objections are as follows:

The dramatic rise in both houses and population of the villages by approximately 20% will overload an already stressed infrastructure. There is always a waiting period of about two weeks to get a doctor’s appointment. The local schools are oversubscribed. The Raleigh currently has about 30% of its students coming in from Effingham and Bookham. The Local Plan makes no provision in the Horsleys, as I could read, for the buildings that would be required to deliver services to new residents e.g. doctors surgery, schools, etc. The train service up to London is already over stretched in the rush hours. Often people further up the line have to wait for a later train because the carriages are completely full with people standing. This general overcrowding of the area on, roads, trains, etc. has a damaging effect on people’s wellbeing and general happiness. Although these are difficult to measure they are vitally important to the quality of people’s lives.

The effect so many more people from outside the village will have on the culture of the village. The Horsleys will become a small town. The development plans go against the protection of The Green Belt that was designed to protect rural villages and stop urban sprawl. It is extremely important for Surrey to retain its villages to make it an attractive area for people to live and visit. It is part of what makes South East England a jewel in the crown of this country.

There has been a significant rise in the volume of traffic over the last ten years or so. Very little has been done to address this issue and another 1000 cars (assuming about 2 cars per new dwelling) will be horrendous. It will also mean more potential for accidents. Many of the residents are elderly and find it difficult coping with so much traffic.

The expansion of the village has already meant that the local wildlife has suffered a loss of habitat. There are more dead animals on the roadside than there ever used to be. As a village gets more like a town there is more night time traffic which is more hazardous for the animals. This is currently before adding another 1000 or so vehicles.

If more housing is required it would seem more sensible to me to locate additional dwellings in and around the towns where those people are likely to work. This has the benefit of using existing brown field sites and cutting commuting traffic and so pollution.

Overall I believe this Local Plan is fundamentally flawed as far as the Horsleys are concerned. It might seem an easy option to build in the countryside at first but the effect on this area of outstanding natural beauty would irreparably destroy the area for the residents and the people that visit the villages.

Thank you for taking on board my objections.

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

Attached documents:
As a resident of West Horsley, I would like to record my objection to the current version of the Local Plan, as outlined on your website.

My specific concern is the number of new houses that are proposed in or around the villages of East and West Horsley resulting in an increase of up to 35% in West Horsley households. This concern stems from the following observations:

- Where is the proven demand for houses in the village, from people who need to work here?
- If none, where then would the people living in these houses work? If not locally then each household would need one or more cars to transport the occupants to work.
- Queues on the A3 northbound in the morning, from Ripley to the M25, are already severe at rush hour.
- Similarly, queues southbound on the A3 towards Guildford, and on the slip roads into the town, are also high.
- Emissions and pollution from vehicles using these stretches of road will not be reduced if more people try and use it.
- There is less than adequate existing drainage in East Lane, Ripley Lane and The Street, all of which flood when there is exceptional or heavy rainfall. Building additional houses can only reduce the capacity of the ground to absorb rainfall.
- The existing schools and medical facilities are already stretched: we experience lengthy delays in getting a routine doctor's appointment at the Medical Centre.

I have no objection to selective development on underutilised sites but value the Green Belt in which I live and would like to see it remain as such.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2039  Respondent: 11024289 / Robert Manley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I would like to voice my objections to the building of an unacceptably large number of new homes which Guildford Borough Council's draft local plan proposes to sanction in the parishes of East and West Horsley.

In 2014 a previous draft plan proposed to remove the green belt status which the two villages enjoy.

It was abolished after central government intervened to make it clear that green belt status could only be taken away from a village if "exceptional circumstances" could be established to justify doing so. To my knowledge no "exceptional circumstances" have ever been established and yet the new plan again attempts to remove the Horsleys' green belt status and facilitate the building of almost 600 properties in the villages immediately, followed by an unspecified and unlimited number of additional houses or flats thereafter.

600 is a very large number of extra properties for the two villages and, if built, would put great pressure on the limited amenities we currently enjoy (doctors and dentists surgeries, school places and the provision for care for the elderly etc.) That situation would be further exacerbated by the 2000 houses proposed for Wisley airfield just a couple of miles distant.

The villages lack the infrastructure to cater for so many new residents. Yet if more roads are built or widened and fields concreted over, the rural character of our community will be lost. In effect the plan's proposals put the cart before the horse by first removing the green belt status and then cramming in sufficient development to justify having removed it.
Finally, I seriously doubt that Guildford Borough Council can point to where, over the whole of Surrey, the new residents would find enough jobs to meet their needs. And even if they could all find work in London travelling there is very expensive. There is therefore a real danger that many new residents will discover that there is no work for them locally but that anything they can find in London does not pay enough to meet cost of travel to get to it. They would be marooned.

I believe that the local plan arises from a requirement placed on local authorities by central government to get more homes built to meet a national shortage. The objective is right but in my submission it is a mistake to build so many homes in areas such as the Horsleys which lack both infrastructure and employment. To do so would prove highly detrimental both to the new residents the existing community.

I also object to the Local Plans proposal for 400 dwellings in West Horsley. There is still a flagrant disregard of Green Belt land that was introduced to stop urban sprawl. The reduction in the number of homes proposed in the Green Belt initially is a good thing but it does not go far enough.

There appears to be no change to Guildford’s projected housing growth of almost 25% by 2035. The Office of National Statistics is almost 50% less for the same period, yet figures based on this huge discrepancy surely cannot be justified for development of this size

I object to no changes being proposed since the 2016 Consultation to insetting West and East Horsley from the Green Belt. There is need for new dwellings but on a much more considered approach that is in line with the Parish Council’s development plans and sympathetic to the current infrastructure and feel of the villages.

Nothing has been proposed since last years Consultation to improve the sustainability of the West Horsley development sites and thus meet National policy requirements.

The existing infrastructure is stretched under current demand for its services. The local primary and secondary schools have had plans for necessary rejected, the run off for sewage and drainage is low meaning localised flooding occurs in extended rainy periods and sewage pipes get blocked.

Local train station carparks are full at peak times and buses and other large vehicles travelling east through the village stop the traffic due to lack of room for cars to pass the same stretch of road.

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

Attached documents:
I wish to lodge my strongest opposition to the totally disproportionate and wholly unjustified Guildford Borough Council's plans to dramatically increase the population size of West Horsley village.

To increase a village population by in excess of 30% without any thought to the infrastructure and the additional strain placed on already strained local services, roads, schools/education, transport, drainage is outrageous!

The impact of 450 + new homes and circa 900 additional cars that will be added to the village roads, will seriously change the character of the village and will put lives at risk, whether this is local children who cycle or walk to School or the many hundreds of cyclists who use these Country roads as part of their regular road training route.

Numerous surveys conducted by parish council and local groups show a need and tolerance for no more than 50 - 100 new homes. Such numbers could be accommodated in around and within existing housing areas and if planned and executed sensitively, will have hopefully minimal impact on the character and practical functioning of the village.

Please reconsider your proposal for 450+ new homes in West Horsley and take a more measured approach in line with feedback expressed by the existing residents.

The people of West Horsley are not being unreasonable. We understand that some increase in housing stock is needed, as current residents wish to stay on in the village and new and young people wish to join our community. However, to increase the population of West Horsley by the numbers of people and cars you propose would destroy the character and effective functioning of the village for both existing and future residents.

The state of the existing roads is testament to the fact that insufficient funds have been made available for many years on repairing potholes and or sorting out the continual flooding and surface water drainage issues. Increasing the housing by the ridiculous numbers proposed will see an already creaking infrastructure crumble and fall apart completely!

I sincerely hope that you will reconsider your proposals as they stand and that we can arrive at numbers which the West Horsley residents can embrace as a positive outcome for an organically evolving village.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2155  **Respondent:** 11027265 / Jonathan Ingram  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I strongly object to the proposals in the Draft Local Plan for the following reasons:

I live in East Horsley and find the roads to be very dangerous with even the current amount of traffic let alone if we get more traffic due to the increased population in Horsley and the surrounding areas. I notice there is a development proposal at the Thatchers Hotel on the Guildford Road East Horsley. This area of road is particularly dangerous as it has a blind corner and a sharp bend and many people having to turn right out of Ockham Road South onto it, all within the space of about 50 metres.

I object to all the proposals at the sites in West Hosley and East Horsley for the reasons of the local transport infrastructure simply not being able to cope with the huge demand the increased numbers of population will place upon them. In particular the stretch of the A3 from the M25 junction at Ockham past Wisley, past Burpham and all the way along to Guildford experiences many collisions. A new junction will increase numbers of traffic on this dangerous road.

In addition as a daily commuter into London from Horsley station I do not see how this small village station can cope with the increased demand from literally potentially thousands of extra commuters every morning and every evening.
travelling to and from the proposed sites in The Horsleys and at Wisley Airfield Ockham. The new Guildford Local Plan states expressly that regarding Effingham Junction station it is “not considered sequentially preferable or sustainable to direct office development to these locations”. See extract below. If it is not considered an adequate station where will the commuters residing at and office workers working in Wisley Airfield Ockham get the train to and from? Surely not Horsley as this will be having to cope with extra commuters from the 535 proposed new homes in the Horsleys.

4.4.17 For the purposes of the sequential assessment the train stations at Clandon, Chilworth, Gomshall, Shalford and **Effingham Junction**, will not be considered to be transport interchanges because of their locations within the Green Belt, AONB or the isolated nature of the station away from the village or centre. We do not consider that it is sequentially preferable or sustainable to direct office development to these locations.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3672  **Respondent:** 11027649 / Phyllis Charteris-Black  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

**Comments specific to Horsley Villages area**

As a resident of the Horsley Villages (I specifically use this description since, despite the language and descriptions used in the Plan, it is very difficult to overstate how closely East and West Horsley are connected and interdependent on each other, a point which is not full recognised in the documentation) my comments largely relate to the policies in the plan which would affect this area.

I am aware that there is a general pressure for new housing stock to meet many different needs and supporting facilities. National planning guidance advises that villages should only be included in the green belt if the open character of the village makes a contribution to the openness of the green belt. West Horsley clearly has a different character to East Horsley and it should continue to be ‘washed over’ by the Greenbelt. With regard to East Horsley I appreciate that the ‘open character’ is less obvious, however whilst removing the green belt wash over for East Horsley within the existing settlement boundary might be one way of contributing to the additional housing required I think the addition of several areas specifically for development (by way of an amended settlement boundary and specific designation of these areas for development) will so radically change the nature of the village that this cannot be what as envisaged by a simple removal from the green belt wash over. Also I cannot accept that all of sites identified for development in East and West Horsley need to be included in the plan. Whilst it is true that the plan is intended to cover a long timeframe, and not all development would take place at one time, GBC will be making decisions which in the longer run would irrevocably change the character of the Horsley area if the plan were to be implemented as it is currently drafted.

The inclusion of all the areas identified would also put intolerable pressure on existing local facilities. I am sure GBC will be getting plenty of feedback from other Horsley residents, which I would also echo, to say that the primary school, health and parking facilities within the East and West Horsley area are already operating at capacity. There is no mention of including additional primary schools or health centres in the potential usage of these sites – the addition of the proposed housing density across all these sites with no such additional provision of school places or health care is bordering on the irresponsible and dangerous, and would indicate that GBC whilst obsessed with planning for housing has not rationally considered its other duties to the residents of the borough.

I quote from my previous letter in the consultation period

“At present the descriptions of the possibly uses for the areas in West Horsley only relate to housing and do not include uses for public facilities such as schools and health resources, surely this cannot be right? The consultation document at a general level indicates that appropriate resources would be approved in planning terms in the future, but I feel if an area
of land were to be approved for use in a public way such as this, then it should be being brought forward for consultation now. In the Horsley area it is clear new health facilities and a new primary school facility at the very least would be needed if all the areas were adopted.”

As I say, no attempt has been made to address these points in the published draft plan and I feel GBC has failed in its duty to East and West Horsley residents.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1906  Respondent: 11032225 / Graeme Markwell  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I would like to express my opposition to the Guildford Local Plan for the following reasons:

• The character off the area will be adversely impacted through noise and pollution
• There are not enough essential amenities available for such a population influx, in particular the availability of accessible school places would be impacted
• The Green Belt Boundaries were created to protect the characteristics of this area of outstanding natural beauty and moving them is immoral
• Local wildlife will be adversely affected
• The roads and streets will become much more hazardous places as many use them inappropriately, contravening the speed limit.
• The increased volume of traffic will lead to more road traffic accidents and the potential of children being killed road traffic accidents are the most significant cause of unintentional injury for young people.
• Healthcare services will be adversely affected by increased numbers it is already very challenging to secure an appointment with a GP

It is my sincere belief that the plans as they stand will reduce the quality of life of residents currently living in and around the Horsley's.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2269  Respondent: 11033217 / Lemongrass Gardens Ltd (Christos Liasides)  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

After living in Horsley for 29 years I am strongly opposed to the changes that are proposed in the local plan for both East and West Horsley and the surrounding villages. I work in gardening and agriculture and am especially opposed to the changes the plans have on the land.

I strongly object to the proposed changes the plan would have on the Horsley and surrounding villages. These will uncharacteristically change the villages with a significant amount of history and heritage to make them resemble towns.
I hope these objections are listened to and that the Guildford Borough local plan is reconsidered to make better use of brownfield sites to protect the green belt, specifically in the Horsley’s and surrounding villages. I would like my 2 children and their families to be able to grow up and enjoy the beautiful village environment I was lucky enough to have in my childhood.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4363  **Respondent:** 11033921 / Tim Depledge  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategies and Sites June 2016 (the Local Plan).

I also write to fully support the written submission by West Horsley Parish Council written on this topic.

I also write to complain that this plan, which has been touted as written after listening the last consultation does not appear to have addressed any of the concerns raised by residents in the area I live.

I also wish to point out that, as I understand it, all previous correspondence is classed as "null and void", and that this is entirely disrespectful to the citizens of the borough who took time and effort to previously address the issued in the previous local plans. It is clear and apparent that the process is made as difficult, arduous and repetitive, to break down local opposition, whilst developers simply see this process as a step to doing business.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3530  **Respondent:** 11034305 / Susan Stewart  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

- The proposal to remove Horsley from the Green Belt cannot be justified. No exceptional circumstances or justification has been made. The Green Belt and Countryside Study is flawed.

- The proposal to extend the boundaries of the settlement areas has not been properly thought through. It appears that the reason behind this is solely to increase the amount of land available for development. The residents of West Horsley are totally opposed to the village’s removal by insetting and extending the 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area.

The boundaries do not need to be extended.

- West Horsley Parish is one of a rich and varied mix of well-established low density housing settlements with many historical buildings. Positioned on the North side of the North Downs, partly in the Surry Hills AONB, it attracts walkers and cyclists all year round.
The Key Evidence Document GB Economic Strategy 2013-2031 makes no case for locating large numbers of homes in either East or West Horsley or neighbouring villages.

- The scale of the increase in housing is disproportionate to the village. It would mean an increase of 35% of households within the village, greater than any other single area in the borough. Can Guildford Borough Council (GBC) tell us why we have singled out for this massive increase. 385 new houses could not be accommodated without extensive investment in roads, schools and medical facilities. Our local school is already full and oversubscribed. Drainage is inadequate and we suffer from flooding after each period of heavy rainfall. It would also alter the very heart of our village. With only one small shop, no Post Office, limited bus service, it is clearly unsustainable for the proposed high volumes of new housing. The development of these homes would be of a much higher density than already exists and would be totally out of character with the existing mix of homes.

- Thames Water has advised GBC that the areas waste water network is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all the proposed developments.

- The inflated number of houses arises from a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) that was generated from a theoretical model which has not been revealed to the public or indeed to GBC. The SHMA target housing numbers is then further increased by GBC to give a population increase which is almost 70% higher than the official national estimates for population growth in the Borough. The need for so many houses to be built in West Horsley is totally unproven.

- The West Horsley Parish Council and Surrey Community Action Housing Survey identified the need for some 20 houses for local people who wished to remain in the village.

- I am also very concerned about the proposals to build a new town at Ockham, (Wisley Air Field), the extensive developments at Burnt Common and Gosden Hill Farm. The impact on our village of such huge developments under 2 miles away would be enormous.

I have lived in West Horsley for 30 years. I have enjoyed the semi-rural atmosphere and the strong community spirit that ties the residents together. There has been some new housing and other developments within the village during this time, but it has been with due regard to the environment and the protection of wildlife habitats and done in a sympathetic way as to maintain the character and minimise the impact on the very fabric of our way of life.

I urge GBC to reconsider these drastic proposals and listen to the concerns of the people of West Horsley.

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

Attached documents:

I am writing to STRONGLY OBJECT to proposals made in the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan. Removal of Horsley from the Green Belt.

The Planning Policy Framework states that land should only be taken out of the Green Belt in exceptional Circumstances. The prime reason for the Green Belt being the protection of the countryside from urban sprawl. With continuing pressure for development this remains even more important today. There is also a requirement to safeguard the countryside from
encroachment. Horsley is a village set in attractive countryside. The Green Belt designation is required to maintain the character of the village and the area, not just for the residents but also for the many visitors walkers, cyclists, golfers from London and the rest of the UK and abroad who come here to enjoy the countryside and stay at the campsite and local hotels.

The allocation of over 533 houses in The Horsleys is excessive and disproportionate and will detrimentally affect the character and appearance of the villages. This is not just the housing estates themselves but the cars (at least an extra 1000), congestion generated, the pressure on the existing local infrastructure: primary and secondary schools, doctors, sewerage, surface water, parking at the shops and stations. The Horsleys will become a congested urban area.

The loss of Green Belt protection, by ‘insetting’ would mean a presumption in favour of development. This would lead to pressure to develop every small parcel of open land in the area. No provision has been made to protect existing open areas such as Nightingale Crescent, Kingston Meadows, play area adjacent to West Horsley village hall, land adjacent to West Horsley Motors on The Street and Weston Lee playing fields, to name a few, should they be removed from the Green Belt.

There is no justification for altering the development boundary – the villages need to continue to grow slowly and incrementally so that it does not put adverse pressure on services and the local infrastructure.

Brownfield sites must be developed before any Greenfield sites are considered.

Infrastructure

The NPF requires that new residential development must respect the character and density of housing in the area and be limited in quantity by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities.

The proposed amount of development is not sustainable

- There is no extra capacity at the local primary or secondary schools.
- The doctors surgery can not cope with current demand
- Existing flooding problems will be exaccerbated
- Foul water sewers regularly overflow
- Parking at the station and local shops is at capacity
- Mobile phone reception and broadband connections are poor
- An extra 1000 cars will lead to huge amounts of extra traffic on narrow country roads.
- The proposed densities will be out of character with the area

Guildford Borough Council is proposing a large percentage increase in the housing stock in Horsley with NO consideration whatsoever on the affect on the local infrastructure.

Proposed Development Site A41

The proposed development of this site would be seriously detrimental to the character and rural appearance of West Horsley. This land is open countryside and adjoins a group of old buildings, some of which are listed, along the historic bridleway of Lolesworth Lane. It is important that the setting of this group of buildings is maintained so that social history of West Horsley is not adversely affected. Development here would set a seriously undesirable precedent, whether it is for houses or a school.

Proposed Development Site A40
Of particular concern is the triangle of land to the south west of Waterloo Farm, which backs on to the campsite and the rear gardens of properties in Nightingale Crescent. This site was originally a paddock, but has now been absorbed into the grounds of Waterloo Farm, an old farmhouse, which although not listed is over 150 years old. The proposed development would seriously affect the character and setting of this historic building and would create a piece of suburban back land development.

This site is restricted by a main sewer running along the western boundary (along the fence adjacent to the campsite). Other sewers from Nightingale Crescent, cross the site and feed into this main sewer. The existing main sewer can not always cope. We have lived at 36 Nightingale Crescent for 16 years and the sewer which runs through no 38 has backed up twice causing raw sewage to flood into our rear garden.

Nightingale Crescent slopes down to this site and surface water sewers also cross the site and drain into the lake in the camp site. Our garden together with the proposed housing site and the campsite are often waterlogged and regularly flood. Please see attached photos.

Housing development will further increase these problems by generating additional surface water run off.

One of the reasons for refusing outline planning permission for the erection of three detached dwellings (access only to be considered). R14/P/000012 on 27 Feb 2014 was:

The proposed development of three dwellings has the potential to increase the risk of flooding in a area with a high risk of surface water flooding. No information has been submitted to demonstrate how the development would successfully mitigate against flooding. This is contrary to policy and G1(6) of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (as saved by CLG Direction on 24/09/07) and guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Given that development would be constrained, its inclusion for a small number of houses would not outweigh the value it has in maintaining the rural character and setting of Waterloo Farm.

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

Attached documents:
- Flooding at Waterloo Farm (2) June 2016.jpg (490 KB)
- Flooding at Waterloo Farm February 2014.jpg (645 KB)
- Rear of 36 Nightingale Crescent June 2016.jpg (751 KB)
- Flooding at Waterloo Farm January 2014.jpg (630 KB)
- Flooding at Waterloo Farm June 2016.jpg (532 KB)
- Flooding at Waterloo Farm January 2015.jpg (649 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1272  Respondent: 11034625 / Charlotte Fletcher  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Further to my objection letter sent on 10 July 2016. I would like to make it clear that I strongly object the proposed development on Sites A38, 39, 40 and 41. The loss of Green Belt is totally unjustified and the impact on open countryside, ancient woodland, flooding, the setting of historic buildings and the local roads and infrastructure is unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4439  Respondent: 11034657 / Marina Depledge  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

In response to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites: June 2016 (The Guildford Plan) published by the Guildford Council on 6th June 2016 I strongly object to developing new sites and building new housing in West Horsley and East Horsley villages including all the sites proposed in the local plan:

• A37 by the Epsom Road;
• A38 Land along East Lane from Northcote Road to Long Reach;
• A39 Land in East Horsley by the Horsley rail station;
• A40 Land at rear of Ockham Road North;
• A41 Land along Lollesworth Lane in between East Lane and railway

To begin with it is extremely disappointing that the Guildford Council has completely ignored objections previously received from residents of the villages in response to the last local plan consultation ending in September 2014 and published Proposed Submission Local plan with intention of building 385 new homes in West Horsley, an increase of 35% on the current number of homes with just a slight change in the identification of specific sites for this proposed development.

Once again as resident of the village I strongly object to this proposal.

The main reason against development of these sites is that the proposed strategies will remove the villages of East Horsley and West Horsley from the Green Belt, which is against the fundamental concept of the Green Belt as it is supposed to be the policy that immutably keeps the areas designated as the Green Belt out of projected development to retain these areas as undeveloped to surround neighboring areas.

The requirement for increase in housing is not and cannot be considered the reason for removing the villages from the Green Belt as in order to do so the potential to build in the areas which are not classed as the Green Belt has to be completely exploited which is clearly not the case in the Guildford Borough. In the Policy P2 of the Guildford Plan there is absolutely no justification for changing Green Belt boundaries that have been set up by the national legislation. According to planning and Greenbelt policy, Green Belt land can only be built in in exceptional circumstances, there are absolutely no "exceptional circumstances" outlined in the local plan to justify this encroachment in whatever form onto Green Belt land. Hence, I object to this policy statement.

The area near East Horsley and West Horsley villages is classed as Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and attracts many visitors from London to spend time in the picturesque countryside of Surrey Hills which villages of East and West Horsley are part of. The village of West Horsley has low density housing set up with a considerable number of traditional English cottages, which contribute to the countryside character of the area. New housing in the village, especially at the density proposed will completely destroy the character of the village and will make it look like a suburban area of London or Guildford. This is particularly the case if building affordable homes in the village of West Horsley is considered as these type of housing is always high density and makes a drastic change to the outlook and demographics of the area. It is
completely wrong to change the outlook of the village just because more housing has been identified as needed based upon a floored and intransparent SHMA which is then being imposed upon the villages by Guildford council. The effect will be to make the Horsleys a small town rather than a village. The concept of limited infilling that the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan is discussing in Section 4.3.24 - 4.3.27 of Policy P2 Green Belt is absolutely ridiculous as building of additional 385 homes in West Horsley and 100 homes in East Horsley can not be considered as limited infilling (It is 35% increase on the current number of homes!!!).

Building new houses in the villages of West Horsley and East Horsley is against Protecting Policy P1 of The Guildford Plan as the areas of Surrey Hills and nearby villages have to be preserved as areas of outstanding natural beauty. This proposal is also against National Planning Policy Framework which clearly states that "inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances".

There are no special circumstances that justify such massive development in the Green Belt areas as development on brown sites in Guildford borough has not been done to full potential. It is inappropriate that 64.6% of all proposed new homes are to be built in the Green Belt. There is absolutely no justification for this.

The discussion of Policies P1 (Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) and P2 (Green Belt) is self contradictory in the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan document as it talks of necessity to preserve such areas and at the same time very badly justifies exceptions and limitations to the rules which is unacceptable.

Building new houses in the villages of West Horsley and East Horsley is against the Protecting Policy P1 of the Guildford Plan as the areas of Surrey Hills and nearby villages have to be preserved as areas of outstanding natural beauty. This proposal is also against the National Planning Policy Framework which clearly states that “inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances”.

There are no special circumstances that justify such massive development in the Green Belt areas as development on brown sites in Guildford borough has not been done to full potential. It is inappropriate that 64.6% of all proposed new homes are to be built in the Green Belt. There is absolutely no justification for this.

The discussion of Policies P1 (Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) and P2 (Green Belt) is self contradictory in the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan document as it talks of necessity to preserve such areas and at the same time very badly justifies exceptions and limitations to the rules which is unacceptable.

The next argument against development of new homes in the villages is due to limitations of current infrastructure. The village cannot be expanded with any new housing developments as the infrastructure in the village is already exploited to its full potential.

- The schools are oversubscribed in the The Raleigh school has been full every year for a number of consecutive years. There are not enough secondary schools apart from Howard of Effingham School (which has limited capacity) within the area.
- The doctors surgery is operating at its full capacity and it is often difficult to get an appointment already with the current population in the villages.
- West Horsley village mainly depends on the infrastructure of East Horsley as it does not have its own post office, has only one shop and therefore additional housing proposed for West Horsley village will not be sustainable.
- New housing will create an immense burden on the drainage system in the villages and roads network, which in some places is not wide enough for cars to pass each other.

Current wastewater system will not be able to support these proposed developments. The proposed developments are all located within the “surface water hotspots” as identified within the Local Plan itself.

Public transport in the village is non-existent. There is only one bus which runs only on weekdays and on a very limited schedule and cannot be considered as a means of transport to rely on to get to work either in Leatherhead or Guildford.

The car park at the train station is full during the day and will not be able to accommodate more cars. The roads (Ockham Road, East Lane and The Street) will become busy traffic roads instead of semi-busy village roads in case new housing is built in the area.

Based on the above it is clear that this does not comply with Policy S1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development. In order to keep the area sustainable there should on the contrary be no additional housing development in the area as local services and infrastructure are already at breaking point.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that new residential development MUST respect the character and density of housing in the area and be limited in quantity by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities. Although Guildford Borough proposed Local Plan talks about sustainable development there is no consideration for development of infrastructure in the villages of East and West Horsley.
It is clear that potential new residents of West Horsley and East Horsley villages will have to be employed either in London or Guildford town. The fact that there is no public transport system in place to support alternative commuting options is discussed above. Furthermore economic development of Guildford Borough for the foreseeable future does not require additional housing to be built in West or East Horsley. None of the strategic employment sites mentioned in Policy E1 (office B1a and Research & Development B1b Strategic Employment Sites, Guildford Town Centre employment core, Surrey Research Park, Guildford Business Park, London Square, Cross Lane, 57 and Liongate Ladymead) are near the Horsleys hence it would make much more economic sense to find solution for building new houses close to new economic development sites and not in the Green Belt area.

It is clear that one of the main incentives for building new housing in the villages is opportunity of selling new houses at premium as the villages are within commuting distance to central London. Hence with regard to "fairness", how is it possible to support this plan, which prioritizes profits for housing developers, and landowners (who most likely either do not live in the area, or will move away from the building based on their windfall profits), and imposes costs (financial and lifestyle) on those who live in the community? The balance of houses have been identified as for 40o/o of the developments to be "affordable homes", there is absolutely no reason to suggest that the residents of the Horsley's have a need for over 200 affordable homes. Surely it makes more sense for houses to be built in areas which are sustainable, in areas with appropriate infrastructure, and close to the local area in which people who buy the houses work?

Having discussed above the arguments why additional housing will become an unsustainable burden for the existing infrastructure and unfairness of development on the Green Belt which is both unbalanced and unsustainable I would like to reiterate my main objection that there is no justification for removal of the villages from the Green Belt. I strongly oppose the removal of the villages from the Green Belt also because it sets up a vicious precedent to exploit the opportunity and destroy the area of outstanding natural beauty in the future beyond the timescale discussed in the current local plan.

The suggestion in the local plan to create new areas of the Green Belt between Ash Green village and the Ash & Tongham urban area to compensate for the removal of the villages of West and East Horsley is not enough. There is no need to destroy certain areas of the Green Belt to create others.

Why should Guildford Council enforce the construction of new homes, in areas which are unsustainable, where infrastructure is insufficient, in areas where the local community objects, changing the face and demographics of villages in order to generate profits for house builders, and enable the council to declare it can meet an unjustified housing demand?

I once again would like to reiterate that I strongly object building of new houses in the areas discussed in the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites: June 2016 in the villages of East and West Horsley particularly as I am against removal of the villages from the Green Belt. I trust that my opinion and my comments will be considered.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2380</th>
<th>Respondent: 11034913 / Alison Hutton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 changing of boundaries - the insetting boundary - in particular the inclusion of the environmentally valuable Kingston Meadows and Horsley Tennis and cricket club.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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>
• All the proposed policies far exceed the local need.
• The proposed density is far higher than any existing locally or in Guildford, it is more reminiscent of London.
• The proposals are tantamount to the formation of a sizeable new town in the Horsleys. There is no justification for this.
• There is no local support for these policies.
• The collective and cumulative impact of these 7 sites has not been properly considered or assessed.
• The proposed developments are completely out of scale with existing and planned building elsewhere in Guildford.
• The sites are unsustainable. The vital improvements in infrastructure are missing (water, sewage, anti-flood provision, traffic management, schools, health, telecommunications)
• The Wisely Airfield site was rejected by the councilors and yet it is included in this proposal. Why? Things have not changed since the refusal and additionally, no account is taken of this proposed site on the Horsleys.
• The changes in the settlement boundaries are far too sweeping and the squaring off or regularizing activities will suck in many adjacent fields. The plan cannot maintain that this means they don’t contribute to the openness of the Green Belt.
• If Wisely Airfield were to be built on, the Green Belt space set between the neighbouring villages will become much smaller and is contrary to the entire raison d’etre of the Green Belt.

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

General observations in objecting to the local plan:

• There is a lack of primary and secondary schooling in West Horlsey and the surrounding villages. The Raleigh and Howard of Effingham (both state schools) are already oversubscribed with may local children unable to get places. Local private primary and secondary schools are also full (or near to full) capacity. No provision has been made in the local plan for new schooling or increased facilities for existing schools. With the proposed level of housing, the schooling crisis will be more important than ever, but will continue to remain unaddressed.
• Kingston Avenue Medical Centre serves both East and West Horsley, as well as the surrounding villages. It is near impossible to get an appointment within a one week timeslot and further development to the area will make this even worse. Again, there is no provision for new medical facilities in the village, despite an additional 385 homes being proposed.
• Horsley train station serves both East and West Horsley. It is impossible to park on a weekday and there are no other suitable parking areas in the village. The addition of 385 homes in West Horsley, as well as 2100 homes
on Wisley Airfield, without increasing the size of the station, or improving accessibility is going to cause immense strain.

- Traffic generation from the proposed new housing in West Horley and the new settlement in Ockham is going to have a significant impact on our roads. Being in a rural setting, every household has at least one to two cars, possibly three. The proposed levels of development are going to cause immense strain on the local roads, already in a poor state of disrepair. Many roads are small, winding lanes, unsuitable for heavy traffic or large loads.

There is a known waste water/sewerage problem in the Ockham Road North / Green Lane area. No provisions have been made to improve the waste water infrastructure, which is deplorable, given the proposed increased housing numbers in the area. Thames Water has advised Guildford Borough that the area’s wastewater network is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all the proposed developments.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2679  Respondent: 11039105 / Robert and Judith Warren  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 for a number of reasons set out below related to the Horsleys

- **Green Belt**: The Plan does not justify the “exceptional circumstances” as required by the NPPF to remove areas of Horsley from the Green Belt by changing settlement boundaries.
- **Infrastructure**: The local infrastructure is already overloaded and no planning thought appears to have been given to the provision of additional roads, schools, medical facilities and drainage/sewerage.
- **District Centre at Station Parade**: This is inappropriate given the nature of the facilities in the village.
- **Ockham Three Farms Meadow**: 2000 isolated houses are proposed there. There are many arguments for objecting to this site being in the Plan at all given that a planning application has already been rejected, however the development will have a considerable negative impact on the Horsleys particularly if the promised infrastructure facilities do not materialise, as is often the case under “viability” pressure from developers.
- **Disproportionate housing development in Horsley**: The planned allocation of housing in the Horsleys is utterly disproportionate to the size of the village – a 35% increase in existing West Horsley households and on Green Belt land. This compares to 11% increase in Guildford Town where opportunities for brownfield development remain to be explored. A fairer and balanced allocation of new housing is required.
- **Suspicious basis to the numbers of houses required**: There remains considerable suspicion that a flawed model has been used for the estimation of numbers. Suspicions sustained by the lack of openness of the model used for the calculations – this model has not even been exposed to the GC councillors. Particularly in the light of Brexit, these numbers require justification and revision.

I OBJECT to the Draft Plan and request that it is radically redrafted to account for existing law, national policies and the wishes of current residents.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2704  Respondent: 11039105 / Robert and Judith Warren  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

**I object.** The planned allocation of housing in the Horsleys is utterly disproportionate to the size of the village – a 35% increase in West Horsley properties and on Green Belt land. This compares to an 11% increase in Guilford Town where opportunities for brownfield development remain to be explored. A fairer and balanced allocation of new housing is required. These proposals will destroy the rural character of the villages. This is at least unfair and feels persecutory, particularly when the west of the Borough (Ash and Tongham) is allocated so few properties. The cumulative effect of so many houses on the Horsleys must be taken into account. If there are reasons for the current allocation of housing, these should be argued and justified in the Plan rather assumed. The density of new housing on the proposed Horsley sites is inappropriate, and greater than anywhere in the locality.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2867  **Respondent:** 11039137 / Geoff Downing  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 above plan in relation to “The Horsley’s Development Sites”.

My reasons for this are as follows:-

- Whilst some development of new housing, assuming a broad mix of affordable through to upper end, is desirable to meet demand the proposal for up to 593 new dwellings in the Horsley’s is out of balance compared to the existing housing stock.
- No justification of the “exceptional circumstances required” has been established within the local plan to remove the Horsley’s from the Green Belt.
- Development outside the existing settlement boundaries should only be considered once all suitable sites within the current settlement boundaries have been utilised.
- The local plan does not provide an infrastructure proposal to support even a modest increase in housing stock. For instance the Horsley Medical Centre is close to capacity and would not be able to accept registration for new patients on anything like the scale proposed.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2651  **Respondent:** 11040993 / Justine & Jo Thorne  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

With reference to the proposed changes to the Horsley area;

I am very concerned about the extent of the housing proposal in the Horsley area and the removal of the Horsleys from Green Belt land.
Primarily, I am concerned about the network of roads and public facilities, which would come under extreme pressure, should more houses be permitted. The roads are not suitable for heavy vehicles and increased traffic. Most local roads suffer with drainage and pothole issues, without additional vehicles using them.

The local facilities, including the doctor’s surgery, would not cope with more than 500 additional families. (Over 2,500 families if I include the 2,000 houses proposed for the Wisley Airfield) There is already limited availability for appointments, without any proposal for extending the surgery and it’s car park, to cover the additional people, who would wish to use it.

Parks and carparks are also stretched. The Station Parade is always busy, as is the train station car park. Without additional space for the additional shoppers / commuters, there would be restricted access for current residents to use the facilities.

Finally, I understand that building on Green Belt areas is only to be undertaken in exceptional circumstances, which the plans do not demonstrate. The plans will fundamentally alter the complete dynamic of what is an exceptionally friendly and supportive community and I hope you take these factors into consideration when deciding on the fate of our village.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2994  Respondent: 11041601 / Robert Bayley  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

REMOVING THE HORSLEYS FROM THE GREEN BELT

I OBJECT to this proposal.

Policy P3 states that “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt, as shown on the proposals map, against inappropriate development. 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.”

What “very special circumstances” have been demonstrated that warrant taking the Horsleys out of the Green Belt? The Plan’s projected housing numbers are flawed, whilst the roads, schools and doctors’ surgeries are already overloaded.

To “inset” two-thirds of the borough’s rural villages on the grounds that they no longer contribute to the purposes of the Green Belt is utterly implausible.

Furthermore, the Green Belt is not the Council’s to give away, and once it is gone it is gone forever.

EXTENDING SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES OF THE HORSLEYS

I OBJECT to this proposal.

There are no concrete reasons why these areas should be extended – other than a sneaky plan to carve out more land for future development.

OVERLOADED INFRASTRUCTURE

I OBJECT to this inevitable result of the Local Plan.
It is obvious that not a single member of the Local Plan’s drafting team has visited the Horsleys in recent years. Roads are full of potholes from the sheer volume of traffic, drains do not work and roads flood repeatedly, schools are oversubscribed and trying to get an appointment at the doctors’ surgery is next to impossible.

How can anyone even dream of making this scenario worse by the addition of new households?

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3799  Respondent: 11041953 / Elizabeth Baxter  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am writing to express my opinions on the above document and its proposals.

I object to the imposition of an unsupportable burden on the drainage infrastructure, the schools, the roads’ network, the medical services, and the parking in the shopping areas. None of these seem to be addressed in the plan.

I object to the high density and large volume of housing planned, as they are unbalanced and will change the nature of the village quite out of character.

I object to the extra volume of traffic that will inevitably follow such a large expansion.

Since the National Planning Policy Framework requires that new residential development must respect the character and density of housing in the area and take into account the infrastructure and local facilities I cannot see how the Plan caters for this.

The Green Belt was set up in law to provide for the maintenance and care of an area of countryside between villages to maintain not only the countryside but also the individualism of the villages. If this is changed then the spread of conurbations will clearly mean the Surrey area ends up being a further extension of the London suburbs.

The well being of the countryside is paramount to the health, economy and lifestyle of many thousands of people now and in the future in Surrey. The loss of habitat will be irreversible and has huge consequences for the ecology of the remaining countryside.

I would be particularly upset to see the development of land in the Northern section (A40) of West Horsley that is alongside our house and is where we keep our sheep.

This provides much character and green space for the wildlife in the area.

The land is commonly under water when there is substantial rain as shown below and housing development would exacerbate those problems.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1894  Respondent: 11042817 / Jessica Withers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

RESPONSE TO GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL (GBC) DRAFT LOCAL PLAN 2014
I object to the proposals. The scale of development would put significant strain on local infrastructure and services and completely change the character of West Horsley. GBC’s plans to remove land from the Green Belt goes against national planning policy and prioritises ease of development over preserving the environment of the borough for future generations.

POLICY S2: BOROUGHWIDE
STRATEGY: Object
● No evidence is provided for the 13,860 new homes. The need for the proposed 533 extra homes in East and West Horsley seems to be down to the availability of landowners willing to sell their greenfield land for development rather than any consideration that West Horsley is the right place to build this number of homes.
● Brownfield sites must be developed first before any land is removed from the Green Belt.

POLICY P2: GREEN BELT AND THE COUNTRYSIDE: Object
● As our MP, Sir Paul Beresford was told by the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State (Planning) in his letter of 18 June 2014 in relation to the last draft local plan, “most development in the Green Belt is inappropriate and should be approved only in very special circumstances … unmet housing need is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt to constitute the very special circumstances justifying inappropriate development within the Green Belt. … Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances.” Nothing central government has said since has done anything to alter this position. Unmet housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.
● The Green Belt is precious and must be protected for future generations.

POLICY I1: INFRASTRUCTURE AND DELIVERY: Object
● Developments at West and East Horsley and at Wisley Airfield will place considerable strain on already stretched infrastructure, including transport, education, medical services, parking and shops. Local school, childcare, medical and transport facilities are already overcrowded.
● The Draft plan does not provide enough detail on how further strains on resources will be met. No information is provided about how increases in traffic produced by these developments will be managed to protect the health of residents and their safety on the road.

POLICY I3: SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FOR NEW DEVELOPMENTS: Object
● The developments in West Horsley will increase car use, which is contrary to sustainable transport policies.

In conclusion, I object to the removal of land from the Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances presented to justify this. Development in West Horsley will completely change the character of the village and put more strain on already stretched local infrastructure.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2321  Respondent: 11043041 / James Withers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

SITES IN EAST AND WEST HORSLEY: Object
● The plan proposed that East and West Horsley take 35% of the new homes proposed in the borough. This is a
disproportionate number and will have a significant impact on the area and its infrastructure.

- No details are given for the infrastructure planned to deal with this number of new homes.
- The density of new housing proposed is greater than anywhere locally.
- The plan presents no argument or exceptional circumstances for extension of settlement areas into the green belt.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/664  Respondent: 11043105 / Rosemary Tottman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am writing to oppose The Guildford's proposed Local plans: strategies and sites June 2016. I have lived in West Horsley for over a decade and I am strongly against the plans to change the nature of the village and the surrounding countryside. The National Planning Policy Framework states that any new residential development should be in keeping with the current character and density of housing in the area. This plan does not meet that criteria and it also does not make allowances for how the current infrastructure and local facilities will be able to cope with all the additional people moving into the area.

My specific concerns include:

Education
Currently both the Raleigh and Howard of Effingham schools are full. Local children should be able to go to their local school and not have to travel outside of the village.

Housing Density and the results of this
The infrastructure will not be able to cope with the proposed additional number of houses. There are already issues with drainage when we have heavy rain and Thames Water has advised your council that the current wastewater network will not be able to support the proposed housing developments. Congestion and increase of traffic on roads is also a major concern and will not be helped by children having to travel to school outside of the local area because of the aforementioned issue with over subscribed schools.

Green Belt
I refer again to the point re: changing the whole character of the village which would happen if this plan goes ahead. The National Planning Policy Framework says any change of Green Belt boundaries should demonstrate exceptional circumstances. The law does not state that unmet housing need is an exceptional circumstance. Therefore, the Green Belt boundaries should not be altered. This development would cause irreparable damage to the Horsleys and the surrounding villages and is completely unacceptable. It would be much better to use brownfield sites before destroying the beautiful countryside in the green belt that makes the villages here what they are.

I strongly oppose the Local plan and do not believe that you are complying with the NPFF. Given the overwhelming feeling of local people against this plan I hope you will not seek fit to implement it.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2768  Respondent: 11043393 / Kerry Scott-Patel  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I want to object to the Draft Local Plan (refs A36, A39, 90, 353, 2177, A37, A38, A40, A41, 2292, 350, 1219, 1275, A35, A37, A38, A40, A41, 2292, 350, 1219, 1275, A35, A37, A38, A40, A41, 2292, 350, 1219, 1275, A35) affecting the Horsleys on the following grounds:

- Traffic and Parking - our streets are already congested. It is very difficult to park at the Parades on Ockham Road and due to the sheer volume of cars, it is often difficult to see people crossing the road with the consequential accident risk this has. Adding to this pressure and risk with more households which bring at least 2 cars per household on average is simply non-sensical given the potential accident dangers that could follow;

- Pollution - the large increase in the volume of traffic will cause an increase in pollution levels which is already a concern in our area.

- Flooding - the area already suffers from flooding and building in this area will only exacerbate the situation. The soil and drains already cannot cope.

- Schools - local schools are already at capacity. Where will the children of incoming families go to school? Even if the schools were to be expanded, or new schools built, the standard of education for which the area is known will suffer adversely which will ultimately impact the desirability of the area for families. Hence, the development will not lead to families residing the area if the schools are not up to scratch, and therefore the development will not achieve what it set out to.

- Medical facilities - similar point to schools.

- Transport - road and rail links are already busy, if not congested. Our transport infrastructure will be under enormous strain by increasing the numbers of users with the result that there will be failures, poor service, misery for those that travel and ultimately, make this area unattractive for people to move to. Hence, the development will not achieve what it set out to do.

- Green belt land - developing on our countryside will slowly erode the beauty of Britain. There is a reason why Britain is so attractive to live in and this is in part due to the countryside we have here. To build in our countryside will only destroy this beauty and ultimately, make our country and in particular, this part of the country, unattractive.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3156</th>
<th>Respondent: 11043969 / Mercedes Underwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

Villages and Major Previously developed Sites, sustainable Transport for new development

West Horsley is one village and always has been, its not west Horsley south and west Horsley North, where did you get this from? Settlement boundaries exist and do not need to be extended you give no good reasons for this and no exceptional circumstances have been presented. West Horsley only has one small shop, no post office, limited bus service during weekdays only

Homes For all/ Affordable Homes
We don’t have the roads/parking for this increase in traffic, the school is already full to brimming. There is no evidence that we need this many new homes, our own west Horsley survey showed we need 20 properties for local people who want to remain in village (downsizes/ young people). 434 homes in 3 greenbelt sites at much higher densities than currently exist would be totally out of character with existing mix.

green Belt, surrey Hills AONB

I am opposed to you removing the green belt in east and west Horsley. Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-31 doesn’t make any case for siting large numbers of homes in west and east Horsley

WEST HORSLEY,

And generally

At The train station the car park is already full quite often, where would the extra commuters park? Potentially 1200 extra cars in the village? No way

The drains on Ockham road north often get blocked, and back up, there are major problems and another 604 homes in the villages will lead to major problems. The drains have a lot of broken bricks in them I have heard and cannot take any more capacity

All the Traffic stopping at glenesk school is a proven bottleneck in the morning. The private schools already generate far too much additional traffic through the village first thing and last thing, building all these extra homes will make it gridlock in the mornings and afternoons

The Raleigh school is full in northcote crescent, and doesn’t have room for any more classrooms or kids. Any more cars going down there for drop off would cause gridlock

At The Medical centre East Horsley, parking is already impossible and almost as hard as getting an appointment, it can’t take any more patients in my view and the small road to it cannot take any more cars

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1961  Respondent: 11045537 / Julian Keel  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am writing to express my grave concern about the proposed plans for development and removal of the Horsleys from the Green Belt.

My major concerns and objections are as follows:

1) The residents of West Horsley are totally opposed to the village's removal from the Green Belt.

2) West Horsley's Defined Settlement Area boundaries do not need to be extended at any point and no “exceptional circumstances” or justification for insetting these Areas from the Green Belt have been evident.

3) No sound reasons have been given for the proposed changes, which seem to be solely aimed at increasing land available within the settlements for future additional development.

4) The local infrastructure is already in overload. The local schools are full, medical facilities are stretched, the drainage is woefully inadequate and the traffic is already at high levels with roads in a dreadful state of repair.
5) The density of housing in the proposed development sites is several times more than the density of present dwellings.

6) Brownfield sites are not being developed ahead of these proposed new sites.

7) 2 versions of the Greenbelt Purposes Assessment were produced, in February 2013 and April 2014. Between the 2 versions, the score for contribution to the greenbelt was reduced for all sites in West Horsley without any explanation as to why. This seems a deliberate manipulation to the scores in order to downgrade to a low Green Belt sensitivity.

Please consider the above comments before the consultation period ends.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/349  Respondent: 11045537 / Julian Keel  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
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 changes of the settlement boundaries of the Horsleys into the Green Belt

2) I object to the proposed removal of the extended village areas from the Green Belt

3) I object to the proposed large housing development sites given that other avenues have not been considered and the local infrastructure cannot support these sites.

4) I feel that it is wholly unacceptable for Guildford Borough Council not to be protecting the Green Belt and putting short term gain before it's preservation for future generations.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4398  Respondent: 11045665 / Graham Bannister  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is no way that our already overstretched infrastructure can support the additional population the proposed development will bring in. The roads in the area have not been maintained in recent years and would not support the another in flux of thousands of new vehicles not to mention the destruction caused by heavy goods traffic. Developers traffic has already damaged many of the roads locally.

Schools and medical facilities are already close to breaking point. How are they expected to support a potential 30-40% increase in demand.

I have lived in this village for most of my life. I have watch the village expand slowly. I believe that the huge amount of the proposed development that is planned for this area will decimate this village.

I oppose the removal of the Horsley’s from within greenbelt. The local plan is potentially vague and duplicitous there appears to be very little boundary to the level of development that could happen here. For example, I note that the few
shops a centre of the village is designated as a district centre. Horsley is not district it is a village, not only does this suggest that Little attention has been paid to the nature of our community but I also understand it opens the door to further urbanisation and development. I am opposed to the reclassification of this area.

The proposal for building houses within only very few miles of this community, at Wisley airfield, Garlick’s arch, burnt common and Gosden Farm is appalling. This would eradicate all semblance of village life and potentially merge all local villages into Guildford and create a sprawling mass of unaffordable housing.

There is no denying that housing is sorely needed in this country but it needs to be planned carefully with all of the needs of existing and future communities taking into account. There is nothing to suggest that any of this has been considered in the current plan. There is a general lack of transparency there is language used that is vague an ambiguous. There is no explanation for why developers need to build only on virgin Green Field sites besides the obvious one that it’s much cheaper for them to do so. There is little to suggest that any of the housing will be affordable. There is very little to suggest that any new investment will be found to create an infrastructure that would support the huge increase in population and traffic. There is very little to suggest that any of this development Will benefit anyone except those investing the development. As I understand development in Wisley is being operated by an overseas company, so even the profits made from such rash development would not find their way to help the people of this country.

I appreciate you taking the time to read this letter. It serves as my complete opposition to the new local plan. I hope that you consider the points I’ve raised as this is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity there is no turning back once this beautiful countryside has been destroyed it cannot be returned. Please do not continue with this Plan.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3565  **Respondent:** 11045697 / Nick Hartwell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am a homeowner in West Horsley and concerned on the potential impact to our village adding in a further 385 homes, some 35% increase on the current housing stock. I fully appreciate we live in the south east of England and further housing is needed but surely a more balanced approach with consideration to the existing infrastructure / services and built environment of the village is required before the Horsley’s become part of the urban sprawl along the A246.

One of my biggest concerns is that of impact on local essential facilities such as schools, doctors, shops of which there is limited detail. My son has only by the skin of his teeth got a place at the local state school which is a joke being less than a mile away. If all the new homes were built I doubt this would have happened which is ridiculous for a small village. Getting appointments at the doctors is very difficult at short notice and there is no provision for improvement of the current medical facilities. Infrastructure is already poor and congestion would dangerously increase and be a hazard for all users – the pavement provision is very poor and I often have to walk in the road with my two children in our pushchair.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/519  **Respondent:** 11045729 / Samantha Wigfall  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am a homeowner in West Horsley and concerned on the potential impact to our village adding in a further 385 homes, some 35% increase on the current housing stock. I fully appreciate we live in the south east of England and further housing is needed but surely a more balanced approach with consideration to the existing infrastructure / services and built environment of the village is required before the Horsley’s become part of the urban sprawl along the A246.

One of my biggest concerns is that of impact on local essential facilities such as schools, doctors, shops of which there is limited detail. My son has only by the skin of his teeth got a place at the local state school which is a joke being less than a mile away. If all the new homes were built I doubt this would have happened which is ridiculous for a small village. Getting appointments at the doctors is very difficult at short notice and there is no provision for improvement of the current medical facilities. Infrastructure is already poor and congestion would dangerously increase and be a hazard for all users – the pavement provision is very poor and I often have to walk in the road with my two children in our pushchair.

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

**Attached documents:**
Letter objecting to the proposed submission Local Plan: Strategies and Sites June 2016

I want to voice my objection to the proposed 385 new homes being built in West Horsley in the Guildford development plan. For the village this would mean a 35% increase on the current housing number of 1,111. This is a small village, which does not have the capacity to accommodate an additional 700 cars, another 2000 people all who need healthcare, and schooling and infrastructure to support this level of immigration. As the proposed plan is to build these by 2022, this will radically alter the village and it is unsustainable. This proposal in isolation might not be too bad if we didn't take into account the additional 2000 houses proposed at the Wisley site, which was refused in 2016 by the planning office, the 148 houses proposed for East Horsley, and the large development of 2000 houses just down the road at Gosden farm in Burpham. What you are proposing to do is a travesty; Surrey will no longer be the green belt area it used to be if this plan is allowed to go ahead.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3869  Respondent: 11047809 / Jeremy Frost  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

As a local resident in West Horsley, with 1 child in The Raleigh and myself working locally, we are fully aware of how the Horsleys can struggle to cope with its current residents, let alone if the population were to increase. I have tried to make my points objective and hope you will address them when considering the proposed plan.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2891  Respondent: 11048225 / Hinal Patel  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I want to object to the Draft Local Plan (refs A36, A39, 90, 353, 2177, A37, A38, A40, A41, 2292, 350, 1219, 1275, A35, ) affecting the Horsleys on the following grounds:

- Traffic and Parking - our streets are already congested. It is very difficult to park at the Parades on Ockham Road and due to the sheer volume of cars, it is often difficult to see people crossing the road with the consequential accident risk this has. Adding to this pressure and risk with more households which bring at least 2 cars per household on average is simply non-sensical given the potential accident dangers that could follow;

- Pollution - the large increase in the volume of traffic will cause an increase in pollution levels which is already a concern in our area.

- Flooding - the area already suffers from flooding and building in this area will only exacerbate the situation. The soil and drains already cannot cope.
- **Schools** - local schools are already at capacity. Where will the children of incoming families go to school? Even if the schools were to be expanded, or new schools built, the standard of education for which the area is known will suffer adversely which will ultimately impact the desirability of the area for families. Hence, the development will not lead to families residing the area if the schools are not up to scratch, and therefore the development will not achieve what it set out to.

- **Medical facilities** - similar point to schools.

- **Transport** - road and rail links are already busy, if not congested. Our transport infrastructure will be under enormous strain by increasing the numbers of users with the result that there will be failures, poor service, misery for those that travel and ultimately, make this area unattactive for people to move to. Hence, the development will not achieve what it set out to do.

- **Green belt land** - developing on our countryside will slowly erode the beauty of Britain. There is a reason why Britain is so attractive to live in and this is in part due to the countryside we have here. To build in our countryside will only destroy this beauty and ultimately, make our country and in particular, this part of the country, unattractive.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4151  **Respondent:** 11049761 / Sharyn Mackay  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 following elements of the Draft Local Plan: Strategies and Sites June 2016

- Policy P2: The removal of East and West Horsley from the Green Belt
- The construction of additional housing in West Horsley (sites A38 and A41)

The main aim of Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Developing sites A38 and A41 will undoubtedly contribute to urban sprawl. They are open expanses of land which give views of woodland and surrounding countryside and should not be altered in any way.

Whilst I understand the need for more housing I object to the high number of houses proposed. West Horsley seems to have a disproportionately high number of houses proposed. This will put an enormous strain on local facilities and infrastructure including:

1. The local primary school is already oversubscribed and the local secondary school for the Horsleys, (Howard of Effingham) also serves Effingham and Bookham and is already at full capacity.
2. There is one medical centre serving the Horsleys and it is extremely busy. Building such a large number of new homes in the villages will put too much pressure on the surgery.
3. There will be increased pressure on the rail service. The parking area at Horsley Station is small, always full on weekdays and has no room for expansion. There is an infrequent bus service through the villages and it is not a practical option for getting to work.
4. There will be a large increase in traffic in and around the village, especially when sites A38 and A41 are enough of a distance from the shops/medical centre and station to suggest people will drive rather than walk/cycle. Ockham Road and East Lane are busy, especially at peak times and are in a poor state of repair already.
5. There are areas in the village which suffer with flooding after heavy rain. Clearly the drainage infrastructure is already under strain and will not cope with so many additional houses.
6. The current state of pavements in the villages are inadequate – not continuous in some places – and are certainly not in a fit state for an increased numbers of residents.
One of the reasons our villages are so attractive and pleasant for both residents and visitors is the rural setting. Changing the density of housing and increasing the number of houses so drastically will change the appearance and feel of the villages forever.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3270  Respondent:  11051649 / Andy Lewis  Agent:

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

Existing villages such as the Horsleys have insufficient infrastructure to provide for the development proposed.

I totally object to the need to expand the villages and I OBJECT to the plan to create new settlements such as that proposed at the Wisley Airfield site. The plans do not have the good road, rail, shopping, education, health and leisure facilities to support the new settlements such as Wisley Airfield.

Moreover, it seems perverse in an age of fundamental shift from physical to virtual (internet) shopping, that GBC are still considering massively increasing the area for retail. Some of the areas earmarked for unnecessary shopping facilities could be far better used to meet the perceived housing need and allow protection of the environment that this draft LDP seeks to change for the worse for ever.

Plans proposed have not considered the infrastructure and are fundamentally unwise

Notwithstanding that these plans go against statutory direction, there are additional reasons why many of the consultants’ proposals are flawed. Real concerns of sustainability and viability, together with almost no real impact studies, show that these plans are constructed to meet a political agenda, rather than rational assessment that would have discounted them. I OBJECT to the plans for the following reasons:

- Flooding

In recent years, flooding has become a severe national problem. In the 5 years we have been in East Horsley, there has been significant flooding on the roads each winter. The water table is high, and the drainage system is quite obviously incapable of handling run-off. Removal of more trees and fields to create dwellings will only exacerbate the problem.

- Transport

Many of the proposed villages for development sites struggle already with road and rail infrastructure. For example East and West Horsley, and the Wisley airfield site, are served by the Guildford via Cobham branch line, which is already creaking at the seams at rush hour. With existing population levels, the morning trains are often full after Effingham Junction, even though 10 car trains have been introduced to cope. It is totally impractical to add significant numbers of commuters to our current load. Moreover, the car parking at Horsley and Effingham Junction is barely adequate now. The rail link is simply so congested that it is impossible to contemplate building 3000 new homes in the Horsley/Wisley area to feed into the currently stretched system, let alone the homes in Merrow that will also make commuters lives a misery on the Cobham line.

In terms of roads, they are narrow and struggle with the existing capacity. The major access link is onto the A3, and Old Lane would be completely overwhelmed by the proposals. While there is, this time, indication of junction modification on the A3 at Burntcommon, it is apparent that even SCC are unaware of whether this can be sufficient in any way. It certainly doesn’t appear to be serving the Wisley site. Hence, for transport reasons, it is totally unacceptable to be recommending such a massive and unsustainable development.
Even if additional access were provided at the Ockham Junction, not all traffic would use that exit – at least 50% would use the Old Lane access either to the A3 or to Horsley/Effingham. Planning to build nearly 3000 new homes at Wisley Airfield, Send and the Horsleys, would yield more than 6000 new cars in the area. This is totally impractical and would overwhelm the existing infrastructure, consisting as it does of very narrow rural lanes. Therefore I OBJECT to the draft plan on the basis of the road and rail infrastructure being total inadequate for the planned development.

GBC should also look very closely at the horrendous traffic problems round the Wooden Bridge area of the A3 and the A25 at Ladymead that occur every working day, and recognise that additional traffic from increased housing would be a disaster.

- Schools and Medical centre

Simply unable to cope with more demand.

### Fundamentally Flawed Assessment of East Horsley parade of shops as a Rural District Centre capable to support increased levels of trade from new developments

East Horsley’s parade of small shops is characterised as being 3rd largest in the whole of the Guildford area in terms of size and facilities!, after Guildford town centre and then Ash Vale. This belies that fact that it is no more than a small village facility and certainly not a Rural District Centre (which requires more than 30 retail outlets and we appear to have about 25). Road and rail infrastructure is insufficient; car parking insufficient; space available insufficient to allow any further retail development (if any were contemplated – and it should not be contemplated). Such designation implies relaxation of planning restrictions that would forever change the nature of our village, and I OBJECT to East Horsley shopping parade being classified as a Rural District Centre.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3468</th>
<th>Respondent: 11051809 / David Tilman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 am writing to object in the strongest terms to the local plan for Horsley.

I have lived in East Horsley for over 21 years and it is a lovely place to live and work.

I am in no doubt that if any of the proposals contained within the local plan are followed through then we will lose what makes the Horsleys a vibrant and complete community.

We are a village, and we act like a village and it is worth holding on to this.

Removal from Green Belt
What is the point of the Green Belt if it can be removed on a whim? What are the exceptional circumstances that have been demonstrated for this to apply. I would appreciate a response on this point.

Settlement Boundaries.

This decision too seemed to have no basis. There is scope to build additional houses within the boundary (in much lower numbers) and it is vital that we retain the Horsleys as a distinct village.

Infrastructure

There is no doubt that the infrastructure within the village cannot cope with the number of additional houses proposed. The parking at the station is full to overflowing, there is constant heavy traffic already on our narrow roads - particular problems on Ockham Road South and the drainage system fails every time we have a heavy shower. I do not have personal experience of local schools but I understand they are full and that medical facilities are stretched. We have quite a lot of older people in Horsley and they are a greater burden on the Health Service and deserve to be treated quickly.

Station Parade

The erroneous designation of Station Parade as a District Centre seems to have happened because somebody pressed the wrong button on their calculator. We have a collection of village shops - no more - and the village is not equipped to cope with the development proposed.

Villages at Ockham and Burnt Common

The impact of these proposed developments on our village would be enormous - extra traffic before and after complete and the demand for facilities within the village.

Concern over Housing numbers

It is hard to believe that there is sufficient demand within our area for so many houses. No one objects to "infill" but this is a major change in the shape of our village which seems to have been decided on against all the evidence. Is it true there is sufficient brown field land within Guildford to build a large proportion of these homes? I would appreciate a response to this.

I am concerned that some local businesses are being sacrificed in order to build houses that we do not need. Two local businesses are about to disappear as a result of the new Opera House (construction traffic is already a problem).
While most younger residents work in London there are many middle aged and older people who work locally. It is one of the joys of living in Horsley that friends and neighbours are truly part of the local community. It is important that we retain this balance.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3984</th>
<th>Respondent: 11060545 / Melissa Royde</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>

As a local resident I object to the 533 houses being proposed.

The impact on both West and East Horsley does not seem to have been considered or at least any plans put in place to handle the additional population.

The station car park is already full every day – where will the additional cars park? There is no space for the car park to be extended.

As mentioned above, the roads are already very busy, particularly with speeding drivers. This will get worse, particularly with the rush to get a parking space.

The medical centre is brilliantly run but how can they be expected to cope with an additional 533 families? What plans are in place to deal with this?

If the other large developments are allowed also such as Wisely airfield, this will have the same impact on the Horsleys.

As I have said before, I am not an expert and cannot comment on the planning policy but it seems to me that there must be other more sensible options that wouldn’t cause such a huge feeling of betrayal by Guildford Borough Council. Surely smaller numbers of houses on the plots and not removing the Horsley from the Green Belt would have been a better option. There must be other brown field sites elsewhere which would be better and not in the Green Belt. And the house prices are so inflated in the Horsleys that the intended purchasers will never be able to afford them anyway.

I hope my comments will be taken 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: PSLPA16/4263</th>
<th>Respondent: 11063233 / David Ebdon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 am writing to object most strongly to your proposed plan to carry out extensive housing development in the Guildford area, particularly in the Horsleys.

West Horsley's defined Settlement Area boundaries (ref 2003 Local Plan) DO NOT need to be extended. West Horsley Parish is one of a rich and varied mix of well-established low housing density settlements with a considerable number of historic buildings. Positioned on the north side of the North Downs, partly in the Surrey Hills AONB, it attracts a considerable number of recreational visitors (walkers and cyclists) through the seasons each year.

The number of proposed new homes will swamp the village of West Horsley and change its nature irrevocably. Village expansion is unsustainable. With only one small shop, no post office, a very limited ‘weekdays only’ bus service through the village, it is clearly unsustainable for the proposed high volumes of new housing development.

The development of 385 homes on the 4 proposed sites are at much higher densities than currently exist in the village settlement and will be totally out of character with the existing mix of different housing styles and layout of the village. The homes building proposals are unsustainable in terms of all the above not to mention parking in East Horsley shopping areas and particularly at Horsley station which is virtually full on a daily basis and of course, public transport.

The planned development on Green Belt is therefore unsustainable.

Now that the Council has acknowledged the ‘West Horsley Neighbourhood Area’ (which it did on 8 September 2014 - The West Horsley Neighbourhood Area follows the boundary of West Horsley parish) following an application by West Horsley Parish Council and a six week consultation, it is hoped that the Council will listen to and acknowledge the views of the parish council in future planning matters.

The need for so many houses to be built in West Horsley over the first 5 years of the Plan period 2018 to 2033 is totally unproven. The West Horsley Parish Council and Surrey Community Action Housing Survey: May 2014, identified a limited need for some 20 affordable homes for local people who want to remain in the village, i.e. for young people and for elderly people who wish downsize to a smaller home.

If this is a “Local Plan” which was has been subjected to extensive consultation and vociferous objection by the electorate of Guildford Borough, why is Guildford Borough Council (GBC) perusing this as it is so clearly unsupported by locals. Are you reacting to and being dictated to by central government? It seems so.

Surely the purpose of a Local Plan is to meet local needs and objectives as set out in the Neighbourhood plan, not those handed down from Westminster.

The planning officers and councillors of GBC have signally failed to listen to the concerns about the destruction of the green belt in West Horsley. The draft local plan would result in the urbanisation of this small hamlet. The infrastructure of both the Horsleys, East and West, would not cope with more than a small increase in housing numbers.

In conclusion, I urge GBC to revise the housing number to a more realistic and required number, and to amend the Local Plan to utilise brownfield or previously used land rather than green field sites. There are plenty of brownfield and previously used land sites within the Borough.
I have read the voluminous reports purporting to the above and have several significant objections:

**There are too many homes being proposed to be built too fast for a village without the necessary infrastructure to cope with such an expansion.**

1) I am totally opposed to the West Horsley village’s removal from the Green Belt by insetting and extending the 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area boundaries. There are NO exceptional circumstances other than in a developer’s eyes…!

The policy states that provision will be made for 13,800 new homes over the Plan Period 2103 - 2033; this is far too high and is unsustainable in Guildford's villages.

2) The Key Evidence document makes no case for locating the proposed large numbers of homes in West and East Horsely villages.

3) Village expansion in particular in West Horsley is unviable; there is only one small shop (which is under sale negotiations at the moment and is not guaranteed to remain as a shop), no Post Office, a very limited weekdays only bus service through the village. It is clearly unsustainable to accommodate the high number of homes proposed. The development of 385 propose homes on the 4 sites is with much higher densities than currently exist in the village and will be totally out of character with the existing mix of housing and layout of the village. Also, the need for so many house to be built in West Horsely over the first 5 years of the Plan Period is not proven; the West Horsley Parish Council identified a limited number of about 20 affordable homes for local people (the younger and older residents) who wish to remain in the village.

4) The homes proposal do not take into account the tremendous effect that such a large number of homes and people, as proposed in the Plan Period, will have on an already creaking local infrastructure, in the terms of schooling, drainage, roads capacity and maintenance, shops, parking (in East Horsely - the shops and the station) and public transport, or rather lack of it…!!

5) On another point Policy i3 states that developers would be expected to propose and secure travel plans for their developments and contribute to transport and arrangements for the disabled - my experience proves that this is lacking and therefore the policy lacks teeth to impose rather than expect.

6) There is a continuing lack of clarity as to schools in the area and the influx of large number of home and therefore families with children will worsen this situation. The Raleigh school serving East and West Horsley want to move and expand but this is only preliminary at the moment and will take several years to build and complete - otherwise it is FULL. Schools in the area (Glenesk and Canmore) also currently provide major difficulties for the road transport system at certain times of the day!! the Definitions and Policy ! Infrastructure and Delivery mentions “schools”; but it is rather vague in the extreme…!!

7) medical facilities at the Kingston Avenue Medical Centre, serving East AND West Horsley, are already stretched and residents experience difficulties in making timely appointments. The planned increase would swamp the current facilities…!!

8) Roads and transport Infrastructure, while again mentioned in the Definitions and Policy: Infrastructure and Delivery, there is no specific mention for West Horsley….While there is a reasonable frequency of trains to London and Guildford during the 7 day week, the station carpings is normally full on weekdays, and certainly an increase in the population of the size envisaged would have an unbearable pressure on the station parking and indeed traffic movements in general for work, schools and shopping. Car ownership in village areas tends to be two cars, or even three, meaning journey times on local roads will increase significantly.

9) There are current, known sewage overflow problems in the Okham Road North/ Green Lane and East Lane areas, Also, Thames Water has advised that the area’s wastewater area in unlikely to support the demand anticipated from all the proposed developments. They advise it will take 2-3 years’ construction to install the drains/pipes etc AFTER planning permission has been granted.
All in all, this does not appear to have been properly thought out for modern times and modern living with significant chances of environmental and social disaster. It is simply too many homes for villages without the necessary infrastructure to cope, and vague in setting out developer’s responsibilities at the outset; the developers will be able to make significant amount of money/profits in high value housing area without due though for the local community(ies).

I trust that these comments will be taken into account when decisions are being considered.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4399  **Respondent:** 11069921 / Sarah Keel  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

---

**Re. The Guildford Plan**

I am concerned, and unhappy, about The Guildford Plan.

I object to the proposal to remove Green Belt land from the Horsleys. I also object to the idea of ‘insetting’ the Horsleys. I object too to the proposal of SANGs.

I have major concerns and objections to the proposal to remove East and West Horsley land from the Green Belt. Residents are very worried.

I oppose the proposals to develop Green Belt land for residential development.

There are no justifications for extending settlement areas.

West Horsley's Defined Settlement Area boundaries do not need to be extended. There are not any reasonable, justifiable, nor proven with acceptable evidence, “exceptional circumstances” for insetting these Areas from the Green Belt.

The Horsleys do not have suitable infrastructure for large scale development.

The provision of properties for first time buyers is not a reasonable excuse for building large scale, high density housing on land that should remain as undeveloped green belt land. The Horsleys is not a first time buyers destination of choice. Any argument for creating first time buyers housing is short sighted. Housing would quite easily increase in price very quickly and in just one sale along it could be far higher than a proposed ‘first time buyers’ property, making such an argument utterly ludicrous.

Local schools are full. The current idea that The Raleigh school could be rebuilt is wholly unacceptable as it is being proposed that it be rebuilt on green belt land. The Raleigh School is being used a pawn in the Guildford Plan’s proposals.

The village shops at East Horsley have been incorrectly classified. They are not a significant commerce hub. The village shops are a small row of stores and amenities. As such, they serve the village well, but they are not a significant commercial destination and do not support the proposal of the increased population set out by The Guildford Plan.

The density in the proposed development sites is of a density out of keeping with the Horsleys and is of a density that would have an unacceptable negative impact on the infrastructure.
It is not shown in the Guildford Plan that Brownfield sites are being developed ahead of Green Belt sites. Green Belt sites must only be used for development in exceptional circumstances. There are no proven exceptional circumstances for the developments proposed in the Guildford Plan.

I am very worried that the scores attributed for the sites in West Horsley have been reduced from the first version of the Greenbelt Purposes Assessment to the second version, in order to deliberately manipulate the area to a low Green Belt sensitivity area. This is very worrying. No explanation has been given, It appears that underhand tactics are at play and the Guildford Plan is not to be trusted.

I am concerned and object to the proposals to build on Green Belt land at Long Reach. There is an area of this land that directly backs onto existing residential properties and the existing residential properties would have a loss of privacy by having the Green Belt land developed to their boundaries.

The density of housing being proposed at Long Reach is of an unacceptable high density. The land at Long Reach should remain as Green Belt land.

It has been proposed in the Guildford Plan that Benswood would act as an alternative greenspace. Benswood is already green and the area being proposed for development at Long Reach is already green. How can the development of a Green Belt area be justified by suggesting that it can be replaced by another area that is itself already Green Belt? It is a simple fact of mathematics that ‘two minus one = one’. The Guildford Plan makes the most bizarre proposals that ‘two minus one = no difference, just alternative’. This is an outrageous con and I object to it.

Green Belt land must be protected and persevered. Once it is gone it is gone forever. We must not be the generation that selfishly sold off land and took away the Green Belt. We must preserve and protect the Horsleys Green Belt land for future generations.

Please consider the above comments as concerns and objections to The Guildford Plan.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/614</th>
<th>Respondent: 11071553 / Nicholas Roberts</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The following comments relate to my local area that features in Sites A36-41 (East and West Horsley):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The latest version of the plan reduces the number of development sites here by 2, but 4 remain, representing 395 new homes. This is too many in absolute terms, and disproportionate in relation to the rest of the borough. In my view, the plan is unsound in failing to assess the aggregate impact of these sites, along with the 2,000 homes planned for Site A35 only 2 miles away, in effect leaving the Horsleys as vulnerable to piecemeal planning applications as they are without a local plan in place. By not setting any development boundaries, the “plan” fails to plan this important part of the borough’s future size or shape in a useful or meaningful way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The inspector needs to be aware that Horsley residents believe this is the result of political bias on the part of a Council leadership overwhelmingly representing the other end of the borough, who wish to push development away from their own wards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The plan fails to mention most of the known sustainability and infrastructure problems affecting the Horsley sites, which were fully explained in the public responses to the 2016 consultation. These include public transport, traffic, road safety, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, flooding/surface drainage and shops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
o The density of new housing on the four Horsley sites is too high, being greater than anywhere in the locality at present.

o Sites on the edge of existing development in the Horsleys trespass on surrounding open countryside and require big extensions in settlement boundaries. The plan presents no arguments for this which, contrary to NPPF paragraph 79, will promote creeping urbanisation by squeezing the corridors separating the Horsleys from next-door settlements – one of the main reasons the Green Belt exists.

o Taken together, the 4 Horsley sites conflict with NPPF para. 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been an outstanding success story in the Horsleys, as detailed in response to the last consultation. Assets include a dense public footpath network, parish parks, sports fields, a campsite of international standard, Britain’s newest rural opera theatre (opened this summer) and the popular Olympic cycle route. In order to survive, these assets require a local plan that protects the Green Belt, maintains its openness and beauty and avoids urbanisation and traffic congestion. Sites A35-41 are inimical to this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/285  Respondent: 11077313 / Samantha Crone  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

In particular the proposed development of green belt sites in and around the village of East and West Horsley.

I would like to express the following objections and concerns:

• This would involve building on green belt land which is protected from development by national legislation. Exceptional circumstances must exist for development of this land to be justified. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated.

• Loss of green belt land will increase the risk and extent of localised flooding by decreasing the ability of surface water to drain away. The changes in our climate, as we have recently witnessed, have meant an increase in rainfall and flooding. Decreasing the ability of surface water to drain away by building on green belt land will exacerbate this problem.

• In particular, the houses in Nightingale Avenue and Nightingale Crescent, West Horsley, will be at high risk of flooding if the proposed development goes ahead. Due to the incline of the land, surface water naturally drains onto the land proposed for development at the rear of Ockham Road North.

• Flooding in this location would be further increased by sewage overflow problems, which are already an issue in the Ockham Road North/Green Lane area. The proposed development would increase the volume of sewage in the sewer network resulting in a serious capacity issue

• Such a rapid large increase in population density in East and West Horsley cannot be supported by the current infrastructure or amenities.

1. The local schools are at full capacity. The village primary school, The Raleigh School, is already heavily oversubscribed and cannot fully accommodate the existing number of children in the village.

1. The village medical practice would also be unable to cope as it is already very busy and difficult to get an appointment.
1. Parking in the village is currently difficult. The proposed development would worsen the situation.

1. The existing narrow roads cannot cope with the increase in volume of traffic which would be inevitable with such a population increase.

1. The current traffic on the A3 is very congested, particularly at peak times, as is the M25 around the A3 junction. The proposed development can only exacerbate these problems as there is very little industry or businesses in the immediate vicinity and residents of the development will have to travel to work, or at least travel to the nearest railway station, which themselves have inadequate parking for current usage levels.

- Such a large increase in population density in a small village would drastically change the character of the village and has not been demonstrated to be necessary or desirable for this location.

In considering these objections I would be grateful if you could answer the following questions:

What special circumstances exist to justify building on green belt land in this instance?

What is the justification for such a large increase in population density in the small village of Horsley?

What provisions would be made for schooling, medical care and other such essential services and amenities?

What changes would be made to the infrastructure to accommodate these developments?

Would more green belt land be destroyed for access roads and/or facilities to be put in place?

What would be done to address the issue of flooding which would be increased due to loss of drainage onto green land and an increase in sewage in the sewer network?

What are the proposals to address the issues of increased traffic and congestion?

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

**Attached documents:**
My objections to your proposal to build so many houses in the Horsley area are:

The houses are not going to be affordable for our young people to buy and that is our only need in this area is one and two bedroom houses, flats and bungalows for our elderly, I do not want the Raleigh school to move and to be rebuilt, I do not want the Raleigh school to get any bigger. I want the Horsleys to stay in the green belt.

You don’t take into consideration the extra traffic and air pollution, you don’t seem to care about ripping out hedges and felling trees and woods. You don’t care about our wildlife that need all of these things just to try and survive these days is a struggle for them. These are my reasons to saying no to this development in my area.

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

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4074   Respondent: 11079137 / K C Smith   Agent:

I am writing with regard to the proposed Draft Local Plan Strategies and sites June 2016.

I have many concerns regarding this new plan the most unacceptable aspect of the proposal is the proposed increase in housing for West Horsley. The proposed 35% increase in 6 years is clearly ludicrous. No plans for local infrastructure have been shown. The roads are already overcrowded and the drainage systems are at bursting point. The village designation as a Rural District centre is also inappropriate. The proposed increase in housing will make the local amenities unuseable due to the fact that I already struggle as disabled drivers to park. I also struggle to receive doctors appointments as the surgery is oversubscribed.

The parish council offered a sensible proposal i.e. a limited need for some 20 affordable homes for local people who want to remain in the village, i.e. for young people and for elderly people who wish downsize to a smaller home. This would enable the current community spirit and ethos to remain and allow the village to thrive as a part of proper rural England. This would then respect the NPPF policy which requires that new residential development must respect the character and density of housing in the area and be limited in quantity by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities.

I note also that the designated green belt land which I have always been assured would remain as such, has now become prime building land. I understood in 2014 that it is possible, under exceptional circumstances to change green belt land to enable development. I now understand that this will be obtained by “Insettting”

Can the council demonstrate that all of the required process has been adhered to and recorded and that these circumstances legally allow such re-designation.

Can the council also confirm that all possible brown-field sites have been prioritised for development prior to the green-field being used?

With regard to the proposed development at Manor Farm. I am extremely concerned about the extra road traffic this proposed development of some 135 homes would produce. New residents needing to use the A3 to Guildford or London will chose the shortest route to the main road. This will create traffic down the narrow Long Reach road, which includes a very sharp blind bend towards its North most end. This could easily result in a future accident.
I live in Northcote Crescent and already have problems with our garden flooding during periods of high rainfall. The Manor Farm development lies on land higher than where I am. The large area of impermeable land that will be created by the development will without doubt contribute to this problem.

With regard to the surface water run off from this development at present this runs into a pond at the back of the proposed Waterloo farm proposed development. The area of land around Ockham Road North in this area is already a high risk flood area. These two proposed developments will also add to this problem unless a very major surface water alleviation project is to be undertaken. I look forward to seeing the promised hydraulic modelling which is only the start of design development work. The feasibility of this flood alleviation work, together with a design and budget costs should be investigated prior to consideration for actual residential development. Normal SUDS schemes will not be sufficient to alleviate this problem which needs to be sorted now let alone following extra new development.

In summary our concerns are as follows:

- Inadequate flood prevention planning for Northcote Crescent and Ockham Road North.
- Inadequate road access for long reach to A3 links.
- Inadequate facilities at station parade shops and surgery.
- Inadequate school facilities in area.
- Inadequate consideration for the use of brown field sites.
- Inadequate exceptional circumstances to change green belt land to enable development.
- Inadequate consideration for population growth prediction figures.
- The complete lack of consideration for the National Planning Framework requirements.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3327  Respondent: 11086433 / Colin Carmichael  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Objections to Guildford Borough Council Proposed Local Plan (June 2016)

I have lived in West and East Horsley since 1984 and object to the level of development proposed for the Horsleys in the draft Local Plan for the following key reasons:

1. Proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green belt: the ‘exceptional circumstances required before taking action have not been demonstrated.
2. Extension of the boundaries of the settlement areas of the Horsleys: no sound reasons have been given for the proposed changes.
3. Infrastructure is already overloaded: local schools are full, medical facilities are stretched, drainage is inadequate, roads and car parks are overloaded and there is little or no scope for improvements.
4. Station Parade is designated as a ‘district centre’: this designation results from a misreading of the nature of the facilities in the village and would inappropriately target the area for future urban developments.
5. Development of over 2,000 houses at Ockham (Wisley Airfield) under two miles away: the impact of such a huge development on the Horsleys will be huge.
6. Major doubt concerning housing numbers: the estimates of housing requirements used are not soundly based with a disproportionate impact on the Horsleys.

I trust that these objections will be fully considered in the consultation on the Guildford Borough Local Plan.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3888  Respondent: 11086433 / Colin Carmichael  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

1. Proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green belt: the ‘exceptional circumstances required before taking action have not been demonstrated.
2. Extension of the boundaries of the settlement areas of the Horsleys: no sound reasons have been given for the proposed changes.
3. Infrastructure is already overloaded: local schools are full, medical facilities are stretched, drainage is inadequate, roads and car parks are overloaded and there is little or no scope for improvements.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3893  Respondent: 11097153 / Rupert Eastell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

It is clearly a complex matter which requires an appreciation of the quality of life enjoyed by many thousands of people in the Horsleys. This is at the heart of the very existence of the Green Belt and is what the Plan ignores. The Plan provides no basis for the removal of the Horsleys from the Green Belt. You have simply not proven the "exceptional circumstances" required.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4391  Respondent: 11097441 / Sarah Christmas  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

Objections to draft Local Plan and proposed development in East and West Horsley. Policy P2: Green Belt and the Countryside / Policy P1: Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

The first line of Policy P2 states, “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt against inappropriate development.”

We in this country and this county have spoiled many of our villages and towns by over development uncompromising housing built in a sprawl without consideration as to facilities and infrastructure and community. The ‘Green Belt’ saved
some of our towns and villages and has meant that there are still many attractive places to live but we now seem set on spoiling those for the next generation. It is no surprise that areas that are not over developed or spoilt by sprawling housing estates and clogged up roads are popular places to live. Surely we must strive to replicate the kind of towns and villages people want to live in rather than spoiling what we have remaining by over development. The Green Belt is key to preserving attractive places to live and prevent overdevelopment and I totally object to changing Green Belt Boundaries which were laid down many years ago by national legislation. Guildford Borough Council have made no sound case to justify changing the boundaries and I cannot believe ‘planners’ have not learn from the errors of the past which instigated the concept of the Green Belt in the first case.

There are no exceptional circumstances or other justification made for the new Green Belt boundaries that will result from the proposed insetting of the two parts of the village from the Metropolitan Green Belt and as such the Green Belt & Countryside Study is flawed.

West Horsley's defined Settlement Area boundaries (ref 2003 Local Plan) DO NOT need to be extended. West Horsley is positioned on the north side of the North Downs, partly in the Surrey Hills AONB, it attracts a considerable number of recreational visitors (walkers and cyclists) through the seasons each year and if the area becomes more urban and the character changed it will not be enjoyed by our visitors let alone the residents.

In our villages we have convenience shops which are convenient because they are accessible. It is still possible to pop to the shops as parking is available and the traffic manageable. Further development in the village will hinder parking and drive local people to use larger out of town supermarkets as the convenience and ease of access of the local shops diminishes. This scenario is well documented in other area where local shops actually suffer and decline because of development. The Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013/2031 makes no case for siting large numbers of residential homes in West and East Horsley and I would argue on the contrary it may well have a negative impact on the local businesses that exist.

The villages infrastructure with narrow roads limited shops parking cannot sustain extensive additional housing. The village will be spoilt by the kind of high density housing proposed which will ruin the attractiveness and character of the village. The need claimed for so many extra houses has not been proven.

We chose this village to live and bring up our children because of the semi rural fee. This is our home and it is not easy to up sticks and move into more rural surrounds not least because of the prohibiting stamp duty rates but also because of the ties we now have in the village. However the development proposed will alter the character and feel of the village for ever and mean it is no longer the kind of village we choose to live in, a different more urban environment will be forced upon us.

All the local facilities are over burdened including library, medical facilities, station and parking, schools. The villages cannot cope with significant additional housing on Green Belt, even the infill which has been allowed and is being permitted at an alarming rate has impacted the availability of essential local facilities without adding significant additional housing on the Green Belt.

The roads become clogged and key times and additional traffic will cause gridlock. The roads are narrow country lanes with narrow pavements not built to sustain significant volumes of traffic and in many cases there is no opportunity to widen and make it safe for pedestrians and car users.

The Secretary of State has stated and re emphasised that it has to be very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt and yet Guildford Borough Council have made no case for the special circumstances.

Removing our villages from the Green Belt must not be allowed to occur, we have a duty to preserve the village and country side for our children.

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 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 in its current state, especially the following points:

- Removing the Horsleys from the Green Belt
- Extending settlement boundaries of the Horsleys
- Overloading already stressed infrastructure
- Defining Station Parade in East Horsley as a “District Centre”
- Using unfounded and inflated future housing numbers

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4395  Respondent: 11101473 / Ewa Fuller  Agent:

Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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

I am writing to express my absolute objection to the latest revamp of the Guildford Local Plan.

It is clear that on many levels, you have yet again refused to listen to residents and continue to promote a wholly inappropriate and unacceptable plan.

I have been resident in West Horsley for 21 years and moved here specifically because it was in the Green Belt. It is my understanding that for any authority to remove Green Belt status, “exceptional circumstances” must be demonstrated. This is not the case with the current plan as no “exceptional circumstances” have been given and the proposed extended boundaries appear to be aimed simply at increasing available land for future development.

There seems to be major doubt concerning the inflated and unrealistic number of new houses proposed by a Strategic Housing Market Assessment, calculations from which, are not in the plan and do not seem to be available to Guildford Borough Council either. The target housing number arrived at by the SHMA is further increased by Guildford Borough Council, to a figure that is almost 70% higher than that suggested by official national estimates for population growth in the borough.

385 new homes are being proposed in West Horsley alone between 2018-2022, which is an increase of 35% on the current number of homes. This is greater than any other single area in the borough and imposes an unsupportable burden on drainage infrastructure, road network, public transport, parking facilities, medical services and schools.

Our 1 remaining Primary school is full and has been for years, the nearest secondary school (which is a half hour bus drive for my children) is also at full capacity, however, there seem to be no plans for creating further school places for children from the Horsleys.

Our roads are in an appalling state and cannot even cope with the current number of vehicles using them, let alone, potentially, an extra 770 cars if we allow 2 per household, which is not unusual nowadays. Every single household in my road has 2 or more cars.

Drainage in the village is an issue and The Street regularly floods during periods of prolonged rain. Apparently, Thames Water has advised Guildford Borough Council that the current drainage network will not be able to cope with the anticipated demand from the proposed new developments.
There seems to be a visible lack of any plans for new drains, roads, schools, Doctor’s surgeries etc, and this is before we even mention the new development of 2000 houses proposed on the former Wisley Airfield, despite the planning application being unanimously refused by the full planning committee this year.

Finally, the National Planning Policy Framework states that any new residential development must respect the character and density of housing in the area and must be limited in quantity by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities. Clearly, this advice is being flagrantly disregarded by Guildford Borough Council with the current proposed local plan for west Horsley.

This current draught of the local plan is unrealistic and unsupportable and does not warrant the time and resources being spent on it.

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

Attached documents:
I object to the removal of West and East Horsley from the Green Belt by “insetting” and extending the 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area boundaries for no apparent and justifiable reason.

I object to the removal of 12 other villages from the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been identified by GBC that would allow the use of Green Belt land for a large amount of house building.

I object to the number, density and sustainability of new housing in The Horsleys. Most of the roads in The Horsleys are narrow, many have no pavements. I frequently have to stop and reverse to allow a bus or lorry to pass, or mount the pavement where there is one. When two lorries meet, it often creates a traffic jam, as they struggle to pass one another. This is especially the case in Ockham Road South. Our roads are narrow, rural roads, which cannot be widened and it will surely not be long before a pedestrian is injured by a car or lorry mounting the pavement.

Neither West nor East Horsley offers the prospect of employment, therefore the occupants of these proposed new houses will need to drive or take the train, mainly one assumes to London or Guildford. This will result in many more vehicles on the roads, adding to air pollution. Moreover, by mid morning each weekday, the Horsley Station Car Park is usually completely full, so that parking will become impossible for many of those wishing to commute to London. The Proposed Local Plan makes no provision for additional parking at Horsley or Effingham Junction, nor is there any room for such. Neither does it make any attempt to ease the already severe congestion on the A3 and M25.

GBC apparently voted unanimously against the large scale development on land at the former Wisley Airfield site, yet it remains in the Local Plan. If these houses are built, the parking facilities at Horsley and Effingham stations will be completely overwhelmed and there will be severe congestion from cars attempting to drop off and pick up commuters.

Already, it can be very difficult to park in East Horsley in order to shop, visit the hairdresser or borrow a book from the Library. East Horsley Village Hall has insufficient parking when there is a big meeting in the hall, so all available parking in the village is used by those attending.

It is already impossible to park at the Medical Centre at busy times, so where will all the proposed new residents park and, given how busy our doctors are now, how will it be possible to provide for the vastly greater number of appointments that will be needed to serve a much enlarged population?

I object to the fact that East, and particularly West Horsley, are being asked to take a far greater number of new houses in proportion to the existing number of houses than anywhere else in the borough. Moreover the proposed density of houses planned is far greater than the density of existing housing in the villages.

I object, as stated earlier, to the fact that The Horsleys and 12 other villages are being insetted from the Green Belt, while in Ash and Tongham, new Green Belt is to be created. There is surely more employment opportunity in that part of Guildford Borough.

The Horsleys are attractive to developers because they are such lovely villages to live in. Although a proportion of these houses are supposed to be affordable homes, it is difficult to discover what the cost of an affordable home in The Horsleys would be. There is undoubtedly a need for a small number of smaller homes for local downsizers and young people wishing to stay in or return to their home village. This was established in a survey carried out by West Horsley Parish Council in 2014. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that the demand would be great or the price low enough. If developers can show that there is insufficient demand for affordable homes, they are then allowed to opt out and build expensive and more profitable homes instead. That is the attraction of building houses in The Horsleys, rather than in the urban area or on the other side of 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? ( )

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This planning appraisal has been carried out by Batcheller Monkhouse on behalf of Mr and Mrs Neilson, to provide an up to date site assessment of land at Oakland Farm, Green Lane, Ockham Road North, West Horsley in the context of the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan.

1.2 The land at Oakland Farm has been identified for allocation in the Guildford Proposed Submission Local Plan as part of a wider site referred to as Land to the North of West Horsley, under policy A40. The purpose of this report is to address why this proposed allocation site should continue to be included in the final version of the Local Plan and why the site should be removed from the Green Belt.

1.3 This document provides a brief description of the site, designations and restrictions, a brief review of key considerations raised in the Proposed Submission Local Plan and an assessment of the contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. The previous representations which were submitted to the Council in March also included an assessment of the site in relation to competing sites also identified as housing allocations in the Draft Local Plan.

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

Attached documents: 20160715_Oakland_Farm_reps_to_Submission_Local_Plan_HRCJT_FINAL (1).pdf (574 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/732  Respondent: 11556161 / Barry Lewis  Agent:

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

Development within West Horsley. I think West Horsley should yield a parcel of Green Belt land for appropriate development. 40-homes to the rear of the Lotus dealership would seem an ideal site (A37) and/or one of the infill sites A39 or A40.

Sites A39 and A41 do not appear to be "infill" sites so I would not support any plans in the next 10-years to build on these Green Belt sites.

In summary

GBC should make full use of land within the urban settlements and Council land before allowing development within the Green Belt.

The construction of purpose built whole communities within the Green Belt, such as Wisley (and Dunsfold) should be supported within their respective site boundaries and subsequent "development creep" avoided.

Whole scale areas within villages should not be removed from the Green Belt but communities should be encouraged to yield current Green Belt sites for development and I believe one or two of three sites in West Horsley should be made available. Less than 200 additional properties and the impact should be absorbed by the community, any more than 200 houses will have a detrimental impact on the community and services.

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

Attached documents:
Expansion of the village settlement boundary vs Local Plan 2003 (see attached maps)

- Together with the insetting policy, the proposed expansion of the settlement boundary vs LP 2003 would remove additional undeveloped green spaces from the Green Belt, rapidly hastening village expansion and encroachment on the neighbouring countryside. There is no supportable basis for this expansion which contradicts the NPPF policy that local planning authorities should “define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent” and the above government objective to safeguard the countryside from encroachment.

- I want to specifically highlight the area to the east of The Street currently outside the settlement boundary, including the Village Green and neighbouring undeveloped land which contributes to the village’s rural character, which would not be best served by being included in the settlement.

I challenge the village expansion as a whole and the area of the West Horsley Village Green/neighbouring fields specifically

1. C) Strategic Site Allocations (A38-41)

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

- The proposal places a disproportionate burden of future housing provision on West Horsley relative to other villages, the impact of which would be a significant loss of village character and stress on amenities and roads which could be better addressed through a broader distribution of strategic sites across the borough.

In closing, I fully recognise the need for sustainable housing development within the borough to meet the current and future needs of its residents, but believe we must do so while also safeguarding our countryside and the rural nature of the villages which make this area unique.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  
- **zzzzzzzzzzzz.png** (2.5 MB)  
- **zzzzzzzz.png** (571 KB)
of the village. The homes building proposals are unsustainable in terms of schooling, drainage, roads capacity, shops, parking in East Horsley (shops and station), public transport

- The need for so many houses to be built in West Horsley over the first 5 years of the Plan period 2018 to 2033 is totally unproven. The West Horsley Parish Council and Surrey Community Action Housing Survey: May 2014, identified a limited need for some 20 affordable homes for local people who want to remain in the village, i.e. for young people and for elderly people who wish downsize to a smaller home.

The exceptional circumstances require before taking action to remove the Horsleys from the green belt have not been demonstrated at all.

In conclusion I would as that you revise the housing number and amend the local plan to use brownfield land rather than our now dwindling green belt areas

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1168  **Respondent:** 15127777 / Keith Hammond  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**My Local Village (West Horsley) and Surrounding Area**

Above I have focused on Guildford wide issues. Below I will focus on issues very specific to where I live. However when looking at issues in my location it appears that there is very little detail or consideration of problems and issues that the Local Plan could raise. If the plan is approved and the houses built, those issues will then have to be solved. Rather than consider those issues now and come to a sensible solution now we will be faced with a series of disasters for which dramatic solution will have to be found. This is inappropriate and unnecessary.

As it is clear that in my area a number of these exist (surface water flood identified but no solutions identified, 35% increase in housing, but no schooling provided, existing traffic jams not identified, etc) then it is reasonable to assume there are many more of these issues in other areas of the borough which I will not be aware of as they are not local to me.

In addition there are so-called solutions to other problems/issues identified in the plan that are just a few words with no substance behind them whatsoever. I will give some examples below. In several of these cases I have sought further information from the Council and there isn’t any further detail. Saying there will be a traffic management system, or a SANG is of no use whatsoever if there are no details. It doesn’t have to be comprehensive at this stage, but it has to be more than a few words!

We need to know what the problem is and an outline of the solution as otherwise it could be that an insolvable problem is being created or a problem created that can only be solved by a very damaging solution.

When it comes to the Wisley site the interface with the A3/M25 and the impact on surrounding villages could be catastrophic yet very glib solutions are provided or missed altogether.

The plan gives an impression that the council has been told it will build ‘x’ number of houses, has accepted it and creates a plan to fit the numbers regardless of how damaging or impractical it is.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I am writing to object to the local plans for the Horsleys. The numbers of houses planned are excessive, and the changes to the green belt are not in the best interests of the village.

The Green Belt is critical to the Area's quality of life, and we urge you not to remove the current protection which for example the Horsleys enjoy. It opens up any chunks of land for possible house building including the land adjoining High Park Avenue. It is not just the Horsleys under threat – but also Ockham/Wisley, Ripley, Send, West Clandon and Effingham, on this side of the Borough.

Surely there are better brown field sites which could satisfy demand. The worst possible solution is to use or change the green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I'm disappointed to hear of the changes Guildford Boroughs intends to implement to the area which will adversely affect the area.

My wife, kids and I recently bought a house and moved to the area because of it's quiet, small village and beautifully untouched country surrounds. With the new proposal the existing character will be lost among other things.

- The existing services and amenities will not be able to sustain such an increase in residents.
- The existing schools are already oversubscribed, this would strain them even further and at the risk of lower their standards/rating.
- The local GP is already oversubscribed, with appointment waiting times from 1-3 weeks, they will not be able to cope.
- The train service will become more congested and inevitably more expensive.
- There is already not enough car park space at Horsley train station.
- The existing roads are already in disrepair with very poor maintenance and will only get worse.
- The village will not be able to cope with the additional traffic and parking space requirements.

I cannot think of any reason why it would be good for us and any of the other residents of the area to bring this change into effect and allow further development.

For the record I contest the changes and this NEW Local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
|---|---|
| Of particular concern to me and my family is that a more local level the proposals include: |
| • At least 148 more houses in East Horsley. |
| • At least 385 more houses in West Horsley. |
| • Both villages to be taken out of the Green Belt. The new boundary, (called the in-setting boundary) extends the old settlement boundary and includes some fields and open spaces. This means that if they aren’t already identified in the plan for development that they too, are vulnerable to future development. Eg Kingston Meadows (by East Horsley Village Hall) is included inside the insetting boundary – despite being a valuable green space. Why? |
| Similarly Horsley Tennis & cricket club at the end of Pennymead Drive is also inside the insetting boundary. Why? |
| **What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?** |
| **Attached documents:** |
| **Comment ID:** PSLPA16/205  **Respondent:** 15150337 / Peter Byrne  **Agent:** |
| **Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North |
| 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 “new” local plan. As far as I can tell, there is nothing ‘new’ regarding this plan so far as West Horsley and the Wisley Airfield development proposals are concerned. |
| It has been my long-held belief that GBC have continuously targeted West Horsley as a key development site – and we have done well to resist such continuous development attacks on our village and the surrounding area. Yet again, GBC want to remove West Horsley formally from the Green belt; develop over 500 new homes and support a ‘new town’ build on the Wisley Airfield – less than 2 miles from the West Horsley boundary. |
| This area cannot sustain such large-scale development. Its infrastructure is still Victorian in it capability. Plumbing; pipes; road width; flood defences all point to a bygone time of the 1920’s. Two lorries on Ockham Road North travelling in opposite directions cause havoc. They simply cannot pass without mounting pavements and crashing continuously into the railway bridge, which happens approx. 3 times a year. |
| Schools cannot cope with existing demand, neither can the 1 Doctors surgery. |
| The railway station and parking and pick-up/drop-off routines will be interesting with, possibly, the addition of 1,000 extra cars and 2000 commuters. |
| The road quality in the area now mirrors Beirut on a bad day back in troubled times. |
| The absolutely baffling thing to me is the fact GBC are clearly taking a well-trodden path and a ‘line of least resistance’ in regurgitating these well-worn proposals. The lack of imaginative research to accommodate the genuine housing need on existing brown-field sites in the wider area is startling in its incapability; willingness and desire to plan effectively within the Borough. The political manoeuvrings to eliminate any real powerful say of the elected Guildford Greenbelt Group from any Committee of meaning and the exclusion of this elected Group of Councillors from any real debate shows a complete disrespect to us, the Public you are supposed to serve. |
| The scale of your development proposals in the Horsley area and Wisley beggars belief and demonstrates a level of disdain of previous very public objections. |
You should hang your heads in shame GBC.

Your Local Plan from a Horsley and Wisley perspective is a complete disaster. Over 500 proposed new homes and 2,000 in a new town build within 2 miles is a recipe for disaster for the area. An area you have clearly wanted out of the Green Belt for the last 24 years we have lived here.

Your previous deceit; arrogance and utter disdain of the wishes of the people who live in this area over that time borders on a campaign of ruthless arrogance. A vote of ‘no confidence’ in you; the Local Plan and the architects of such nonsense is long overdue.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/251  Respondent: 15158561 / Graham Lloyd  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 housing developments planned for West Horsley.

The village of West Horsley already struggles with peak time traffic, local school places, village parking, station parking, doctors availability etc etc. The planned addition of 1,111 homes in our small village will increase the population by approximately 4000 people, adding at least 2000 additional cars to our local environment. This will adversely change/ruin the appearance and character of our village forever.

I also believe that ignoring the green belt will be at our peril. We need to protect our green areas or lose our air quality for the whole of the South East of England. There are so many brown field sites that should be considered first before riding rough shod over the green belt policy.

Personally, I moved to Surrey from London due to price pressure. This is something that people have to accept, we can't keep building just to allow our children to live in the area they were raised. This housing won't help matters in that respect. As soon as they are built, they will reflect Surrey house prices, making them unaffordable to young people. The North - South divide is set to widen with this type of housing policy. The Country is in danger of tipping up with the Weight of housing and population in the SE compared to other parts of the country.

The proposed developments are far too large to 'fit in' and would destroy our village way of life. Can these developments be spread more evenly around the county of Surrey, in smaller scale, consequently reducing impact on Surrey citizens?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/320  Respondent: 15178305 / Nancy Shafee  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write to register my objection to the current plan to overdevelop the villages of East and West Horsley endangering their status as villages and trying to turn them into small towns.

Primarily my objections are as follows:

**Infrastructure**

The roads in the Horsleys are coping with considerably more traffic than they were designed for.

In particular East Road/The Street running through West Horsley between the A246 and Ockham Road is frequently congested with cars queuing back along the road at both ends, worse at busy times of the day.

Ockham Road from The Drift intersection up to the station is particularly busy with business and school traffic.

These roads are now too busy to be safe for young cyclists who should be able to cycle to school in a so-called village.

Ripley Lane and The Drift are in poor repair as are stretches of East Road/The Street and further heavy traffic will be detrimental.

The junction with the A3 at the Wisley roundabout is already dangerous with cars queuing back to the roundabout at busy periods and drivers taking unacceptable risks to get into the middle and outside lanes of the northbound A3 to avoid the queues up to the junction with the M25.

There are few buses through the villages. Each new house is likely to have at least one, and probably two cars.

Has anyone thought of the impact all this extra traffic will have on air quality or doesn’t our health count?

There appears to be no evidence to support consideration for additional parking in the villages, at the station, shopping paraes or the village halls for all these additional residents.

**Drainage and surface water**

Housing plans recently have run into difficulties with the disposal of surface water. Additional foundations can only encourage further surface water to gather. On roads this often causes drivers to swerve into the oncoming traffic to avoid stretches of deeper water. Furthermore surface water on the roads is not safe for cyclists, nor pleasant for pedestrians.

Has anyone thought of the stress so much additional housing will cause to the waste water systems?

**Education & Healthcare**

When we arrived in West Horsley 20 years ago we couldn’t get our children into the village school. A recent telephone call to the secretary of The Raleigh confirmed it is still the case that local children frequently have to travel many miles to school. I find there are no plans to increase provision for schooling within the Horsleys. How are new families to be accommodated without causing further traffic upheaval?

We already have to be ‘ill by appointment’. It has been impossible to get an appointment with one’s chosen doctor within one week, and often much longer. In the holiday months one can wait considerably longer to see one’s chosen GP and often the wait for a physio referral is upwards of six weeks.

East and West Horsley are VILLAGES, among the last remaining examples near London. They are not dormitory offshoots of Cobham and Guildford which is what they will become if these plans are allowed to go through.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/330  **Respondent:** 15185153 / Olivia Stuart  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please note that I object, very strongly, to the following:

- Lack of evidence of the housing need in the borough;
- Removal of villages from the Green Belt allowing increased development into the future;
- The proposed erosion of the Green Belt in any way, shape or form; The really short time frame for consultation of the Draft Local Plan;
- The council ignoring the many suitable brownfield sites within the borough which could be used for future development;
- The lack of proposed new infrastructure and facilities to cope with the needs of those already living in these areas, without increasing the demand by intensifying the housing;
- I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools, GP surgeries etc. locally;
- I object to the potential six main development sites contained in the Draft Local Plan which are located in and around the Horsleys.

It is already hard to get see a doctor, to get a school place, or to travel around the area because of so much traffic, so why make things any worse within our uniquely beautiful local village? The roads are already too dangerous for me to cycle on because there are so many cars, without adding to these by building lots of smaller developments all over the place - why not concentrate on the bigger brownfield sites?

Please ensure that my comments are available for the Independent Inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/356  **Respondent:** 15192737 / Caroline Allen  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I grew up in West Horsley and visit every week with my parents who live there. I use the shops, hairdressers and restaurants on a regular basis. It is very clear to me that the proposals in the Guildford plan are not thought through properly and totally unsustainable.

I am opposed to removing the village from the green belt. The Council do not appear to be adhering to its own policies in considering removal from green belt. It is vital to protect the balance of houses and green space for the sake of the inhabitants and the future sustainability of the area.

The proposal to build high volumes of housing would destroy the village due to the volume of people and transport and this would impact on air pollution, health and wellbeing of residents. The village layout and infrastructure cannot sustain such high volumes of housing. It would change a pleasant area into a stressful, busy thoroughfare squashed densely into a small area; placing a strain on sewerage, parking, shops and access to Doctors and schools.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/363  Respondent: 15194721 / Josephine Fearn  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (), is Sound? (), is Legally Compliant? ()

I live in Shere Road West Horsley. I have lived here for over 50 years.

I am sending you a list of some of the very strong objections to your housing proposals for West Horsley.

I came to live in a village, not a town.

Once you have taken away the Green Belt it will have gone for good.

Where do the extra children go to School?

What about Doctors surgeries? They are already too busy.

The roads are in a terrible state as it is. Double the traffic and a cyclist is going to get killed by riding into one of the many potholes.

There is not enough car parking facility now. Where are all the extra cars going to park?

Why do you want to spoil beautiful countryside?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/368  Respondent: 15196065 / Peter Collett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (), is Sound? (), is Legally Compliant? ()

I would like to focus on various aspects of the proposed local plan. I have lived here for 59 years.

I am particularly concerned about the following:-

(a) Very many of the inhabitants of the Horsleys bought property here because it is in the Green Belt; I want the Green Belt to be preserved for future generations.

(b) without knowing the precise statistics it is likely some 20% to 25% of the current population in the Horsleys are older than 60. Most of us live in houses with many bedrooms and I feel would like to downsize without moving outside the Horsleys if there was a greater availability of smaller houses or bungalows : if therefore new houses are to be built most of them in my opinion should have no than three bedrooms.
(c) it is not clear to me what provisions are being made for increases in services such as doctors' surgeries, school places, parking sites etc and who will bear the cost of developing such infrastructural needs: it strikes me all the focus in the new local plan is on the sites for new houses.

(d) I am totally against the development of a satellite town at Wisley which would have a huge impact on the Horsleys because of its proximity.

I would be grateful if all the above considerations are taken into account.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/382</th>
<th>Respondent: 15196545 / Jim and Rachel Brady</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

Please record our objection to the plans to build 533 new houses in the above area!! All the present facilities would be swamped ie schoole roads etc.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/392</th>
<th>Respondent: 15197441 / Philip Holmes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

As a resident at the above address for 29 years, I wish to make a strong objection to “The Guildford Borough Council’s Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites” and, in particular, to the proposals for Policies A36, A37, A38, A39, A40 and A41.

Firstly, I object to the proposed Plan on principle because:

Policy P2: Green Belt and the Countryside/Policy P1: Surrey Hills AONB. No “exceptional circumstances” have been demonstrated for removing West Horsley from the Green Belt by insetting and extending the 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area boundaries. The Green Belt & Countryside Study is flawed and the Key Evidence document “Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2031” makes no case for locating 385 new homes in West Horsley.

Policies S1 Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development, S2 Borough Wide Strategy, H1 Homes for all and H2 Affordable Homes. The addition of 385 new homes for West Horsley across four sites represents an increase of 35% on the existing number of houses which is unsustainable (only one small shop, no post office and very limited bus service) and is totally unproven and inappropriate (The West Horsley Parish Council and Surrey Community Action Housing Survey: May 2014 only identified a need for about 20 affordable homes for local people).

Secondly, I object because insufficient provision has been made to improve the following essential infrastructure:
1. The Raleigh School has been full for many years and places at the Howard of Effingham School are limited with long commutes for children forced to attend other secondary schools. Relocating and building ever larger local schools does not necessarily enrich the children’s educational experience during their formative years.

1. The Horsley Medical Centre is always very busy with delays before seeing a doctor. The alternative of attending the A&E Department of the Royal Surrey County Hospital only aggravates the problems of an over-stretched NHS.

1. The Street and East Lane are already congested with early morning road traffic due to on-street parking, a single lane chicane and numerous school buses. Ockham Road North and the A246 are similarly busy. There is thus the serious risk of injury to school children and cyclists from increased traffic at a time when drivers can be tempted to rush to their early morning destinations.

1. Car parking at Horsley Railway Station on weekdays is normally full of early morning commuters to London. This makes it very difficult/impossible for people to travel by train anywhere later in the day causing problems of increased road traffic and is in conflict with the Government’s policy to reduce carbon dioxide emissions.

1. Flooding on The Street, East Lane and Ripley Lane is already a problem after heavy rainfall. There are also known sewage overflow problems in the Ockham Road North/Green Lane area. The loss of natural drainage with land use change and additional household waste water will aggravate these problems.

This letter is a plea that Guildford Borough Council withdraw the proposed Plan, scale down the scope/content and seek alternative sites and solutions to the provision of large numbers of additional homes in West Horsley and surrounding villages. The Government’s advice is clear – the housing need alone is not adequate grounds for building on the green belt and any major new development must take account of any need to upgrade the necessary infrastructure. The GBC should reconsider and revise the Plan before proceeding any further.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/440  Respondent: 15207809 / Colin Rugless  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would wish to make the following comments in respect of the Plan:

I consider the local infrastructure completely inadequate to accommodate the number of properties that are being proposed.

Parking in East Horsley is already difficult and at both Horsley and Effingham stations commuters now often have to park on the roads or, in the case of Horsley, down by the community centre.

The surgery in Horsley is already overloaded and it can take weeks to get an appointment with ones own GP.

School places are simply not available.

I also fail to understand how changing the boundaries can be allowed when this is a deliberate attempt to build on green-belt land, which is supposed to be protected.

The idea of 2000 homes at Wisley must be a joke ! 3000 extra cars and 5000 more people.
**OBJECTIONS TO GUILDFORD BOROUGH PROPOSED SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN EAST & WEST HORSELEY (JUNE 2016)**

I object very strongly to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016).

These are my main reasons are…

I object to the Local Plan as the following development proposed is not sustainable (Policy S1)

At least 148 more houses in East Horsley. At least 385 more houses in West Horsley.

I further object to both villages to be taken out of the Green Belt. The new boundary, (called the in-setting boundary) extends the old settlement boundary and includes some fields and open spaces. This means that Kingston Meadows (by East Horsley Village Hall) is included inside the insetting boundary – despite being a valuable green space. Horsley Tennis & Cricket club at the end of Pennymead Drive is also inside the insetting boundary.

This is totally unacceptable. I object to not protecting the Green Belt (Policy P2)

**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 ESPECIALLY TO 6 POLICIES: A36, A37, A38, A39, A40 & A41:

- Amount of new housing far exceeds local need.
- Housing density excessive when compared with existing development.
- Would transform the Horsleys into a sizable town, something for which no case is made.
- No local support.
- Collective impact of these 6 sites on a small part of the borough not considered. Should not be treated as isolated, separate sites.
- Total amount of new building out of scale with the planned development elsewhere the borough, especially less sensitive urban areas not protected by Green Belt.
- Sites unsustainable. Key infrastructure lacking. No adequate provision is made to increase it – e.g. poor wastewater capacity, lack of schools, absence of traffic management plan, flooding.
- No account taken of additional impact of Wisley Airfield site on Horsleys.
- Extension of settlement boundaries too permissive. Horsleys characterised by streets with development along only one side of the road. Policies allow too many adjacent green fields to be developed by squaring off boundaries and claiming they don’t contribute to Green Belt “openness”. 6
- 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:
field sites available for development.

I would ask that the council consider my objections and avoid destroying the Borough's green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/546  Respondent: 15234849 / Alastair Fleming  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to all sites in West Horsley for over 5 homes. The proposed sites will merge the villages of Ockham, West and East Horsley creating urban sprawl.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/561  Respondent: 15239297 / T Fleming  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to all sites in West Horsley for over 5 homes. The proposed sites will merge the villages of Ockham, West and East Horsley creating urban sprawl.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/586  Respondent: 15244641 / Wesley Raynbird-Tilbury  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2. Sites in East and West Horsley

I OBJECT in particular to including Sites A36-41 (East and West Horsley). This is a back-door way to create a mega-village-essentially, a soulless new dormitory town. The Horsleys feel victimised by this plan, which has been masterminded by Council leaders representing Ash and Tongham at the other end of the borough, where (in a flagrant case of political double standards) the Green Belt is actually being extended under Policy P3.15
Whatever their merits as development sites, the 6 Horsley sites should not be considered individually but for their cumulative impact on the contiguous villages of East and West Horsley.

Building 533 new houses on these 6 sites, plus at least another 90 on small sites is (a) excessive in absolute terms and (b) disproportionate relative to the rest of the borough. It will destroy the rural character of these communities. "16

Under the plan, rural West Horsley will take 35% of new homes, urban Ash and Tongham 16% and Guildford urban area only 11%. The total number of homes in West Horsley will increase by 35%, which is disproportionate when measured against the overall increase in housing across the borough and particularly in Guildford town. If the Council have justifiable reasons to transform a particular community so radically, the plan should present a case rather than putting forward site proposals as a fait accompli.

These sites will put unsustainable strain on local facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops. For instance:

- Thames Water have advised the Council that the current wastewater network will not cope and that the foul drainage system all the way to the treatment works North of Ripley will need to be upgraded.
- Guildford Council's Education Review says "expansion options may need to be considered for primary" education in the Horsley area within the first 5 years of the plan, but Surrey County Council have no plans to do so. The Raleigh School is already full. The private Glensk and Cranmore schools are also at or near to full capacity. The suggestion that schools in Ripley can be used contradicts the plan's stated intention to reduce traffic on the A3 and strategic aim that primary schools should be within walking distance.
- The plan's Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C) imagines an "East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme between 2019 and 2023 by Surrey CC" but gives no details. This scheme is just wishful thinking. The proposed housing can only harm the local environment, not "improve" it.

The harmful impact of these sites is magnified by the proximity of the so-called Wisley Airfield site (Three Farms Meadow), with over 2,000 new homes only 2 miles away (see below).

The density of new housing on the 6 Horsley sites is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the locality at present.

Sites situated on the periphery of existing development in the Horsleys encroach on surrounding open fields and require the extension of settlement boundaries for which the plan presents no arguments. Contrary to NPPF paragraph 79, this will contribute to creeping urbanisation by attenuating the Green Belt corridors separating the Horsleys from neighbouring settlements.

Collectively, these 6 sites militate against NPPF paragraph 81's encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been a success story in the Horsleys, with the creation of an amenity wood and community garden, the purchase of adjacent fields (on the eastern side of Ockham Road North) by local residents in order to preserve their open aspect, well-maintained pitches for local football and cricket clubs, public tennis courts, open space for a high-quality campsite (at Waterloo Farm) used by many foreign tourists and the approval of plans for a "Theatre in the Woods" - making West Horsley the only village in Surrey with an opera house. The open nature of West Horsley determined that a long portion of the 2012 Olympic cycle races passed through the village. This route has since been adopted by cyclists as a permanent asset, including the annual

"14 E. Gallagher Homes v Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283

"15 Councillor Paul Spooner and his predecessor, Councillor Stephen Mansbridge.

"16 Even some property developers complain about the Council's bias in favour of oversized developments, g. Dandara, whose relatively small Green Belt sites on the A246 (Epsom Road) in West Horsley is not considered in the plan.

Prudential cycle race. These and future examples of "positive planning" depend on protecting the Green Belt to maintain the openness and attractiveness of the local landscape and avoiding the urbanisation and traffic congestion that Sites A36-41 will bring.
By surrounding Waterloo Farm campsite with 120 new houses, Policy A40 on land to the North of West Horsley will make this rural tourism amenity unviable. This may accord with developers' plans, since the site would then be vulnerable to infilling with yet more housing.

Site A40 is subject to an unacceptable flood risk from a combination of a high groundwater table and the lack of surface water run-off. This is flat, clay land on the downhill side of the Horsleys where floodwater from new development will accumulate and back up onto existing properties nearby. I can provide photographs proving how badly these fields already flood at present. These problems will only get worse with the increase in extreme weather events associated with climate change. The "appropriate mitigation" suggested in Policy A40 exists only as an abstract notion. It should not overrule the need for Green Belt "exceptional circumstances".

Policy A40 underestimates the problems of safe access and egress. Firstly, Ockham Road North was closed for several weeks in 2014 because of flooding, and still floods regularly. Secondly, access problems are not confined to flooding and are not addressed by the proposal to extend the existing 30m ph zone past the site entrance. Repeated attempts made by Ockham Road North residents to extend this zone have been turned down by the local authorities, Highways England and Surrey Police, even though data collected in 2015 show that traffic has doubled over the last 15 years and that the average speed in the 40mph section of this road is 52mph, with maximum recorded speeds of over 80mph. No traffic calming measures have so far been achieved. Additional housing will add to several hazards along this stretch of road, including:

- Its use by pedestrians, especially children (using the Raleigh and Glenesk schools and catching school buses to Guildford and Howard of Effingham), pensioners living in the string of bungalows at the northern end of the road, and visitors from the Waterloo campsite who are unfamiliar with the area.
- The existence of a narrow footpath on only one side of the road in any one spot. The layout means that walking half a mile between Green Land and East Lane requires crossing the road twice.
- The road's increasing use by recreational cyclists (see above).
- Its winding nature, poor sight lines (especially when interrupted by summer vegetation) and dangerous, concealed driveways. Most of these were built in the 1930s. Some have been widened but many are too narrow for modern traffic. Since a deep ditch runs along most of the road, vehicles have to swing out dangerously when entering or leaving.
- The prospect of additional traffic, including 19,000 HGV movements (90 a day over a long period) if Surrey County Council approves the Drift Golf Course's planning application to re-landscape its site using bulk waste transported from London.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
West Horsley has a rich and varied mix of well established low housing density settlements with a considerable number of historic buildings. It is a pretty village which receives a considerable number of recreational visitors through the seasons each year who are undoubtedly attracted by its setting in a rural environment.

It is of note that the Key Evidence document 'Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2031 makes no case for locating large numbers of homes in West and East Horsley or neighbouring villages.

The sites proposed cannot be considered individually but must be considered for their cumulative impact on the area.

Building 385 new houses on these 4 sites, plus at least another 50 on small sites will destroy the rural character of this community.

I fail to understand why West Horsley in particular has been singled out to increase in size by 35% when the rest of the borough will increase by a far lower percentage and in particular Guildford town is scheduled to have an increase in size of only 11%.

A development of this size will put unsustainable strain on local facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops.

There are as far as I am aware no plans whatsoever to provide the necessary schools to cope with such an increase in population.

The Raleigh School is already full and the private Glenesk and Cranmore schools are also at or near to full capacity. The suggestion that schools in Ripley can be used contradicts the plan’s stated intention to reduce traffic on the A3 and the strategic aim that primary schools should be within walking distance.

The secondary school situation is already critical. The Howard of Effingham is well oversubscribed and is struggling to cope on a site which it outgrew many years ago there seems to be no proposal from Surrey County Council to cope with the present situation let alone that which would arise if these plans were to go ahead.

There are other reasons why the proposed village expansion is unsustainable. With only one small shop which is due to close in September, no post office, a very limited weekdays only bus service through the village, there is no infrastructure which could begin to support the proposed high volumes of new housing development.

The development of 385 homes on the 4 proposed sites are at much higher densities than currently exist in the village settlement and will be totally out of character with the existing mix of different housing styles and layout of the village.
An increase in village population will increase pressure on station parking and traffic movements to and from Horsley station and an increase in school children going to Guildford and Leatherhead.

The volume of traffic generated from the proposed new housing estates will be considerable and the impact on the local roads, which already struggle to cope with adverse weather conditions, will be significant.

Kingston Avenue Medical Centre which serves all of East and West Horsley and surrounding areas is already extremely busy and residents experience difficulty in making appointments.

For all these reasons I implore you to agree that the need for so many houses to be built in West Horsley is totally unproven and unrealistic.

**GREEN BELT**

The first line of Policy P2 states, “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt against inappropriate development.”.

A survey of the residents of West Horsley conducted in 2015 showed that they are totally opposed to the village's removal from the Green Belt by insetting and extending the 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area boundaries.

I of course accept that their views cannot dictate planning policy, but such a strength of feeling should surely only be ignored if there is cogent evidence to justify it.

No exceptional circumstances or other justification is made for the new Green Belt boundaries that will result from the proposed insetting of West and East Horsley from the Metropolitan Green Belt.

West Horsley's defined Settlement Area boundaries (ref 2003 Local Plan) do not need to be extended and should not be.

*What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?*

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/600</th>
<th>Respondent: 15247265 / Aileen Aitcheson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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? ( )

Policies A37, A38, A40 & A41, located in West Horsley

The LAA identifies six sites in West Horsley for potential development, the four largest having allocation policies within the Proposed Submission Local Plan. The total housing number arising from these six sites is 405 homes in total. For a village which had 1,124 dwellings at the 2011 Census, this represents a proportional increase of 36% over the plan period, an enormously high proportion by any standards.

The four policy sites are all located within the Green Belt. One is a partly brownfield development but the other three sites are all open fields used for agriculture and all lie within the current Green Belt at the edge of the Settlement Area. The reasons presented by the consultants, Pegasus, in the Green Belt & Countryside Study to justify these settlement boundary movements appear to us highly questionable and in no way to meet the requirements of the NPPF that such boundary movements are only to be made in ‘exceptional circumstances’. These movements clearly represent a deliberate pushing back of settlement boundaries in order to provide more greenfield sites for housing development. As such, I consider these proposed movements in settlement boundaries to be invalid.

These proposals are also contrary to the principles of the Metropolitan Green Belt. West Horsley represents one of the first ‘lines of defence’ against London urban encroachment outside of the M25 circle. Yet these policies will eliminate a significant part of this defence as they seek to expand the boundaries of this village and fill-in every bit of green space within this rural setting.

It is also totally contrary to the opening statement of Local Plan Policy P2 that “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt” It seems that in West and East Horsley at least the draft Local Plan is doing exactly the opposite.

Given the scale of the development proposed in West Horsley, the inevitable destruction of its village character and the impact on infrastructure across West and East Horsley, I OBJECT to the site allocation policies A37, A38, A40 and A41.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The LAA identifies six sites in West Horsley for potential development, the four largest having allocation policies within the Proposed Submission Local Plan. The total housing number arising from these six sites is 405 homes in total. For a village which had 1,124 dwellings at the 2011 Census, this represents a proportional increase of 36% over the plan period, an enormously high proportion by any standards.

The four policy sites are all located within the Green Belt. One is a partly brownfield development but the other three sites are all open fields used for agriculture and all lie within the current Green Belt at the edge of the Settlement Area. The reasons presented by the consultants, Pegasus, in the Green Belt & Countryside Study to justify these settlement boundary movements appear to us highly questionable and in no way to meet the requirements of the NPPF that such boundary movements are only to be made in ‘exceptional circumstances’. These movements clearly represent a deliberate pushing back of settlement boundaries in order to provide more greenfield sites for housing development. As such, I consider these proposed movements in settlement boundaries to be invalid.

These proposals are also contrary to the principles of the Metropolitan Green Belt. West Horsley represents one of the first ‘lines of defence’ against London urban encroachment outside of the M25 circle. Yet these policies will eliminate a significant part of this defence as they seek to expand the boundaries of this village and fill-in every bit of green space within this rural setting.

It is also totally contrary to the opening statement of Local Plan Policy P2 that “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt” It seems that in West and East Horsley at least the draft Local Plan is doing exactly the opposite.

Given the scale of the development proposed in West Horsley, the inevitable destruction of its village character and the impact on infrastructure across West and East Horsley, I OBJECT to the site allocation policies A37, A38, A40 and A41.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Although none of the five East Horsley sites that are identified in the Borough’s Land Availability Assessment affect us directly, the indirect effect would be substantial since development of all, or any, of them would have an immediate and adverse effect on the items listed by the East Horsley Parish Council in its comments on Policies 11,12 and 13.

We therefore strongly support and endorse the objections raised by East Horsley Parish Council to these Policies.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4385</th>
<th>Respondent: 15282977 / Tom Davies</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>

As a resident of West Horsley I write to you to object to aspects of the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (Reg 19) 2016 draft which is currently under public consultation.

Having reviewed the submitted document, I am very concerned at the potential implications for the rural village of West Horsley, and challenge the following key points:

1. A) Policy P2: Removal (‘insetting’) of the village from the Green Belt

   - This policy directly contradicts the government’s objective in the NPPF to “assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment”, and that “once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances”. Normal population growth does not constitute exceptional circumstances which would justify removal of Green Belt status with the associated loss of rural character of the village.

   - Under the NPPF policy #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.”

   West Horsley strongly meets these criteria, being characterised by low housing density, open countryside views and bordering directly onto both National Trust and AONB lands, and should remain in the Green Belt with its existing boundaries intact.

   The policy as it stands seeks to justify excessive development in areas where it simply cannot be justified - with an inequitable distribution of over 8000 homes proposed to be built within the Green Belt compared with only 1135 in urban Guildford, it will destroy the character of the countryside and eliminate green space that should be protected in perpetuity.

1. B) Expansion of the village settlement boundary vs Local Plan 2003

   - The current proposed expansion of the settlement boundary vs LP 2003 would remove additional undeveloped green spaces from the Green Belt, rapidly hastening village expansion and encroachment on the neighbouring countryside. There is no supportable basis for this expansion which contradicts the NPPF policy that local planning authorities should “define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent” and the above government objective to safeguard the countryside from encroachment.

   - I want to specifically highlight the area to the east of The Street currently outside the settlement boundary, including the Village Green and neighbouring undeveloped land which contributes to the village’s rural character, which would not be best served by being included in the settlement.
I challenge the village expansion as a whole and the area of the West Horsley Village Green/neighbouring fields specifically

1. C) Strategic Site Allocations (A38-41)

- 445 houses are proposed on four ‘strategic sites’ within West Horsley in addition to an undefined number of ‘windfall’ small site completions. Excluding the large site at Normandy, this represents 50% of the total proposed housing within inset villages despite representing only 20% of the current population.

- The proposal places a disproportionate burden of future housing provision on West Horsley relative to other villages, the impact of which would be a significant loss of village character and stress on amenities and roads which could be better addressed through a broader distribution of strategic sites across the borough.

  - The need for so many houses to be built in West Horsley over the first 5 years of the Plan period 2018 to 2033 is totally unproven. The West Horsley Parish Council and Surrey Community Action Housing Survey: May 2014, identified a limited need for some 20 affordable homes for local people who want to remain in the village, i.e. for young people and for elderly people who wish downsize to a smaller home.

In closing, I fully recognise the need for sustainable housing development within the borough to meet the current and future needs of its residents, but believe we must do so while also safeguarding our countryside and the rural nature of the villages which make this area unique.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/770  Respondent: 15288033 / Peter Blackburn  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Re: Guildford Local Plan Dear Sir

I am writing to object to a number of points relating to the East Horsley, West Horsley and Ockham sections of the Guildford Local Plan.

Having originally replied to the earlier version of the Guildford Local Plan, as did many others, I had presumed that some fairly major changes would have been made to this version, in response to the criticism received. However I see little change in this version and indeed nothing that makes the plan more acceptable. It would appear to be another HS2 style project where the locals comment are considered of little importance! But here we go again.

The Horsleys and Ockham are small villages which have always been mainly Green Belt, a factor which to date has not prevented reasonable development, even though infrastructure failures continue to occur.

These three villages are seen as cash cow developments which always feature millionaire type properties that make the best profit for the developers but that do little for the young residents who have aspirations of living in the villages where they grew up. An element of so called affordable housing is usually included in the original plans but by the time the estates are built many of the affordable houses have been taken out of the equation by developer donations to other Council projects while those left which are often seen as too expensive for the affordable market and therefore after requests from the developers to the council they are often allowed to be sold to the normal market place.

The local roads between and connecting the three villages are all country lanes with access to the A3 extremely busy at certain times of the day, made worse by regular jams on the A3.
Road drains throughout the villages are constantly having to be cleared as the old pipework is regularly collapsing and/or being blocked by mud etc.

Public transport for the area is mainly by Main Line trains with two stations both located in East Horsley, these are Horsley and Effingham Junction stations which take huge numbers of residents off to London each day. Both stations have car parks but these are filled to capacity every day.

The East Horsley Doctors Surgery is stretched to breaking point with some people having to wait up to two weeks for an appointment.

The local schools are all sought after and feature both private and public, with the public schools well over subscribed.

The development of a further 2,500 plus homes in this area will only exacerbate the above problems and change the villages for the worse.

Removal of the Horsleys from the Green Belt and/or the extension of the boundaries of the settlement areas of the Horsleys is an obvious ruse to allow even further development of the area in future years without further need to come back to seek support from the residents.

I therefore totally object to your proposals:

- To remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt,
- To extending the boundaries of the Settlement areas around the Horsleys
- To the creation of 2,000 house village at Ockham
- To the creation of 533 houses across the Horsleys.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/824  **Respondent:** 15298849 / Elaine Burns  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**POLICIES A37, A38, A40 & A41, located in West Horsley**

The LAA identifies six sites in West Horsley for potential development, the four largest having allocation policies within the Proposed Submission Local Plan. The total housing number arising from these six sites is 405 homes in total. For a village which had 1,124 dwellings at the 2011 Census, this represents a proportional increase of 36% over the plan period, an enormously high proportion by any standards.

It is also contrary to the opening statement of Local Plan Policy P2 that “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt” It seems that in West and East Horsley at least the draft Local Plan is doing exactly the opposite.

Given the scale of the development proposed in West Horsley, the inevitable destruction of its village character and the impact on infrastructure across West and East Horsley, I object to the site allocation policies A37, A38, A40 and A41.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/846  **Respondent:** 15300833 / Emma Vigan  **Agent:**

**Document:** 525
I am at present enjoying one of my very frequent visits (2 or 3 per annum) to my parents in West Horsley, in company with my 2 children- unfortunately due to work pressures my husband has to be elsewhere. Together with my 3 sisters I was brought up in West Horsley so I have high regards for it. I am not at all happy by what I have read about the above, and wish to protest.

The Green Belt Act 1948 established green belts in perpetuity. They cannot be moved at will by planners as is proposed here. Legislation requires that new housing has to be of a similar character and density to what is there at present. Common sense dictates that there be adequate roads, schools, medical facilities and draining etc to accommodate any huge increase in population brought about by a large increase in housing in an area.

From what I have seen, none of these conditions has been fulfilled. Therefore the proposed developments should not go ahead. Please register my objection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the above plan. It will impose a huge burden on drainage infrastructure, schools, the local roads, medical services, shopping, parking facilities and public transport and at the same time alter the whole character of the West Horsley area and its surrounding villages. At the same time the plan does not address the provision or even consider the need for expanding local services. While not opposed to limited brownfield development I do OBJECT to changes to the current Green Belt. These are not necessary or desirable and there is too little attention given to the use of brownfield sites in Guildford city areas.

I particularly OBJECT to the method whereby this plan has regurgitated inaccurate, badly researched and unjustified information and is an obvious ploy to get around the previous objections voiced within West Horsley and, indeed, in all the villages affected.

I OBJECT to being forced to undertake this exercise again and that my previous OBJECTIONS have been put aside. This cannot be democratic.

I OBJECT to Policy Q: Green Belt and the Countryside: Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

I am totally opposed to the plan affecting all the Guildford Villages and to West Horsley’s removal from the Green Belt by insetting and extending the 2003 boundaries. There are no exceptional circumstances or other justification for the new Green Belt boundaries that will result from the proposed insetting. This study is flawed.

The West Horsley Parish is well established with low housing density settlements with a considerable number of historic buildings and the Council fails to make a case for locating large numbers of homes in the Horsley or neighbouring villages.

I OBJECT to the Polices S1 Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development, Borough Wide Strategy, H1 Homes for all, H2 Affordable Homes.

No accurate or acceptable case has been made for provision for 13,800 new homes over the period 2013 to 2033. The number of homes is too high and unsustainable in Guildford’s villages. The current infrastructure is strained and at breaking point and there are no plans for addressing the infrastructure.
The proposals for West Horsley are clearly unsustainable for the proposed high volumes of new housing development.

I OBJECT to the development of 385 homes on the proposed sites in West Horsley. The proposals are at much higher densities than currently in the village and will be totally out of character with the existing mix of different housing styles and the layout of the village.

I OBJECT particularly to the proposals for site A40 in that this is the area I know best. The A40 site is unsuitable for development and the Guildford Council has several times rejected applications to build on the site. It has a high water table, is prone to flooding in even medium rain fall and in high rainfall there are problems with flooding of the roads and the overflow of sewage. The work to make such a site suitable for development, even for a third of the homes specified would be out of proportion to any return on capital invested.

The drainage affects are acknowledged by the water authorities who point out that the downstream effects are sizeable and probably uneconomic.

Importantly this is an area of calm, peace and quiet within the green belt and I am reliably informed that there are several species of orchids growing and the land is full of wild life which needs preservation.

The development proposals throughout the village- and also in terms of the knock on effect of the Wisely Airfield proposals- is unsustainable in terms of schooling, drainage, roads capacity, shopping and Rail Station parking, and lack of public transport.

The roads are already at capacity and breaking up under the strain. Traffic uses Ockham Road North as a cut through/rat run when the A3 and M25 are busy or blocked (frequently these days) and this is acknowledged by Surrey County Council roads authority.

There is a major strain on schooling in the area and on medical services. There are few jobs in the area and the practicalities of commuting to London or, indeed to Guildford are heavily affected by the plan.

The strain on the current rail service is obvious and it all but impossible to park at the Horsley rail Station where the parking even after extension works is problematical.
I OBJECT on the grounds that there is no proven need for so many houses to be built in Horsley. It is totally unproven and risks the formation of a dormitory township devoid of infrastructure that could manage such an influx of people and cars.

Any forecast of housing needs is also rendered out of date by the current Referendum related to immigration which will lead to a much lower demand for housing in the future.

It is my understanding that in West Horsley the recent survey of the village in 2014 identified a limited need for only 20 affordable homes.

Guildford Council’s plans are highly suspect and need investigating in depth. Inquiries should be made into the reasons for the document which, for example, must have been completed before the democratic decision, widely applauded, to refuse planning for the Wiseley Airfield site proposal. Yet this proposal appeared again in the council’s plan. The allocation of developments to the various villages is dubious.

Why build on the Green Belt when there is room and land for development within the immediate area of the town of Guildford where it is likely there could be an increased demand.

The National Planning Policy Framework requires that new residential development must respect the character and density of housing in any areas and be limited in quantity by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities.

I couple with that the need and the desire of the people of the area to preserve the GREEN BELT.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/899  Respondent: 15313537 / Philip Mitchell  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am a resident in West Horsley I want to comment on the 2016 new Local Plan.

The plan has identified 4 main sites in the village for housing development with a total of 385 new houses. As we have nearly 1000 existing houses this would mean an increase of about 40%. I am objecting to this very large and unsupportable increase in houses in the village. I appreciate the need for additional houses in the Borough and that our village, and indeed other villages, should take its fair share which should be about 3%, that is 30 new houses. These additional houses could be built without affecting the infrastructure of our community. A 40% increase would put an unsustainable strain on roads, schools, medical services, and drainage.

I also strongly object to the proposal to build on the Green Belt land around our village. Our fair share of 30 new houses could be built within the existing village settlement boundary without any need to build on Green Belt land.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/900  
**Respondent:** 15313601 / Christine Mitchell  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I should like to write to express my opinion on the proposed development within the village of West Horsley. Having lived in the village now for 18 years I have experienced the pressures that are already on the services, roads, parking, schools and medical services. An increase in the number of homes of 35%, which is proposed, would put a phenomenal strain on all the above services with the roads especially being unsuitable for such a large increase in the inevitable number of cars and service vehicles that would be required. Many of the roads could not be widened or improved to cater for such an increase in traffic flow. Mentions in the plan do not include the detail of how developments of services within the village will be managed.

In recent years the area has become a magnet for cyclists travelling into the area from a considerable radius because of its rural roads and villages. This is encouraged locally and governmentally. With more traffic on the roads, the potential for accidents will be magnified dramatically.

Of particular concern is the suggestion that West Horsley will be removed from the Green Belt, despite earlier promises that the Metropolitan Green Belt would be protected. The settlement boundaries do not need to be extended if proper use is made of the already available land and a proportionate number of houses (2%) agreed as West Horsley’s share of the number of homes requiring to be built. The number of houses actually required for people choosing to live in the village is very far short of the proposed submission as demonstrated by the neighbourhood plan. (20 affordable homes)

Finally, but of great concern to the villagers, is the strain that will be put on the drainage system. Already sewage overflow problems occur in the neighbourhood and the network would certainly not cope with the demands of so many new homes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/911  
**Respondent:** 15314465 / Jasmin Walker  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have seen a copy of the latest draft of the local plan and realised that my house will be deeply affected. I understand that GBC members are discussing this latest draft on Wednesday 13th April and I urge you to take account of my views.

I live in the house with my brothers and parents, it is the house where my father grew up and we all expected at some time, that there would be houses on the fields behind us as it is an obvious infill between houses. My grandfather planted trees in preparation for this hideous event. My parents said when the first draft came out that it would be awful living through the building of 135 houses behind us, but we would live with it. Your new plan shows that the field in front of my house would also have 90 houses on it. Can you imagine living through being sandwiched between the building of 225 and the having to live with your new view, as well as another 220 houses in the village? It would be ok if you were
moving into these houses as you would have never known the village any different, but for my family who has lived in Horsley for over 40 years it will be a horrendous and life changing event. I expect you know that there is one state primary school in the village; The Raleigh (my father went there) but this school is already full and people want to move to the area to get in the catchment area. The same goes for The Howard which is our state senior school, what would happen to all these people who move here? I often walk my dog to the village in the mornings and 9.5 times out of 10 the doctor’s surgery car park and the doctors is full. The village itself is lovely but has a limited supply of things to do. The football club and tennis club is a major part of my family’s life as it is where we can all play sport and socialise. Both these clubs have a very long waiting lists and what would happen to all the people that want to join these clubs?

445? Houses are planned to be built in Horsley along with the 2828 houses that were recorded in the 2011 census. All of the new houses would be built on green land which most people thought you weren’t allowed to do, but you must be able to if you are. The population of Horsley (2011) was 2828 I do not know how many new residents you will plan to have, but I can tell you that Horsley is not big enough to hold all these people. On average (2011 census) 62.2% of the houses in Horsley have two or more cars (there were 2055 cars in total). I don’t know if you have ever driven around the village but the roads are awful, with huge potholes that nothing seems to be done about. Surely if you build all these new houses you will have to fix the roads as they would only get worse with around 890 new cars on the roads (this is based on the fact that your 445 houses would each have two cars.) this would be adding over 30% of the cars on the road and therefore changing Horsley in to a loud and dangerous place to live.

Overall, as well as looking at facts and figures, I would like you to consider the personal affects that your plan will have on the local people. For my family it would mean living through a tedious, noisy and dirty time when the houses are being built, and then having to face the facts that this once quiet and beautiful village has turned into a loud cramped area and to have lost its green belt. I’m sure you would not like these events to happen to your family and I know that the houses will make money but they would mean dropping Horsley’s rural and village atmosphere and it would ruin many family’s opinions of their village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**SITES**

1. **Sites in East and West Horsley**

I OBJECT in particular to including Sites A36-41 (East and West Horsley). This is a back-door way to creating a megavillage – essentially, a soulless new dormitory town.

Building 533 new houses on these 6 sites, plus at least another 90 on small sites is (a) excessive in absolute terms and (b) disproportionate relative to the rest of the borough. It will destroy the rural character of these communities.

Under the plan, rural West Horsley will take 35% of new homes, urban Ash and Tongham 16% and Guildford urban area only 11%. The total number of homes in West Horsley will increase by 35%, which is disproportionate when measured against the overall increase in housing across the borough and particularly in Guildford town. The need for so many houses to be built in West Horsley over the first 5 years of the Plan period 2018 to 2033 is totally unproven.
The West Horsley Parish Council and Surrey Community Action Housing Survey: May 2014, identified a limited need for some 20 affordable homes for local people who want to remain in the village, i.e. for young people and for elderly people who wish downsize to a smaller home.

These sites will put unsustainable strain on local facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops. For instance:

- Thames Water has advised that the current wastewater network will not cope and that the foul drainage system all the way to the treatment works North of Ripley will need to be upgraded.
- Local Schools such as The Raleigh School and the Howard of Effingham are already full and oversubscribed. The plan’s stated intention to reduce traffic on the A3 and its strategic aim that primary schools should be within walking distance will not be met.
- The plan’s Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C) imagines an “East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme between 2019 and 2023 by Surrey CC” but gives no details. The proposed level of housing can only harm the local environment, not “improve” it.

The harmful impact of these sites is enhanced by the proximity of the so-called Wisley Airfield site (Three Farms Meadow), with over 2,000 new homes only 2 miles away, which will, amongst other things, affect and further damage the local roads, with ever increasing pot-holes.

Collectively, these 6 sites militate against NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been a success story in the Horsleys, with the creation of an amenity wood and community garden, the purchase of adjacent fields (on the eastern side of Ockham Road North) by local residents in order to preserve their open aspect, well-maintained pitches for local football and cricket clubs, public tennis courts, open space for a high-quality campsite (at Waterloo Farm) used by many tourists and the approval of plans for a “Theatre in the Woods” – making West Horsley the only village in Surrey with an opera house. The open nature of West Horsley determined that a long portion of the 2012 Olympic cycle races passed through the village. This route has since been adopted by cyclists as a permanent asset, including the annual Prudential cycle race. These and future examples of “positive planning” depend on protecting the Green Belt to maintain the openness and attractiveness of the local landscape and avoiding the urbanisation and traffic congestion that Sites A36-41 will bring.

By surrounding Waterloo Farm campsite with 120 new houses, Policy A40 on land to the North of West Horsley will make this rural tourism amenity unviable. This will all accord with developers’ plans, since the site would then be vulnerable to infilling with yet more housing.

Finally, 40% of the development will be classified as affordable (80% of the market value.) Affordable for whom I ask? Certainly not affordable for a great number of people including first time buyers and will not be responding to local need as demonstrated by The West Horsley Parish Council and Surrey Community Action Housing Survey: May 2014. The Key Evidence document Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2031 makes no case for locating large numbers of homes in West and East Horsley or neighbouring villages

The first line of Policy P2 states, “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt against inappropriate development.”

There is no justification for the proposed large-scale inequitable development within West Horsley, especially the removal of the Green-Belt status, changing beyond all recognition, the rural village settlement which will impact negatively on a whole range of really important matters, some of which have been alluded to earlier on. I would agree to some development but not of this magnitude.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The draft plan indicates that West and East Horsley are to be removed from the Green Belt. This is a throwback to the 1940s when there was a plan to urbanise the villages and build a new town - the final decision to build at Crawley saved the Horsleys.

The current plans seem to indicate that 385 new homes would be built in West Horsley and a further 100 on the plot A39. I understand that East Horsley will have an additional 148 homes built.

I do not believe the roads, parking, drainage and schools will be able to cope. Should just 100 of the proposed new homeowners in the Horsleys wish to commute then the station car parks at Horsley and at Effingham Junction will not have the capacity - at present they are virtually full by 9.00am.

There must be some building but ideally for the benefit of the local community, be they properties for starter homes or for the elderly to downsize. We do not need a further influx of residents from London - particularly with the parking capacity at the stations.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPA16/976  
Respondent: 15326209 / Kirsten Allan  
Agent: Maps - West Horsley North

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to proposed developments of East and West Horsley in Guildford Borough Council’s Draft Local Plan. The numbers of new homes is out of proportion and is based on out of date population data as the basis for the plan.

The infra-structure is not in place; there are no more secondary school places, the current train station car park is full by 08.30hrs and the morning commuter trains are crammed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/998  
Respondent: 15327745 / T S Pilkington and C A Gray  
Agent: Maps - West Horsley North

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Ref: Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategies and Sites June 2016

As resident home owners living in West Horsley we have reviewed the contents of the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites document and wish to register our objections with regards to: Green Belt and the Countryside (Policy P2) and Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) (Policy Pl):

OBJECTIONS/CONCERNS:

1. We object to the village's removal from the Green Belt by insetting and extending the 2003 Local Plan settlements Area As such the Green Belt & Countryside Study is flawed.
2. We feel that West Hosley's defined Settlement Area boundaries (ref 2003 Local Plan) DO NOT need to be
3. In the Key Evidence document "Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013 2031" makes no case for locating large numbers of homes in West and East Horsley or neighbouring villages, therefore, why are changes been considered?
4. 13,800 new homes over the Plan Period 2013 to 2033 is too high and unsustainable in Guildford's villages.
5. The current village size of East and West Horsley is not adequate to support an increase in homes. The development of 385 homes on the 4 proposed sites are at much higher densities than currently exist in the village settlement and will be totally out of character with the existing mix of different housing styles, historic buildings and layout of the village and, therefore, we feel this is inappropriate development within the Green Belt. The West Horsley Parish Council and Surrey Community Action Housing Survey: May 2014,identified a limited need for some 20 affordable homes for local people who want to remain in the village, ie for young people and for elderly people who wish to downsize to a smaller home.
6. Access to essential facilities, such as road and transport infrastructure, parking, medical facilities, schools, waste water infrastructure, sewage infrastructure would be greatly impacted if development of the size currently proposed is granted.

On top of the Local Plan proposals there are other planning applications that require consideration/objection eg. Land adjacent Cranmore Lane, including Goodhart-Rende! Community Hall and the development of Bell & Covill which all impact on the village settlement area.

Please give due consideration of our objections/concerns when reaching a decision.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
2. Sites in East and West Horsley

I OBJECT in particular to including Sites A36-41 (East and West Horsley). This is a back-door way to create a mega-village – essentially, a soulless new dormitory town.

Whatever their merits as development sites, the 6 Horsley sites should not be considered individually but for their cumulative impact on the contiguous villages of East and West Horsley.

Building 533 new houses on these 6 sites, plus at least another 90 on small sites is (a) excessive in absolute terms and (b) disproportionate relative to the rest of the borough. It will destroy the rural character of these communities.

Under the plan, rural West Horsley will take 35% of new homes, urban Ash and Tongham 16% and Guildford urban area only 11%. The total number of homes in West Horsley will increase by 35%, which is disproportionate when measured against the overall increase in housing across the borough and particularly in Guildford town. If the Council have justifiable reasons to transform a particular community so radically, the plan should present a case rather than putting forward site proposals as a fait accompli.

These sites will put unsustainable strain on local facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops. For instance:

- Thames Water have advised the Council that the current wastewater network will not cope and that the foul drainage system all the way to the treatment works North of Ripley will need to be upgraded.
- Guildford Council’s Education Review says “expansion options may need to be considered for primary” education in the Horsley area within the first 5 years of the plan, but Surrey County Council have no plans to do so. The Raleigh School is already full. The private Glensk and Cranmore schools are also at or near to full capacity. The suggestion that schools in Ripley can be used contradicts the plan’s stated intention to reduce traffic on the A3 and strategic aim that primary schools should be within walking distance.
- The plan’s Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C) imagines an “East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme between 2019 and 2023 by Surrey CC” but gives no details. This scheme is just wishful thinking. The proposed housing can only harm the local environment, not “improve” it.

The density of new housing on the 6 Horsley sites is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the locality at present.

Sites situated on the periphery of existing development in the Horsleys encroach on surrounding open fields and require the extension of settlement boundaries for which the plan presents no arguments. Contrary to NPPF paragraph 79, this will contribute to creeping urbanisation by attenuating the Green Belt corridors separating the Horsleys from neighbouring settlements.

Collectively, these 6 sites militate against NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been a success story in the Horsleys, with the creation of an amenity wood and community garden, the purchase of adjacent fields (on the eastern side of Ockham Road North) by local residents in order to preserve their open aspect, well-maintained pitches for local football and cricket clubs, public tennis courts, open space for a high-quality campsite (at Waterloo Farm) used by many foreign tourists and the approval of plans for a “Theatre in
the Woods” – making West Horsley the only village in Surrey with an opera house. The open nature of West Horsley determined that a long portion of the 2012 Olympic cycle races passed through the village. This route has since been adopted by cyclists as a permanent asset, including the annual Prudential cycle race. These and future examples of “positive planning” depend on protecting the Green Belt to maintain the openness and attractiveness of the local landscape and avoiding the urbanisation and traffic congestion that Sites A36-41 will bring.

By surrounding Waterloo Farm campsite with 120 new houses, Policy A40 on land to the North of West Horsley will make this rural tourism amenity unviable. This may accord with developers’ plans, since the site would then be vulnerable to infilling with yet more housing.

Site A40 is subject to an unacceptable flood risk from a combination of a high groundwater table and the lack of surface water run-off. This is flat, clay land on the downhill side of the Horsleys where floodwater from new development will accumulate and back up onto existing properties nearby. I can provide photographs proving how badly these fields already flood at present. These problems will only get worse with the increase in extreme weather events associated with climate change. The “appropriate mitigation” suggested in Policy A40 exists only as an abstract notion. It should not overrule the need for Green Belt “exceptional circumstances”.

Policy A40 underestimates the problems of safe access and egress. Firstly, Ockham Road North was closed for several weeks in 2014 because of flooding, and still floods regularly. Secondly, access problems are not confined to flooding and are not addressed by the proposal to extend the existing 30mph zone past the site entrance. Repeated attempts made by Ockham Road North residents to extend this zone have been turned down by the local authorities, Highways England and Surrey Police, even though data collected in 2015 show that traffic has doubled over the last 15 years and that the average speed in the 40mph section of this road is 52mph, with maximum recorded speeds of over 80mph. No traffic calming measures have so far been achieved. Additional housing will add to several hazards along this stretch of road, including:

- Its use by pedestrians, especially children (using the Raleigh and Glenesk schools and catching school buses to Guildford and Howard of Effingham), pensioners living in the string of bungalows at the northern end of the road, and visitors from the Waterloo campsite who are unfamiliar with the area.
- The existence of a narrow footpath on only one side of the road in any one spot. The layout means that walking half a mile between Green Land and East Lane requires crossing the road twice.
- The road’s increasing use by recreational cyclists (see above).
- Its winding nature, poor sight lines (especially when interrupted by summer vegetation) and dangerous, concealed driveways. Most of these were built in the 1930s. Some have been widened but many are too narrow for modern traffic. Since a deep ditch runs along most of the road, vehicles have to swing out dangerously when entering or leaving.
- The prospect of additional traffic, including 19,000 HGV movements (90 a day over a long period) if Surrey County Council approves the Drift Golf Course’s planning application to re-landscape its site using bulk waste transported from London.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1009  Respondent: 15328449 / Fiona and Keith Watson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We have recently moved to Horsley from neighbouring Effingham and we are frankly shocked to see the proposals for housing throughout the whole of our area.

Whilst we understand that there is a need for housing this plan seems excessive and will effectively destroy these old villages just creating an urban sprawl.
There also seems no forethought regarding infrastructure. At the moment there is only 1 doctors surgery which supports both the Horsleys and Effingham, (always very busy and difficult now to get an appointment) and only 1 secondary school which again supports over 2000 pupils and despite its good reputation is way too large to give proper pastoral care to individual pupils. All these extra homes puts increased pressure on services already full to capacity. The council can’t seem to cope with what we already live with. The roads are in a poor state and verges and common land are not properly or regularly maintained.

We are totally against removing green belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1014  Respondent: 15328769 / Anne Cox  Agent:

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In West Horsley, the facilities that are available i.e limited public transport, schooling and as I understand, no shops available (from September 2016) would not be able to sustain the number of houses that are proposed.

Furthermore, it seems that there are no plans available as yet for the infrastructure- drainage is inadequate now on the roads in the village.

In East Horsley, again there is inadequate parking now for the use of the shops and station, and the extra houses in both villages, will make it impossible to make appointments at an already very busy Medical Centre.

Finally, how will our sewage and waste water system cope?

None of the points seem to have been considered or explained.

I therefore strongly object to this present plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1040  Respondent: 15341153 / Peter Singer  Agent:

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 Horsley villages being taken out of the Green Belt. Many promises have been made to preserve the Green Belt and it should be. It is a rural area and the character of the villages should be maintained.

The Horsley villages have already, during the last few years, had considerable infilling and large areas of new houses built resulting in considerable congestion on the narrow roads, particularly at peak times. It is already almost impossible to park to shop in the village, and the overflow car park is constantly full.
The station car park is also nearly full now, and with the additional houses planned commuters would not be able to park there.

The filter roads off the A3 already have huge tailbacks at peak times, and the pollution levels at the M25 Junction 10 at Wisley are already well above recommended safety levels.

The proposed number of houses to be built would mean a huge strain on the infrastructure, and cause a different way of life for the residents who do not want this. The further possibility of development at Wisley airfield is a complete horror as it would ruin the areas of outstanding natural beauty all around it.

Please reconsider the Local Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1057  **Respondent:** 15341953 / Betty Bannister  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My arguments against this work are as follows.

Firstly the one junior school we have is full to capacity.
Doctors Surgeries are full with waiting time for appointments.
Our roads are too narrow to take anymore lorries or cars, its not safe to walk to the village anymore.
Roads flood every year and building more houses on green belt will make it far worse, the rain water has nowhere to drain away from the roads.

Already there are dangerous pools of water which accumulate and more building will exasperate this situation.
Our village is too small to accommodate all the additional planned houses.

Please think again.

You say that 40% will be affordable houses, nowhere are we told how much these houses will be.
You should state a level at which these affordable houses will be sold.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3247  **Respondent:** 15342113 / Jane Carwardine  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---
I object to removing the Horsley's from the green belt. Our country is very overcrowded already, particularly in the southeast and the green belt was created by some foresighted government to protect the environment around London for all. It should therefore be sacrosanct. It serves as London's lung. We have seen how other policies supposedly to cut carbon emissions by encouraging people to buy diesel cars has now been proven to have made London one of the most polluted cities in Europe. How short sighted governments can be to reach so called targets!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3249  Respondent: 15342113 / Jane Carwardine  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Station Parade being classified as a District Centre. In my opinion it is not appropriate as a place for more urban development

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1061  Respondent: 15342881 / Caroline Southall  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing regarding the revised local plan you have recently published which, despite its volume (no doubt designed to befuddle those who elect you), appears to wholly ignore earlier feedback and to contain fatal flaws.

Firstly, as regards likely population demands, your projections (such as they are) need to be re-visited in the light of Brexit. Your proposal for up to 533 new homes in the Horsleys with possibly another 2,000 on the Wisley site (under two miles away) would represent a disgraceful urbanisation of what is still a predominantly countryside area, with little thought given to the infrastructure consequences and certainly no guarantees that these will all be addressed in advance of any building.

Your papers also contain comments on the type of housing that you would wish to see in the Horsleys. Here again your approach is flawed as 533 new homes of the type you describe would be wholly out of keeping with the village. It is an observable fact that many Horsley houses are large and on large plots and that is why people have bought them. Furthermore, you reflect this fact in the heavy Council tax bills we pay from which Horsley residents derive few benefits.

You need a major re-think and a concentration on the more than adequate brownfield sites in the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1069  Respondent: 15345025 / John Weaver  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
To sum up, the proposal to build over 533 homes at a density significantly above that currently in the Horsleys on green belt sites would permanently destroy the character and appeal of the village and place an intolerable strain on local roads, the Raleigh school, the medical centre, and access to local shops and services. It also completely ignores the views expressed by the local population in the West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan survey in 2014.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Nothing has been put forward since last year's Consultation to improve the sustainability of the West Horsley development sites and thus meet national policy requirements. Every home on the West Horsley sites will need a minimum of one car to enable residents to get to shops, the medical centre, library, and Horsley Station, regardless of how much pressure is applied to adopt cycling and walking as the preferred means of travel.

I object to no changes being proposed since the 2016 consultation to removing East & West Horsley from the green belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT most strongly to the removal of EAST and WEST HORSLEY from the GREEN BELT. A ring of GREEN around London was meant to PREVENT LARGE SCALE URBANIZATION of GREATER LONDON.

I further object to the incredibly large number of houses allocated to EAST and WEST HORSLEY making the two closely linked villages totally unrecognizable from what they are today, with many very old houses, and most of the rest built to reflect and fit in with semi-rural surroundings. I have lived in Surrey for 60 years, 36 in West Horsley, and there has already been considerable development, but not on the scale now proposed, from SEMI-RURAL to URBAN.

Surely further use of BROWN-FIELD sites in GUILDFORD which is now a City and already has many high-rise buildings could be accomplished with careful planning.

Roads, schools, hospitals, public transport (both rail and road), water supplies and sewerage will be adversely affected and will need to be enlarged and up-dated causing considerable disruption to two small villages.

So many extra properties will bring a significant number of extra cars - local traffic is already considerable in the morning rush-hour and also from mid-afternoon when schools close, through to the evening rush-hour.
Many local people and visitors enjoy WALKING and CYCLING in this area, both for recreation and to observe the considerable amount of wild-life - which if this URBANIZATION proceeds will not be available for future generations.

Many areas of this country would welcome housing development and new businesses to provide JOBS and good housing - THERE IS NO SHORTAGE OF JOBS in LONDON and the SOUTH EAST.

I understand that we cannot stand still completely, but please not on so LARGE a scale, and certainly retaining the precious GREEN BELT - once it is gone we cannot ever have it back.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1107  **Respondent:** 15353633 / Neal Stone  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

7. I OBJECT especially to Policies A36, A37, A38, A39, A40 and A41: all of the proposed Horsley sites for all the reasons stated in my introduction. I am aware of no local support for these plans. The amount of new housing proposed far exceeds local need. The proposed density of construction is too high (approx. 37 dwellings/hectare at A36) compared with existing development (approx. 8 dwellings/hectare around that site). The sites proposed are unsustainable with no supporting plans for enhanced services e.g. wastewater, schools, traffic management, flooding. No account is taken of impact of suggested Wisley Airfield site development The insetting lines suggested seem arbitrarily drawn and do not feel at all in keeping with the actual spaces on the ground e.g. some streets have houses on only one side so to develop opposite would be ruinous. Policies A37, A38, A40 and A41 require moves to the Green Belt, which I fundamentally disagree with and are contrary to Local Plan Policy P2 which states “we will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt.”

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4266  **Respondent:** 15353633 / Neal Stone  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 Submission of the Guildford Local Plan: Strategies and Sites June 2016 as it is in its current format.

I have tried to be objective as this is of historical, environmental and social importance. I have read the local press, looked at the GBC website, videos and Plan (very hard to read and scrutinise), been to local meetings and spoken to local people to get a balanced view.

I was brought up in Walton-On-Thames where my parents still live so I have called this area home for the past 40 years. A year ago I returned to Surrey with my husband and young son to live in West Horsley. I was fortunate to be brought up in the area and very happy to have been able to return here now.

We moved here to be close to family and friends, enjoy the more rural aspects of life and leave the hustle of London. However having known the area so long I am aware of the problems the area faces already such as severe congestion,
over crowded trains, enormous infilling of housing (radically changing the look and feel of the area, especially Walton and Weybridge), over stretched schools and health facilities. I am a nurse and I am very aware of the existing pressures on local health facilities.

My three main objections to the Local Plan are therefore:

• Erosion of the immensely precious Green Belt by redefining the boundaries; “the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence” (Department for Communities & Local Government) both of which will be irrevocably lost if this Plan goes ahead. I feel that the “exceptional circumstances” needed to justify this environmentally devastating change have not been demonstrated by the Guildford Borough Council Local Plan.

• A very worrying lack of provision of infrastructure in the Plan to cope with the disproportionate scale of the proposal. Health, education, transport, sewerage are all currently under pressure and not convincingly addressed in the proposal. For our village, West Horsley, the Guildford Plan does not even consider the need for extra local services but the schools, the GP, the roads, the car parks are full, the bus service basic, the roads suffering severely from potholes and the area is subject to flooding and sewerage problems.

• The scale and density of the proposed plan is alarming which has not been satisfyingly explained in the GBC Plan. GBC has not revealed how it has arrived to the conclusion that such expansion and development is needed. In which case how can such potentially environmentally catastrophic changes even be put forward? How does this comply with Government guidelines?

From a far more local perspective, i.e living in West Horsley I am extremely alarmed at the density and scale of the proposed Green Belt change in the Horsleys and the density of permitted housing proposed. Why on earth is there a proposal for a 35% increase in new housing for West Horsley (the highest % than any other borough) when the allowance for surrounding villages is so much lower and for Guildford Town centre only 11%? I understand that Guildford University has available land for building and yet this is somehow being protected? Surely building there would be of greater local use than farther afield villages for university and hospital workers?

Furthermore the density of housing proposed in the Horsleys is not in keeping with the current local density of housing which will permanently change the community feel and look. The Key Evidence given in the Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-31 does not explain the need or demand for this huge increase in housing, i.e 148 houses in East Horsley and 385 houses in West Horsley. And this number does not take into account any potential future developments once the villages are taken out of the Green Belt.

With regards to the surrounding villages and areas I am also very alarmed at, and object to, the scale and number of proposed sites which are all within the vicinity of the A3 dual carriageway: Wisley Village (2068 houses), Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Ripley (400 houses), Gosden Hill Farm (2000 houses). This road and surrounding roads struggle daily to cope with heavy congestion. The proposals will only worsen this and the pollution increase yet further. With scarce and unreliable local transport and hence heavy reliance on private cars how can this proposal be realistically sustainable?

The proposed Wisley Airfield village (or more correctly new town) is incredibly close to Ockham, Ripley and the Horsleys. The repercussions on the Horsleys and the already over subscribed schools and GPs will be immense. I object strongly to this large scale development and understand that again the local infrastructure will not cope with this new town.

I have also been concerned to read that despite 20,000 objections to the 2014 Plan the New Plan 2016 is barely different and in fact the number of houses to be built per year is more than in 2014 Plan.

I wholeheartedly hope that local objection will force this Plan to be rejected on the grounds of un-sustainability, excessive scale, environmental repercussions, density, lack of infrastructure, lack of demand and most importantly the unrecoverable loss of precious Green Belt protection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**DRAFT LOCAL PLAN – CONSULTATION**

**East Horsley and West Horsley, and other villages in Surrey**

This letter addresses in particular the proposals contained in the June 2016 Guildford BC Draft Local Plan for substantial extra housing across the Borough, and particularly in the Horsleys where I live, over a period 2013 - 33.

I OBJECT to the proposals on the same grounds as my husband and support all his comments.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1200  **Respondent:** 15372577 / Martin Fish  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I wish to register OBJECTIONS to the Proposed Submission Local Plan in respect of its impact on East and West Horsley.

**GREEN BELT**

No sound case has been made for justifying changes to Green Belt Boundaries laid down by national legislation.

The National Planning Policy Framework requires any change in Green Belt boundaries to be the result of exceptional circumstances. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated.

**PROPOSED HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS**

The proposed development of 533 homes on Green Belt sites, at much higher densities than currently exist, would be totally out of character with the existing houses and village layout. These developments would also be unsustainable in terms of drainage, roads capacity, schools, medical facilities, shops, parking and public transport.

**LAND AT FORMER WISLEY AIRFIELD**

The proposal to build approximately 2000 homes at this site is in effect the creation of a New Town in the Surrey Green Belt. This development would be a severe contravention of Metropolitan Green Belt policy and would have a major adverse impact across a widespread area, including East Horsley.

**CONCLUSION**

I object to the Proposed Submission Local Plan. The Council should be directed to amend the Local Plan by using brownfield and previously used land for housing instead of encroaching on Green Belt land.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1217  **Respondent:** 15377985 / Moira Garten  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (), is Sound? (), is Legally Compliant? ()

I am writing to protest strongly about the new proposal planning in the area.

Apart from the strain on the schools, doctors and traffic.

The roads around here are in such a state and overcrowded in the village where parking is at present so difficult.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1239  **Respondent:** 15380289 / Stephen Hewlett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (), is Sound? (), is Legally Compliant? ()

I object to any sites in West Horsley for any site with 5 or more houses. No planned infrastructure and will create an urban sprawl into neighbouring Ockham East and West Horsley.

I object to the allocation of manor Farm allocation A38

I object to the allocation of bell and colville allocation A37

I object to the allocation land at Ockham road north, West Horsley, allocation A40

I object to allocation of land at Ockham Rd north, allocation A39

I object to the allocation of Thatcher’s hotel East Horsley, allocation A36

I object to the allocation of land at East Lane West Horsley, allocation A41

I object to the insetting of town from the green belt

I object to the insetting of West Horsley

I object to the insetting of Ripley

I object to the insetting of West Clandon

I object to the insetting of Send

There is plenty of land for development in urban area that should be used rather than determinate further.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
OBJECTIONS TO GUILDFORD BOROUGH PROPOSED SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN EAST & WEST HORSLEY (JUNE 2016)

I object very strongly to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). These are my main reasons are...

I object to the Local Plan as the following development proposed is not sustainable (Policy S1)

At least 148 more houses in East Horsley. At least 385 more houses in West Horsley.

I further object to both villages to be taken out of the Green Belt. The new boundary, (called the in-setting boundary) extends the old settlement boundary and includes some fields and open spaces. This means that Kingston Meadows (by East Horsley Village Hall) is included inside the insetting boundary – despite being a valuable green space. Horsley Tennis & Cricket club at the end of Pennymead Drive is also inside the insetting boundary.

This is totally unacceptable. I object to not protecting the Green Belt (Policy P2)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I write further to the publication of the above document and write to express my objection to elements of its contents.

My principle overarching objection is the proposal to take a number of Surrey villages out of the Green Belt, and East and West Horsley in particular. This proposal in particular will have "urbanisation" implications far beyond those envisaged by the mantra that more houses must be built in the Borough. Whilst I fully accept the need to provide additional housing in the Borough, I do not agree with the drastic actions of removing the Green Belt status in order to be able to provide large scale developments that would otherwise be subject to far greater planning scrutiny.

1. I object to your proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt. The Green Belt was established for a very defined purpose by statute. It was designed to prevent urban sprawl and to a large extent has succeeded in doing this. It is there for the benefit of not just our generation but those that succeed us. This area not only contains many areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty but also Sites of Special Scientific Interest. The Green Belt enables these areas to be protected in order that the Guildford/Leatherhead/Dorking area does not become a suburban sprawl such as Hersham/Weybridge/Walton on Thames.

2. Large numbers of people visit the Surrey Hills area because of its stunning beauty, villages and leisure opportunities. These visitors in turn support many businesses both large and small whose livelihood depends upon the area.
retain its rural charm. You simply have to remember that these people are your citizens, your ratepayers and your electorate and changing the nature of their environment will potentially destroy the uniqueness of their businesses.

1. I object to the volume of housing, and associated density of construction, which is currently proposed in the Horsleys and is completely out of keeping with their village status. The proposal to build 180 houses in East Horsley and 411 in West Horsley is completely disproportionate to the housing stock currently in existence. There has not been any detailed study undertaken proving the need for this level of housing in these locations, the size and style of the proposed houses or the impact on the surrounding infrastructure.

1. I object to the proposals as many of these sites do not reflect the level of infrastructure in place to support such a volume of housing, from schools to medical facilities, shops, bus services, train station parking and we have seen how many villages in the area have been blighted by the bolt on Council Estates of the post war years - dumped on village back land with no regard to the architectural merits of the development, the local amenities on offer or the employment of the proposed residents. Each site should be considered on its own individual merits under the existing planning regime which has been designed to protect the environment of our rural life and given its particular circumstances.

1. I object to the proposal to build 100 houses on site A39 in East Horsley as it is fundamentally the plan already recognises that the site is in a flood plain and notes that the flood risk needs to be reduced and that accordi ngly there is to be no greater flood risk to anywhere else. Surely by interfering with the flood plain in this location can only transfer the flood plain impact somewhere else? That may be downstream of the site or onto adjoining properties. If there is no interference with the flood plain at the site doesn't become viable for 100 houses. The existing proposal by Cateby Land to develop 100 affordable homes here simply does not sit comfortably with any sustainable, accessible or employment rationale. It is building the wrong types of houses in the wrong place.

1. I also do not believe that the Council has given sufficient regard to where all these new inhabitants are going to. There is little or no employment in these villages, there is very little bus transport, the railways are currently crammed in rush hour with no room for extra capacity and the station car parks are not big enough to cater for more cars. And yet how are people meant to get to work in Guildford, Woking and London as the primary employment centres? The answer will be by car, whether this be by way of a short journey to the station (where they will end up parking on the streets) or a full journey into Guildford (which is already rammed in rush hour). I cannot see how this can sit comfortably with the Council's Green agenda. The Council certainly will not be able to force the bus and train companies to extend their services as these are now privately owned businesses operating for profit.

1. I disagree with the Council’s housing projection of a need for 693 houses per year (identified in the SHMA) for the period 2013-2033 when an independent report prepared by NMS for Guildford Resident's Association in June 2016 identifies that the Objectively Assessed Housing Need is nearer to 51. This reinforces my view that the statistical basis for the draft Local Plan is fundamentally flawed.

1. I object to the Council's failure to unlock the development potential of brownfield sites in the Borough and the volume of currently unoccupied residential properties in the Borough should be given a greater priority in the search for developable land before ruining the environment, livelihood and well-being of a unique area of Britain.

Remember, there will be no opportunity to undo any development resulting from these proposals. You will not be able to wind back time.

I re-iterate my unreserved objection to the proposals as set out in the above document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1294</th>
<th>Respondent: 15388065 / Emily Hustler</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 don’t think that you should build on the green belt because it will be from a village to a town and there will be less humans and living things trees and plants help us live and it’s a nice view but if it’s a town it won’t be once the schools struggle they will struggle and most people could be home school and that’s not good for a future. It will also mean it will be noisy and crowded and we already have been chopping down thousands of trees to survive so we don’t need any more just to have houses. We don’t even know that the houses will be bought they could just sit there and effect us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/1346</th>
<th>Respondent: 15390433 / Caroline Warren</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a West Horsley resident for the last thirty years I am writing to you as I am very disturbed by the proposal to take the Horsleys out of the Green Belt. In addition the proposals to infill parts of the village look unsustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe West Horsley currently has approximately 1110 homes and the proposal is to use Green Belt areas and to increase the size of West Horsley by 35%. This will transform Horsley from a traditional village to a town stretching its current infrastructure to intolerable limits. Also some of the proposals seem to suggest housing developments different in character to the rest of the village.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential facilities such as shops, medical centre etc will not be able to cope with the additional volumes. Roads, especially the A246, are in a poor state of repair and are subject to heavy congestion at peak times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I urge you to seriously consider the implications for the current residents before proceeding with the proposal to increase the size of the village so dramatically.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/1354</th>
<th>Respondent: 15390625 / J Lewis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 wife and I have been residents in West Horsley since 1958 and our 3 children attended local schools. During this time we have witnessed increased traffic on the roads due to housing infilling. This has caused queueing during busy periods at junctions such as East Lane into Ockham Road and difficulties in parking when shopping in the village etc. It is quite obvious that West Horsley has reached the limit for sensible development and the proposals for building large numbers of additional houses would be quite out of scale with the existing infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There appears to be no justification or planning behind the proposals which seem to be driven by developers rather than planners. There are certainly no exceptional circumstances to justify removing the Horsleys from the Green Belt and, as far as I am aware, no justification has been put forward by Guildford Borough Council.

If there is a need for so many houses in Surrey, surely it would be far better to build a new town situated well away from existing settlements otherwise much of the character of Surrey's attractive villages will be spoiled for ever. I find it astonishing that Guildford Borough Council should have left these proposals to be assessed by outside consultants rather than using its own knowledge and expertise in co-ordination with local residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1369  Respondent: 15397729 / G B Harris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Here we go again - being asked to send in our response to a proposal to build umpteen houses in a village that, frankly, neither WANTS nor NEEDS them. I understand our West Horsley Parish Council says it needs 20 houses. I am sure they know what is required for our village yet we are told we need hundreds - this is crazy. We are a small village, people who have moved here have done so because they want to live in a small village. We chose to live here 40-odd years ago for that very reason.

Quite apart from the fact that we do not want all this extra housing it would be impossible to sustain them. To summarise:-

INFRASTRUCTURE SCHOOLS:

Drains are at their maximum capacity Raleigh, the State primary school, is always full. Traffic to and from the private schools, Glenesk and Cranmore is enormous

PARKING:

The car park at E Horsley Medical Centre (also serving W Horsley) is more often than not totally full and getting a medical appointment is always difficult.

Parking for the shops in E Horsley we only have 1 shop in W Horsley) is more often than not totally full. The station carpark is full on weekdays.

GREEN BELT MOST IMPORTANT OF ALL

BUILDING OF HOUSES SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED ON GREEN BELT LAND

I quote from section 9 of the NPPF, which sets out the fundamental aim of green belt policy

"The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, the essential characteristics are their openness and their permanence"

It also makes clear that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as "inappropriate " for the green belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1397</th>
<th>Respondent: 15400769 / H L Cunnah</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>

My husband works in the property sector, and his business relies upon development. I am certainly not opposed to the idea of sustainable, reasonable development - but the proposed plan will ruin the Horsleys, destroy the beauty of the surrounding Green Belt and makes no provision for the obvious strains on services and infrastructure that such development would cause.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1398</th>
<th>Respondent: 15400865 / M J Cunnah</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 work in the property sector, and my business relies upon development. I am certainly not opposed to the idea of sustainable, reasonable development - but the proposed plan will ruin the Horsleys, destroy the beauty of the surrounding Green Belt and makes no provision for the obvious strains on services and infrastructure that such development would cause.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1420</th>
<th>Respondent: 15406177 / Leonilla Frost</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 STRONGLY TO** Policies A36, A37, A38, A39, A40, A41

- The number of houses being proposed is ridiculous, and will completely turn our beloved village into an ugly, urban sprawl.

- The congestion of new people and buildings will be unsustainable with our current infrastructure as well as schools and facilities

As stated, we moved from London out to the Horsleys less than a year ago, so that we could raise our children in the peace and beauty of our new home and its surrounding spaces. This proposal will completely ruin the "feel" of the entire area and would break the hearts of many loyal residents, including mine.
Many thanks for your time.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I am writing to comment on and object to the Local Plan.

In particular, I am concerned about a number of the proposals as they impact East and West Horsley (the "Horsley's") and the surrounding area.

Quite apart from the fact that it is absolutely clear that the residents are totally against the Horsley's being removed from the Green Belt, the proposal to increase the number of dwellings in West Horsley by around 35% is excessive in the extreme.

In this regard, I understand that the National Planning Policy Framework must take account of and respect the character and density of housing in the area of new residential development and the quantity of new dwellings be limited by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities.

Many residents like me have made their home in the Horsley's attracted by the village atmosphere but the high density developments proposed for West Horsley would forever change this.

In the 30 years I have lived in West Horsley I have seen a steady increase in the numbers of new residents moving to this area.

In doing so, services such as the Medical Centre have already become so busy that it is often difficult to make an appointment. Parking at the Medical Centre is also at a premium.

Access to parking in the area of the East Horsley shops is already often extremely difficult with the current volume of shoppers and traffic and the Horsley railway station parking facilities, once adequate, are generally pretty full.

Furthermore, the car park at Effingham Junction Station, which in the past could be used as an alternative to Horsley Station, is regularly full.

The proposed developments will result in traffic movements becoming significantly greater following the inevitable increase in the number of vehicles on the road. Consequently, traffic using the local roads are likely to come to a grinding halt at the times when travellers are attempting to get to or return from the local railway stations to get to work or school.

It must be clear to anybody that the increase in population resulting from the proposed developments would generate a huge increase in traffic in the area which would be significantly exacerbated by any development of Wisley Airfield.

I believe that the road capacity in the Horsley's is totally inadequate to support these plans.

I understand there are other issues which have been raised by the local Parish Councils which include concerns about road and transport infrastructure for West Horsley as well as concerns about the existing pressure on sewage and the local wastewater network's ability to support the demand from the proposed developments.

It seems to me that Guildford Borough Council has simply decided to remove the Horsley's from the Green Belt and build an inappropriate and excessive number of houses in West Horsley without any justification.
Given the scale of the proposed development in West Horsley which would lead to the unnecessary end of village life and an adverse impact on the infrastructure across the Horsley's I object to these proposals in the strongest terms.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1457  Respondent: 15410849 / G Reid  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am most concerned over the proposals contained in the Guildford plan in relation to West Horsley, and would cite the following among my main concerns:

I am very much against the higher density of the proposed new homes in West Horsley which would spoil the whole character of our village.

It is clearly unreasonable that any major increases in the number of homes in West Horsley should be considered without major parallel improvements to- and expansion of much necessary infrastructure - much of which is already operating under severe pressure.

I cannot see any valid reason or any 'very special circumstances' as to why West Horsley should be taken out of the Green Belt and am opposed to any such measure.

I also have real concerns as to the validity of many of the assumptions upon which the Guildford plan is based - particularly in relation to West Horsley.

I trust the above points are sufficient to illustrate my opposition to the currently proposed plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1460  Respondent: 15411041 / V Reid  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am opposed to many aspects of 'The Guildford Plan' concerning West Horsley - especially to the following.

1) I was shocked at the proposed removal of West Horsley from the Green Belt, particularly in the absence of any stated "exceptional circumstances" to justify such a main change to our village.

2) I object to the disproportionately high increase in the number of proposed new homes in West Horsley compared to similar areas in the Guildford Plan.
3) Local facilities- such as the medical centre, schools of public transport- all already overstretched- would NOT be able to cope with any significant increases in the population of West Horsley.

I could easily, yet again, add to the above objections to the plans, but would urge you to reconsider and amend it in the light of objections such as those noted above.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1483  Respondent: 15420961 / S M Newton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objection to Guildford Local Plan 2016

I object to the new plans seeing that all the proposed building is on GREEN BELT

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1513  Respondent: 15424961 / D Petitt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 to inform you of our objection to the proposed housing development in the Horsleys and surrounding area.

I support the need for new housing, however, this proposal is badly thought-out and will see the first steps of destroying valuable greenbelt land in this area. This scheme would be more suited to the brownfield site sat and around Guildford/Woking where it can easily combine with the town centre facilities, especially with regards to water and sewage treatment.

Traffic, especially heavy goods vehicles, has increased rapidly over the past 10 years and this will continue when the development goes ahead. These are small country lanes with no traffic flow management, the road traffic accident will have to go up.

Public transport is limited in this area with no bus routes and only 2 Railway Stations at Horsely/Effingham Junction. Station car parking at both of these stations is now at full capacity, also morning peak rush hour services on the trains are also heavily congested.

These 2 proposed Roundabouts located near Old lane will make traffic more heavily congested and will deteriorate the quality of life for the residents near to them. Also the Constant noise and inconvenience to the residents during and afterwards the installation of the Roundabouts.
Very little thought and planning for the nearby residents who will have to tolerate the increased noise and pollution (noise and air pollution) that the construction this housing scheme will bring forever to this place in rural Surrey.

These are my objections to this proposed scheme and please put them on the record.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1570  Respondent: 15432545 / M Petitt  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to inform you that I wish to object to the proposal of Building Houses (593) in the Horsley’s, one of my main objections is to remove the Horsley’s from the Green Belt – Such a decision and action would be a disastrous act of stupidity because an increase of homes would mean an upheaval for most residents to the environment such a development would cause.

Village roads cannot cope at the best of times, let alone a further increase of traffic which in turn cause more pollution to this green village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1574  Respondent: 15433153 / Helen Green  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Re DRAFT LOCAL PLAN

I write to object to the Draft Local Plan (DLP) and in particular the proposals as they apply to East and West Horsley and the surrounding area.

I regularly visit my daughter and her family in East Horsley, and consider that the proposals for development and in relation to the road infrastructure in the area will have a significantly bad impact on traffic flow through, and access to the village. The roads are narrow and winding and already suffer from regular congestion, particularly if there has been an accident or breakdown on the M25 or A3.
The proposed new interchange at Burnt Common will simply encourage more vehicles to attempt to bypass any traffic jams by using the local roads. Such traffic is also likely to cause problems with speed and risk-taking, which increases the danger for pedestrians and cyclists, including children walking or cycling to and from school.

Additionally, the proposals in relation to the Wisley Airfield site and other local housing developments will add significantly to local road use, particularly at peak times. The DLP envisages some 533 new houses in the Horsleys, plus in excess of 2000 new houses on the Wisley site, the likelihood is that the majority of these new homes will be households running at least 2 vehicles. There are already difficulties at Effingham cross-roads, Effingham Junction and in getting into Cobham, all of which are regular routes for commuters and for the school run. The local roads are not capable of absorbing an addition 5000 or so vehicles without adding substantially to the delays and congestion in the area and decreasing the safety of all road users.

I object to changing the status of the land currently within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that any change of Green Belt boundaries must demonstrate exceptional circumstances. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated within the DLP, and to change the status of current Green Belt land would change the character of the area for ever, to the considerable detriment of the Borough as a whole and the local communities.

Please take these points into account and reject the Draft Local Plan as inappropriate for the area. A new Draft should be put forward which properly takes these factors into account.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to a plan which proposes that over 70% of new housing be built within the Green Belt. There is ample brownfield land in the urban areas which needs to be regenerated, without the need to encroach on protected Green Belt land. Election manifesto promises to the electorate are being ignored.

I object to the removal of the Horsleys and the Former Wisley Airfield (FWA/TFM) from the Green Belt. The later site serves a vital role in protecting against urban sprawl from London. Development on the site will create an urban corridor stretching from London to Guildford. Under the NPPF, no exceptional circumstances have been established to warrant removing the Horsleys and FWA/TFM from the Green Belt.

I object to the housing number from the West Surrey Strategic Market Housing Assessment (SHMA) as far too high. This assessment and calculation process has been far from transparent. I understand that plan includes a figure which is almost 70% higher than the official national estimates for population growth in the Borough. The scale of this increase has alarming results for example an increase of up to 35% in existing West Horsley households - greater than any other single area in the Borough.

The infrastructure in the Horsleys and Ockham are already in overload. The local schools are full and the medical facilities are in inadequate and roads and car parks are overloaded with little or no scope for improvements.

I object to the disproportionate allocation of housing in the immediate localities of Ockham, Ripley, Send and the Horsleys.

I object to the threat the Local Plan poses to the historic rural villages of Ockham and the Horsleys and the blight on properties. These are villages would change considerably with 2,000+ dwelling development at Wisley and the additional housing proposed on the Horsley sites.

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road transport. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the Wisley development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars.
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of around 2,600 homes in the Horsleys and Ockham would result in an estimated 5,000 additional cars on the roads.
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements.
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the Wisley site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads.
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

8. I object to the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to the environmental and ecological value of the FWA/TFM site, in relation to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI).

9. I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously - air pollution in many parts of the borough, 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. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

10. I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities.

11. I object to the continued inclusion of a site (the former Wisley Airfield, now known as Three Farm Meadows) - where the planning application has already been unanimously rejected by GBC's Planning Committee. After 14 months of consideration (and various extensions and amendments), Wisley Property Investments Ltd. 's (WPIL) planning application was unanimously rejected by GBC on 8th April 2016 on the recommendation of GBC Planning Officers, who cited the same grave concerns highlighted in this letter. Serious concerns about this site have also been raised by a broad number of authoritative sources across the UK, including Highways England, Thames Water, NATS and the Environment Agency.
I trust that these objections will be fully considered and Allocations A35, A36, A37, A38, A39, A40 and 41 are removed from the Local Plan with immediate effect.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1627  Respondent: 15439105 / Jean Stiff  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objections to Guildford Borough Council Proposed Local Plan (June 2016)

I object to the draft Local Plan for the following key reasons:

1. I object to a plan which proposes that over 70% of new housing be built within the Green Belt. There is ample brownfield land in the urban areas which needs to be regenerated, without the need to encroach on protected Green Belt land. Election manifesto promises to the electorate are being ignored.

2. I object to the removal of the Horsleys and the Former Wisley Airfield (FWA/TFM) from the Green Belt. The later site serves a vital role in protecting against urban sprawl from London. Development on the site will create an urban corridor stretching from London to Guildford. Under the NPPF, no exceptional circumstances have been established to warrant removing the Horsleys and FWA/TFM from the Green Belt.

3. I object to the housing number from the West Surrey Strategic Market Housing Assessment (SHMA) as far too high. This assessment and calculation process has been far from transparent. I understand that plan includes a figure which is almost 70% higher than the official national estimates for population growth in the Borough. The scale of this increase has alarming results for example an increase of up to 35% in existing West Horsley households - greater than any other single area in the Borough.

4. The infrastructure in the Horsleys and Ockham are already in overload. The local schools are full and the medical facilities are in a poor state. Drainage is inadequate and roads and car parks are overloaded with little or no scope for improvements.

5. I object to the disproportionate allocation of housing in the immediate localities of Ockham, Ripley, Send and the Horsleys.

6. I object to the threat the Local Plan poses to the historic rural villages of Ockham and the Horsleys and the blight on properties. These are villages would change considerably with 2,000+ dwelling development at Wisley and the additional housing proposed on the Horsley sites.

7. I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road traffic. I specifically object to:
   1. The assertion that the Wisley development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars.
   2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of around 2,600 homes in the Horsleys and Ockham would result in an estimated 5,000 additional cars on the roads.
   3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements.
   4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them).
   5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the Wisley site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads.
   6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.
8. I object to the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to the environmental and ecological value of the FWA/TFM site, in relation to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI).

9. 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. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

10. I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities.

11. I object to the continued inclusion of a site (the former Wisley Airfield, now known as Three Farm Meadows) - where the planning application has already been unanimously rejected by GBC's Planning Committee. After 14 months of consideration (and various extensions and amendments), Wisley Property Investments Ltd.'s (WPI) planning application was unanimously rejected by GBC on 8th April 2016 on the recommendation of GBC Planning Officers, who cited the same grave concerns highlighted in this letter. Serious concerns about this site have also been raised by a broad number of authoritative sources across the UK, including Highways England, Thames Water, NATS and the Environment Agency.

I trust that these objections will be fully considered and Allocations A35, A36, A37, A38, A39, A40 and A41 are removed from the Local Plan with immediate effect.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1630  Respondent: 15439329 / P Darrell-Smith  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

For the reasons as listed by the Horsley Countryside Preservation Society, will you please ensure that this OBJECTION is duly recorded by your council of by subsequent Independent Inquiry.

Major Objections and concerns for the Horsleys:

• Proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt.
The "exceptional circumstances" required before taking this action have not been demonstrated.

• Extension of the boundaries of the Settlement areas of the Horsleys.
No sound reasons have been given for the proposed changes, which seem to be aimed solely at increasing the land available within the settlements for future additional development.

• Infrastructure already in overload.
The local Schools are full. Medical facilities stretched. Drainage is inadequate, roads and car parks are overloaded with little or no scope for improvements.

• Station Parade is designated a "District Centre".
This 'classification' results from a complete misreading of the nature of the facilities in the village centre and would inappropriately target the area for future urban developments.
• Development of over 2,000 house village at Ockham (former Wisley Airfield)

The impact on the Horsley villages of such a huge mixed housing, retail, commercial, traveller and schools development, under 2 miles away, would be enormous. The plan also includes extensive developments at Burnt Common (400 houses & commercial developments) and Gosden Hill Farm, Burpham (2000 houses & mixed use developments).

• Major doubt concerning housing numbers

The inflated number of new houses proposed arises from a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) that was generated by a consultant's mathematical model which is not revealed in the plan. Nor, apparently, to Guildford Borough Council, GBC.

This SHMA target housing number is then further increased by GBC to give a population increase which is almost 70% higher than the official national estimates for population growth in the Borough. The scale of this increase has alarming results e.g. an increase of up to 3 5% in existing West Horsley households - greater than any other single area in the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: [LP2016- P Darrell-smith.pdf](108 KB)
4. Although reduced from the previously planned numbers, the current PSLP figures equate to 384 new houses in West Horsley, a rise of 35% compared to the existing 1,111 households in the village, and as I understand it, the new developments are scheduled to be implemented in the early years of the New Plan. Taken with the other development sites proposed for the Eastern side of the Borough, this is sure to put excessive pressure on local services including roads, and other infrastructure.

Turning to East Horsley's proposed development as a District Centre, this is beset by problems, particularly as regards the area of East Horsley Station Parade. Even today, this area has too little short-term and long-term parking, both at the railway station and increasingly for the local shops. Other services, particularly medical and educational, are also already over-burdened. Alone, the new housing developments proposed for both East and West Horsley in the PSLP would overload the proposed District Centre, but the possibility of a larger development at the Wisley Airfield site can only exacerbate this, since Horsley station would be the obvious (or only feasible) access point to the railway for London commuters (and other users) from Wisley. The proposed new Merrow station might attract residents of the proposed Gosden Hill Farm and I Send housing developments, but it will not help Wisley, and would, in any case, lead to increased over-crowding at later stations, given the likely limit to the additional train capacity which could be run on existing track; and because there are no proposals to develop the Effingham junction area (which is marginally closer to Wisley).

All in all it seems that the adoption of the current proposals in the PSLP for excessive housing concentration in the Eastern areas of the Borough of Guildford will lead, over a short time period to the complete destruction of the Green Belt in the Horsley areas, the overwhelming of services in general, and possibly to a major transport disaster. Please reconsider the PSLP proposals; specifically, reject Strategic Development Site A41; drop the proposal to indent West Horsley from the Green Belt, review the adoption of East Horsley as a District Centre.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1661</th>
<th>Respondent: 15441601 / B Simpson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE: GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL -LOCAL PLAN: STRATEGY AND SITES.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I write further to the publication of the above document and write to express my objection to elements of its contents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principle overarching objection is the proposal to take a number of Surrey villages out of the Green Belt, and East and West Horsley in particular. This proposal in particular will have &quot;urbanisation&quot; implications far beyond those envisaged by the mantra that more houses must be built in the Borough. Whilst I fully accept the need to provide additional housing in the Borough, I do not agree with the drastic actions of removing the Green Belt status in order to be able to provide large scale developments that would otherwise be subject to far greater planning scrutiny.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to your proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt. The Green Belt was established for a very defined purpose by statute. It was designed to prevent urban sprawl and to a large extent has succeeded in doing this. It is there for the benefit of not just our generation but those that succeed us. This area not only contains many areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty but also Sites of Special Scientific Interest. The Green Belt enables these areas to be protected in order that the Guildford/Leatherhead/Dorking area does not become a suburban sprawl such as Hersham/Weybridge/Walton on Thames.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Large numbers of people visit the Surrey Hills area because of its stunning beauty, villages and leisure opportunities. These visitors in turn support many businesses both large and small whose livelihood depends upon the area retaining its rural charm. You simply have to remember that these people are your citizens, your ratepayers and your electorate and changing the nature of their environment will potential ly destroy the uniqueness of their businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. I object to the volume of housing, and associated density of construction, which is currently proposed in the Horsleys and is completely out of keeping with their village. The proposal to build 180 houses in East Horsley and 411 in West Horsley is completely disproportionate to the housing stock currently in existence. There has not been any detailed study undertaken proving the need for this level of housing in these locations, the size and style of the proposed houses or the impact on the surrounding infrastructure.

4. I object to the proposals as many of these sites do not reflect the level of infrastructure in place to support such a volume of housing, from schools to medical facilities, shops, bus services, train station parking and drainage. We have seen how many villages in the area have been blighted by the bolt on Council Estates of the post war years - dumped on village back land with no regard to the architectural merits of the development, the local amenities on offer or the employment of the proposed residents. Each site should be considered on its own individual merits under the existing planning regime which has been designed to protect the environment of our rural life and given its particular circumstances.

5. I object to the proposal to build 100 houses on site A39 in East Horsley as it is fundamentally flawed. The plan already recognises that the site is in a flood plain and notes that the flood risk needs to be reduced and that accordingly there is to be no greater flood risk to anywhere. Surely by interfering with the flood plain in this location can only transfer the flood plain impact somewhere else? That may be downstream of the site or onto adjacent properties. If there is no interference with the flood plain at the site doesn't it become viable for 100 houses? The existing proposal by Caterby Land to develop 100 affordable homes here simply does not sit comfortably with any sustainable, accessible or employment rationale. It is building the wrong types of houses in the wrong place.

6. I also do not believe that the Council has given sufficient regard to where all these new inhabitants are going to. There is little or no employment in these villages, there is very little bus transport, the railways are currently crammed in rush hour with no room for extra capacity and the station car parks are not big enough to cater for more cars. And yet how are people meant to get to work in Guildford, Woking and London as the primary employment centres? The answer will be by car, whether this be by way of a short journey to the station (where they will end up parking on the streets) or a full journey into Guildford (which is already rammed in rush hour). I cannot see how this can sit comfortably with the Council’s Green agenda. The Council certainly will not be able to force the bus and train companies to extend their services as these are now privately owned businesses operating for profit.

7. I disagree with the Council’s housing projection of a need for 693 houses per year (identified in the SHMA) for the period 2013-2033 when an independent report prepared by NMSS for Guildford Resident’s Association in June 2016 identifies that the Objectively Assessed Housing Need is nearer to 510. This reinforces my view that the statistical basis for the draft Local Plan is fundamentally flawed.

8. I object to the Council’s failure to unlock the development potential of brownfield sites in the Borough and the volume of currently unoccupied residential properties in the Borough should be given a greater priority in the search for developable land before ruining the environment, livelihood and well-being of a unique area of

Remember, there will be no opportunity to undo any development resulting from these proposals. You will not be able to wind back time.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
My principle overarching objection is the proposal to take a number of Surrey villages out of the Green Belt, and East and West Horsley in particular. This proposal in particular will have “urbanisation" implications far beyond those envisaged by the mantra that more houses must be built in the Borough. Whilst I fully accept the need to provide additional housing in the Borough, I do not agree with the drastic actions of removing the Green Belt status in order to be able to provide large scale developments that would otherwise be subject to far greater planning scrutiny.

1. I object to your proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt. The Green Belt was established for a very defined purpose by statute. It was designed to prevent urban sprawl and to a large extent has succeeded in doing this. It is there for the benefit of not just our generation but those that succeed us. This area not only contains many areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty but also Sites of Special Scientific Interest. The Green Belt enables these areas to be protected in order that the Guildford/Leatherhead/Dorking area does not become a suburban sprawl such as Hersham/Weybridge/Walton on Thames.

2. Large numbers of people visit the Surrey Hills area because of its stunning beauty, villages and leisure opportunities. These visitors in turn support many businesses both large and small whose Livelihood depends upon the area retaining its rural charm. You simply have to remember that these people are your citizens, your ratepayers and your electorate and changing the nature of their environment will potentially destroy the uniqueness of their businesses.

3. I object to the volume of housing, and associated density of construction, which is currently proposed in the Horsleys and is completely out of keeping with their village status. The proposal to build 180 houses in East Horsley and 41 in West Horsley is completely disproportionate to the housing stock currently in existence. There has not been any detailed study undertaken proving the need for this level of housing in these locations, the size and style of the proposed houses or the impact on the surrounding infrastructure.

4. I object to the proposals as many of these sites do not reflect the level of infrastructure in place to support such a volume of housing, from schools to medical facilities, shops, bus services, train station parking and drainage. We have seen how many villages in the area have been blighted by the bolt on Council Estates of the post war years - dumped on village back land with no regard to the architectural merits of the development, the local amenities on offer or the employment of the proposed residents. Each site should be considered on its own individual merits under the existing planning regime which has been designed to protect the environment of our rural life and given its particular circumstances.

5. I object to the proposal to build 100 houses on site A39 in East Horsley as it is fundamentally The plan already recognises that the site is in a flood plain and notes that the flood risk needs to be reduced and that accordingly there is to be no greater flood risk to anywhere else. Surely by interfering with the flood plain in this location can on ly transfer the flood plain impact somewhere else? That may be downstream of the site or onto adjoining properties. If there is no interference with the flood plain at the site it doesn't become viable for 100 houses. The existing proposal by Cateby Land to develop 100 affordable homes here simply does not sit comfortably with any sustainable, accessible or employment rationale. It is building the wrong types of houses in the wrong place.

6. I also do not believe that the Council has given sufficient regard to where all these new inhabitants are going to go. There is little or no employment in these villages, there is very little bus transport, the rail links are currently crammed in rush hour with no room for extra capacity and the station car parks are not big enough to cater for more cars. And yet how are people meant to get to work in Guildford, Woking and London as the primary employment centres? The answer will be by car, whether this be by way of a short journey to the station (where they will end up parking on the streets) or a full journey into Guildford (which is already rammed in rush hour). I cannot see how this can sit comfortably with the Council’s Green agenda. The Council certainly will not be able to force the bus and train companies to extend their services as these are now privately owned businesses operating for profit.

7. I disagree with the Council's housing projection of a need for 693 houses per year (identified in the SHMA) for the period 2013-2033 when an independent report prepared by NMS for Guildford Resident's Association in June 2016 identifies that the Objectively Assessed Housing Need is nearer to This reinforces my view that the statistical basis for the draft Local Plan is fundamentally flawed.

8. I object to the Council's failure to unlock the development potential of brownfield sites in the Borough and the volume of currently unoccupied residential properties in the Borough should be given a greater priority in the search for developable land before ruining the environment, livelihood and well-being of a unique area of

Remember, there will be no opportunity to undo any development resulting from these proposals. You will not be able to wind back time.
I re-iterate my unreserved objection to the proposals as set out in the above document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1667  Respondent: 15442241 / Graham Allen  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We would like to register our objection to the proposed New Local Plan. Fifty seven years ago, we moved to the lovely village of West Horsley and over the years have seen it grow, however, it has basically remained a village,

If the proposed developments go ahead, it will become a town, without the infrastructure to support it. If we had wanted to live in a town to raise our family, we would have done so,

It is of great concern to us that these developments will increase the population significantly and without due concern to the Green belt which was set up to prevent the spread of towns particularly around London,

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1677  Respondent: 15442497 / B H Keyte  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a regular visitor to friends in West Horsley, I write to object strongly to the proposals, particularly to the destruction of large areas of Green Belt despite all the undertakings and assurances that they will be preserved except in very special circumstances.

West Horsley has kept its character as an attractive country village thanks mainly to the Green Belt around and within it. The areas of past development are mostly well separated, so that there are hardly any areas more than a few hundred yards from original woodland, fields, meadows or parkland. The plans propose a huge increase of over 1/3 in the number of homes in West Horsley.

Particularly inappropriate is the proposal to build 135 houses on the Manor Farm site (referenced Policy A38), good agricultural land in the Green Belt. It would bind together two existing areas of housing, causing continuous development for over 1 km between the Ockham Road and Long Reach.

Building 225 houses on the Manor Farm (referenced Policy A38) and East Lane sites (referenced Policy A41) in the Green Belt would greatly increase traffic on the narrow East Lane towards Horsley Station and the shops in East Horsley (West Horsley has only one small shop). East Lane is already heavily used despite being a narrow lane with a one-way section in it; it is frequently flooded and it has been in a VERY bad state of repair for many years, as has The Drift beyond it leading on to Effingham and the east.

As well as the roads, the drainage, medical facilities and schools in the area are all struggling to meet the existing demands on them, yet it seems that no consideration is given to any of these essential things in the Plan.
I believe that the Plan has ignored the existing character of the Village and the availability of facilities of all kinds and I strongly object to the Proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I Object to development of sites A36, A37, A38, A39, A40 & A41 in Horsley because:

- These sites are much too large in proportion to the size of East and West Horsley (additional 533 houses)
- These sites represent a disproportionately large amount of the borough's housing "needs"
- These sites are close to the proposed Wisley development and so together represent a vastly disproportionate development of the area.
- They would change the appearance of the green belt in and around Horsley which contradicts the councils aim of protecting the green belt
- The local roads and pavements are very narrow and increasing traffic both during and after construction would increase the risk of traffic accidents both involving cars and pedestrians many of whom are children.
- Considerable objection to these sites was made following the last draft plan by These objections should be considered and not just objections at this stage otherwise the Council could be accused of trying to "wear down" opinion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I'm writing to object to the local plan for West Horsley. The scale and density proposed is incredible and needs to be urgently amended. The country has just voted for brexit, to a large extent, to curb migration and population growth. It would be aweful to build over such beautiful land on the pretences of population forecasts set before Brexit. Without migration our natural birth rate will lead to a shrinking population. Once you build on the greenbelt like this you never get it back.

The density of housing proposed is significantly higher than existing housing. We need suitable family housing to support swathes of young people unable to buy family houses. Families dont want to live in shoeboxes. Prices can come down if supply and demand balance changes, that is how to make houses affordable rather than building small houses nobody wants.

The local school is already full. What is the plan for that? The station car park already full, what is the plan for that? The peak time trains for London are already full with people standing all the way to london, what is the plan for that? The a3 junction with the m25 is grid lock at morning and afternoon peak, what is the plan for that?
Objection to the Draft Guildford Local Plan for The Horsleys

I am writing to object to various components of the proposed Guildford Borough local plan with regards to the Horsleys as follows:

I oppose the removal of East and West Horsley from the Green Belt as well as oppose the insetting and extending the settlement area boundaries and associated building of several hundred new houses on field and woodland in this village in an area of outstanding natural beauty.

I oppose the extent of the developments proposed on the basis that the volumes of houses are well above the requirement to support population increases, nationally and in the surrounding area.

East and West Horsley do not have the infrastructure to support the current village population let alone several hundred additional homes in the villages. The situation is as follows:

- One small village shop serving all of West Horsley with residents having to travel (mostly by car) to East Horsley
- No post office following its closure in recent years
- No bank or cash machine
- No doctors surgery as such the overstretched East Horsley Medical Centre is utilised where appointments at short and long notice are hard to come by
- No secondary school as such the oversubscribed Howard of Effingham School is the preferred school for the villages. There is no suggestion of a reasonable alternative to the Howard should housing across Guildford and Mole Valley increase as the county and borough councils would like
- Not enough state primary school places. The Raleigh School is already oversubscribed on an annual basis with village children missing out each year.
- Limited bus service
- Limited volume of passengers able to travel from Horsley Station (car park is often full on weekdays as it is without the additional traffic from additional households and thousands of new homes at Wisley.
- Increased risk of flooding due to the development of fields and woodland

Village roads cannot support an increase in traffic from several hundred new homes and those at Wisley. There are already issues with speed and volume of traffic as well as the quality of the roads

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1702  Respondent: 15445921 / Andrew Martin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1707  Respondent: 15446593 / Helen Dare  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
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I object to the proposed development in the Horsleys.

* Overcrowding of junior and secondary schools in the local areas and not enough teachers for the present ones.
* Doctors surgery not large enough and the doctors are already stretched with attending to patients.
* Not enough car parking spaces in the village.
* Sewage drains will be unable to cope with extra effluence.
* Station car park unable to cope with extra cars.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1784  **Respondent:** 15451841 / Marion Marshall  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )**  **is Sound? ( )**  **is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**RE: GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL - LOCAL PLAN: STRATEGY AND SITES.**

I write further to the publication of the above document and write to express my objection to elements of its contents.

My principle overarching objection is the proposal to take a number of Surrey villages out of the Green Belt, and East and West Horsley in particular. This proposal in particular will have "urbanisation" implications far beyond those envisaged by the mantra that more houses must be built in the Borough. Whilst I fully accept the need to provide additional housing in the Borough, I do not agree with the drastic actions of removing the Green Belt status in order to be able to provide large scale developments that would otherwise be subject to far greater planning scrutiny.

1. Your proposal to remove a number of classic Surrey villages that currently give the area its charm, beauty, character, history and overall appeal is outrageous.

   1. I object to your proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt. The Green Belt was established for a very defined purpose by statute. It was designed to prevent urban sprawl and to a large extent has succeeded in doing this. It is there for the benefit of not just our generation but those that succeed us. This area not only contains many areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty but also Sites of Special Scientific Interest. The Green Belt enables these areas to be protected in order that the Guildford/Leatherhead/Dorking area does not become a suburban sprawl such as Hersham/Weybridge/Walton on Thames.

   1. Large numbers of people visit the Surrey Hills area because of its stunning beauty, villages and leisure. These visitors in turn support many businesses both large and small whose livelihood depends upon the area retaining its rural charm. You simply have to remember that these people are your citizens, your ratepayers and your electorate and changing the nature of their environment will potentially destroy the uniqueness of their businesses.

   1. I object to the volume of housing, and associated density of construction, which is currently proposed in the Horsleys is completely out of keeping with their village status. The proposal to build 180 houses in East Horsley and 411 in West Horsley is completely disproportionate to the housing stock currently in existence. There has not been any detailed study undertaken proving the need for this level of housing in these locations, the size and style of the proposed houses or the impact on the surrounding infrastructure.
1. I object to the proposals as many of these sites do not reflect the level of infrastructure in place to support such a volume of housing, from schools to medical facilities, shops, bus services, train station parking and drainage. We have seen how many villages in the area have been blighted by the bolt on Council Estates of the post war years - dumped on village back land with no regard to the architectural merits of the development, the local amenities on offer or the employment of the proposed resident. Each site should be considered on its own individual merits under the existing planning regime which has been designed to protect the environment of our rural life and given its particular circumstances.

1. I object to the proposal to build 100 houses on site A39 in East Horsley as it is fundamentally flawed. The plan already recognises that the site is in a flood plain and notes that the flood risk needs to be reduced and that accordingly there is to be no greater flood risk to anywhere else. Surely by interfering with the flood plain in this location can only transfer the flood plain impact somewhere else? That may be downstream of the site or onto adjoining properties. If there is no interference with the flood plain at the site then it doesn't become viable for 100 houses. The existing proposal by Cateby Land to develop 100 affordable homes here simply does not sit comfortably with any sustainable, accessible or employment rationale. It is building the wrong types of houses in the wrong place.

1. I also do not believe that the Council has given sufficient regard to where all these new inhabitants are going to work. There is little or no employment in these villages, there is very little bus transport, the railways are currently cram med in rush hour with no room for extra capacity and the station car parks are not big enough to cater for more cars. And yet how are people meant to get to work in Guildford, Woking and London as the primary employment centres? The answer will be by car, whether this be by way of a short journey to the station (where they will end up parking on the streets) or a full journey into Guildford (which is already rammed in rush hour). I cannot see how this can sit comfortably with the Council’s Green agenda. The Council certainly will not be able to force the bus and train companies to extend their services as these are now privately owned businesses operating for profit.

1. I object to the Council’s failure to unlock the development potential of brownfield sites and the volume of currently unoccupied residential properties in the Borough should be given a greater priority in the search for developable land before ruining the environment, livelihood and well-being of a unique area of Britain.

Remember, there will be no opportunity to undo any development resulting from these proposals. You will not be able to wind back time.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I. Your proposal to remove a number of classic Surrey villages that currently give the area its charm, beauty, character, history and overall appeal is outrageous.

1. I object to your proposal to remove the Horleys from the Green Belt. The Green Belt was established for a very defined purpose by statute. It was designed to prevent urban sprawl and to a large extent has succeeded in doing that. It is there for the benefit of not just our generation but those that succeed us. This area not only contains many areas of outstanding natural beauty but also sites of special scientific interest. The Green Belt enables these areas to be protected in order that the Guildford/Leatherhead/Dorking area does not become a suburban sprawl such as Hersham/Weybridge/Walton on Thames.

2. Large numbers of people visit the Surrey Hills area because of its stunning beauty, villages and leisure opportunities. These visitors in turn support many businesses both large and small whose livelihood depends upon the area retaining its rural charm. You simply have to remember that these people are your citizens, your ratepayers and your electorate and changing the nature of their environment will potentially destroy the uniqueness of their businesses.

3. I object to the volume of housing, and associated density of construction, which is currently proposed in the Horleys. I am completely out of keeping with their village status. The proposal to build 80 houses in East Horsley and 411 in West Horsley is completely disproportionate to the housing stock currently in existence. There has not been any detailed study undertaken proving the need for this level of housing in these locations, the size and style of the proposed houses or the impact on the surrounding infrastructure.

4. I object to the proposals as many of these sites do not reflect the level of infrastructure in place to support such a volume of housing, from schools to medical facilities, shops, bus services, train station parking and we have seen how many villages in the area have been blighted by the bolt on Council Estates of the post-war years - dumped on village backland with no regard to the architectural merits of the development, the local amenities on offer or the employment of the proposed residents. Each site should be considered on its own individual merits under the existing planning regime which has been designed to protect the environment of our rural life and given its particular circumstances.

5. I object to the proposal to build 100 houses on site A39 in East Horsley as it is fundamentally flawed. The plan already recognises that the site is in a floodplain and notes that the flood risk needs to be reduced and that accordingly there is to be no greater flood risk to anywhere. Surely by interfering with the floodplain in this location can only transfer the floodplain impact somewhere else? That may be downstream of the site or onto adjoining properties. If there is no interference with the floodplain at the site doesn't become viable for 100 houses. The existing proposal by Cateby Land to develop 100 affordable homes here simply does not sit comfortably with any sustainable, accessible or employment rationale. It is building the wrong types of houses in the wrong place.

6. I also do not believe that the Council has given sufficient regard to where all these new inhabitants are going to go. There is little or no employment in these villages, there is very little bus transport, the railways are currently crammed in rush hour with no room for extra capacity and the station car parks are not big enough to cater for more cars. And yet how are people meant to get to work in Guildford, Woking and London as the primary employment centres? The answer will be by car, whether this be by way of a short journey to the station (where they will end up parking on the streets) or a full journey into Guildford (which is already rammed in rush hour). I cannot see how this can sit comfortably with the Council's Green agenda. The Council certainly will not be able to force the bus and train companies to extend their services as these are now privatised businesses operating for profit.

7. I object to the Council's failure to unlock the development potential of brownfield sites and the volume of currently unoccupied residential properties in the Borough should be given a greater priority in the search for developable land before ruining the environment, livelihood and well-being of a unique area of Britain.

Remember, there will be no opportunity to undo any development resulting from these proposals. You will not be able to wind back time.
I re-iterate my unreserved objection to the proposals as set out in the above document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1798  Respondent: 15452481 / David Albert  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Proposed Submission Local Plan - Site Policy A35 and Site Policies A36, A38, A39, A40 and A41.

I am writing to OBJECT to the Proposed Submission Local Plan in relation to the above Site Policies for the following reasons:

1. Traffic

I live in a house just off Ockham Road South, on the bend just to the south of the shops, so I am familiar with the current traffic which uses Ockham Road South and Ockham Road North (together “Ockham Road”).

Ockham Road is the route between the Wisley Roundabout and the A246, and as such takes traffic from the M25 and the A3 to the south towards Dorking, Horsham and areas to the south of Guildford, and vice versa. There is therefore a substantial number of HGVs using this road, which was never designed to carry heavy traffic. Along a substantial part of its length it is difficult if not impossible for an HGV or a bus to pass a car going in the opposite direction. Outside my house, the road is so narrow that there is no centre white line, and even cars have difficulty passing each other.

More recently, with a substantial increase in the number of cyclists in the Surrey Hills area, their presence on the narrow roads in the Horsleys contributes to the difficulty in maintaining safe and smooth traffic flows.

If the above policies are approved the traffic flow along Ockham Road will be very substantially increased. 493 new houses in the Horsleys and a further 2,000 houses in Site A35 (former Wisley Airfield) will all have to use Ockham Road for access, and would have a substantial effect on not only Ockham Road but also on the Wisley roundabout, which is already very busy. It is not unreasonable to assume that on completion of all of the above developments there would be at least 3,400 additional cars using Ockham Road.

The inclusion of these Sites in the proposed Local Plan is therefore contrary to Policy I3 (Sustainable Transport for New Developments) and Policy I1 (Infrastructure and Delivery), since there are no proposals which seek to address this problem.

2. Infrastructure

It is generally accepted that the local schools and the Horsley Medical Centre are functioning at the limit of their capacity, and cannot cope with further local development such as is now proposed in the draft Local Plan. It is also the case that the Horsley Station car park is fully utilised during weekdays, and cannot provide further parking facilities for commuters.

Whilst the Proposed Submission Local Plan does indeed envisage the provision of additional schools and a new surgery on Site Policy A35 (former Wisley Airfield), these will only become available if/when this site is fully developed. Consequently, there can be no guarantee that they will be available when the five Horsley sites (and other nearby sites) are developed - and this is likely to happen within a very much shorter time frame.
There do not appear to be any proposals which provide for additional parking facilities required in the neighbourhood of Horsley Station, nor any assurance or means whereby the provision of extra medical facilities or schooling can be secured so as to be available on completion of the proposed developments in the Horsleys. Whilst an obligation on developers to pay CIL would provide partial funding, action needs to be taken and money needs to be spent before development takes place.

In the absence of a fully thought-out proposal the inclusion of the above sites in the Proposed Submission Local Plan is premature, and is contrary to Policy I

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The notion that you can increase the number of households by 35% by way of the proposed developments is hard to comprehend particularly when there seems to have been little or no recognition in "The Guildford Plan" of the effect such a huge increase will undoubtedly have on the infrastructure and services.

I think that it is fair to say that the vast majority of people living in the County of Surrey accept that there is a need for more housing, particularly affordable housing but proposals on the scale set out in the Plan are way in excess of what is acceptable and sustainable.

In view of my observations set out above I strongly object to the proposals set out in the "The Guildford Plan" and urge the Council to have a serious rethink about the sizes/numbers of developments proposed and come up with a much more realistic Plan which will meet the aspirations of your electorate living in The Horsleys.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/286  Respondent: 15455905 / Michael Stone  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Having expressed my concerns previously I am writing as a concerned parent of a West Horsley resident regarding the latest changes made to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan June 2017 consultation.

My overriding concern is that it would appear that no change is being proposed with regard to the idea of insetting West and East Horsley from the Green Belt thus risking the beautiful countryside of the two Parishes being swallowed up by the Metropolitan Sprawl. The reduction in the number of new homes being proposed for West Horsley is to be welcomed but there appears to be little evidence of a realistic reduction in the overall number of homes being proposed or indeed introducing a fair balance in the number of new homes in the Borough - at present it appears that the Eastern side of the Borough is being targeted with an unfair proportion of new homes compared with the Western side. There also appears to be no proposal to introduce commensurate infrastructure upgrades e.g. medical, educational and transport services to cope with the increased number of residents. The proposed Wisley Airfield redevelopment is a step too far.

It is also puzzling that like a lot of other Borough and District Councils in Surrey the number of new homes proposed in the Guildford Borough Plan well exceeds the numbers required by HM Government.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4534  Respondent: 15456385 / Steven Colborne-Baber  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The housing numbers projected by the Council have not been substantiated by the Council, in spite of many requests, so the West Horsley Parish have carried out their own survey, that clearly suggests the figures to be wrong. The Green Belt must be retained as it stands today and each Planning Proposal should be judged on it's own merits. I voted Conservative when they came to office and they vowed to preserve the Green Belt, therefore I expect them to stand by that promise.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I am writing to object to the Local Plan. I live in West Horsley where the pressure on our locals schools, Doctors and other such amenities is huge. We do not have the infrastructure to support these plans. Please note my objection to this plan on these grounds.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Re My Objections to the new Guildford Local Plan are as follows;

-I do not believe the Council have demonstrated that ‘exceptional circumstances’ exist to justify ‘The Horsleys’ being removed from the Green Belt.

-I am not aware of any plans to materially improve the infrastructure re drainage, medical facilities etc to take account of the proposed increase in population.

-No sound reasons have been given for the proposed extension of the boundaries of the settlement areas of the Horsleys.

-The excessive number of new houses (593 new houses in the Horsleys within 5 Years of adopting the plan) proposed arising from a Strategic Housing Market Assessment(SHWA) that was generated by a consultant’s mathematical model, which is not revealed in the plan, nor apparently to Guildford Borough Council(GBC). I think this raises major doubts concerning the inflated number of new houses proposed by the SHWA and further increased by GBC.

I hope the Council will take my concerns into account during this consultation period.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
A39, A38, A40, A41

East Horsley, West Horsley:

I object to the over-development of East and West Horsley. These four proposed site selections will add approximately 445 housing units in what is presently green belt. This as over-development of these two neighbouring villages, with land being inset from the green belt for the sole purpose of meeting housing targets and a further urbanisation of the green belt between Leatherhead and Guildford. Site selections A39, A40, and A41 seem to have no logic, they do not follow easily identifiable boundaries and seems to be created for the sole purpose of artificially creating sites for development in the green belt. Sites 39 and 41 seem only to have development on one or two sides and are in open green belt and inappropriate for development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1884  Respondent: 15458593 / Jennifer Shute  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to tell you of my objections to the plans for more houses to be built in East and West Horsley. Firstly the Prime minister and conservative government said, on more than one occasion, “No ifs, no buts, no infringement into the green belt.

Furthermore, the plans contain no provision for new schools or medical facilities, both these are already over crowded.

I ask you to stick to your word and refuse these plans. The prime ministers also said that the ideal was to build whole new towns, in new areas with the requisite facilities

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1876  Respondent: 15459041 / Jennifer Hills  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Is it right that 30% of new homes are built in brownfield sites and 70% in Green Belt?

West Horsley is still a village but in great danger of becoming an urbanisation

The infrastructure is totally inadequate. I cannot park my car now at the station after 10am in the morning

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1878  **Respondent:** 15459329 / Patrick Wills  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am so sad for the village of West Horsley where I lived and was brought up.

The high density proposals will be an enormous burden on the infrastructure and the plan does not appear to address the provision for schools, surgery, roads, parking etc etc etc. A real worry

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1883  **Respondent:** 15459841 / Lorraine Tribe  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The proposed housing developments in West Horsley would completely overwhelm the village. Drainage would be a major concern as it is inadequate at present.

Similarly road and school capacity, station and village car parking capacity, doctors surgery and shops capacity would all be overwhelmed.

The proposed developments would be as out of place here as they would be in Send, the Clandons and Ockham village.

Any Major developments would be better placed in the west of the borough – Normandy, Ash and Tongham, where there is much more open land

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1901  **Respondent:** 15460289 / Nhora Riederer  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 regarding the impact of Guildford Borough Council’s current Draft Local Plan and in particular object to its impact on West/East Horsley and its immediate environment and its disregard for the existing designation of Green Belt Protected Areas for which I believe no valid case has been made or exceptional circumstances proven.

I think the demand for housing is artificially fuelled by people living longer and by the high level of immigration into the country. You should be building retirement homes not housing estates and the effects form the second issue needs to be look up following the country’s decision to leave the European Union.
I also object to the proposed changes to the village settlement boundaries in particular where there is no proposal to build new houses, I can not imagine what reason could there be? It is obviously a hidden agenda to permit further building in these areas at a later date without having to obtain separate approval in the future.

I should also like to state that the extent and number of new houses proposed in the Horsley’s, area is totally out of proportion to any local requirement, there is no industry or business case for increased housing on this scale which I think is about 40% increase in West Horsley’ if new housing is required it would be better to site it close to where that need really is.

The vast number of new residents commuting in and out of the area would put a massive additional burden on the existing road networks and transport infrastructure that is already buckling under the weight of lack of investment or maintenance by Guildford County Council – Have you tried driving down ‘Long Reach’, ‘Ripley Lane’, ‘The Street’, ‘East lane’ in winter? When flooded and is waisting on the sides.

Where are do the new residents on the proposed of houses are taking the children to school? It would put an unsustainable strain on the local schools. When we moved to this area 12 years ago we struggle getting our son into the local Primary School and there are annual arguments over catchment areas between the local villages just to get children into the nearest Secondary Schools. The proposals do not address these problems adequately they would just make them worse and mean parents would have to drive their children to schools many miles away. What about hospital and Dr surgery?

The increase in housing will also strain the services infrastructure, local sewage and drainage requirements are overloaded as can be seen after a heavy downpour water floods over Ripley Lane and The Street between the Railway Bridge and Long Reach due to many natural springs in the area. Localised flooding will of course be compounded by the proposed new homes the plans take no account of this.

A couple of years ago heavy construction lorries were employed at Jury Farm for a couple of months in Ripley Lane and the Road was structurally damaged as a consequence and has still not been satisfactorily repaired. Building in the local area on the scale proposed will never be made good by the construction companies lining up to build on nice Green Field Sites.

I note that in the latest version of the local plan that the Station Parade in East Horsley has been designated a District Centre which is incorrectly identifying the village facilities in order to justify inappropriate development of the area.

I urge the Council to-

a) Think again on a local scale and consider what is actually needed by the people living in the borough.

b) Go back to Central Government and seriously question the whole premise of this notional housing requirement. Do we really need so many houses in such a small area? when it will only compound the pressure on local facilities and have a major negative impact on the local environment, adversely affecting the quality of life of all those currently living around Guildford

I am sure that there is plenty of room for new housing and properties that could be refurbished in other parts of the country, without the impact to sensitive environmental and designated Green Belt or conservation areas where effort should be put to regenerate both jobs and industry supported by investment in affordable housing.
I really hope you take us serious and try to find a solution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4339</th>
<th>Respondent: 15460353 / Elizabeth Hewlett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 GUILDFORD BOROUGH PROPOSED SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN EAST & WEST HORSLEY (JUNE 2016)

I object very strongly to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016).

My main reasons are…

I object to the Local Plan as the following development proposed is not sustainable (Policy S1)

At least 148 more houses in East Horsley. At least 385 more houses in West Horsley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2227</th>
<th>Respondent: 15460545 / Tracy Salmon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

Outlined below are my objections to the Guildford Local Plan.

? West Horsley is defined by Guildford Council as a Green Belt Village.

? Policies in the Governments National Planning Framework (NPPF) require that new building is regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt.

? These Policies also say that only limited infilling with Housing is appropriate.

? Neither of these policies support substantial new development in the green belt.

? The Councils Proposals total some 500 new dwellings in the green belt, which is clearly contrary to the above policies.
Previous objections to the Local Plan by West Horsley residents have been totally ignored by the council, who have shown no community engagement in producing the current plan with the increase in housing and the expansion of the village contrary to their wishes.

In producing the new Local Plan larger sites are proposed west of Guildford to reduce the pressure on the green belt. No benefit is evident to the residents of West Horsley from this reappraisal and in fact an increased requirement for housing in their green belt is proposed.

The existing roads, schools and health facilities have no plan for funding set out in the plan to address 500 new houses.

Several of the new sites proposed extend the built area out into the countryside, which is clearly damaging to the Green Belt where any new building is regarded as inappropriate in government policy.

The council are proposing new village boundaries which extend the built area outwards into the green belt, again clearly damaging to the Green Belt where any new building is regarded as inappropriate in government policy.

The proposed new development has been focussed on West Horsley with no Special Purpose being defined as required by policy to promote development in the green belt.

The protection of Birds in the special protection area near Wisley requires special consideration within 5 km. All of the sites in West Horsley and the site at Wisley Airfield are within this 5km. Any new development requires the possible effect on the birds to be addressed by the provision of alternative open space to draw residents away from Wisley. Effingham Common has been identified to serve this purpose but in order to be usable for this purpose it requires a public car park which it has not got. Common Rights and planning permission issues may well stop this ever coming forward. This puts in doubt the feasibility of the sites in the long term.

For all of the above reasons I object to the Local Plan and request that the minister addresses the green belt points and confirms that West Horsley remains a green belt village, recognises the uncertainty relating to the protection of the birds and that as a result removes the pink coloured sites as development sites from the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4336  Respondent: 15460545 / Tracy Salmon  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please find below my objections to the Guildford Local Plan.

West Horsley is defined by Guildford Council as a Green Belt Village.

Policies in the Governments National Planning Framework (NPPF) require that new building is regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt.

These Policies also say that only limited infilling with Housing is appropriate.

Neither of these policies support substantial new development in the green belt.

The Councils Proposals total some 500 new dwellings in the green belt, which is clearly contrary to the above policies.
Previous objections to the Local Plan by West Horsley residents have been totally ignored by the council, who have shown no community engagement in producing the current plan with the increase in housing and the expansion of the village contrary to their wishes.

In producing the new Local Plan larger sites are proposed west of Guildford to reduce the pressure on the green belt. No benefit is evident to the residents of West Horsley from this reappraisal and in fact an increased requirement for housing in their green belt is proposed.

The existing roads, schools and health facilities have no plan for funding set out in the plan to address 500 new houses.

Several of the new sites proposed extend the built area out into the countryside, which is clearly damaging to the Green Belt where any new building is regarded as inappropriate in government policy.

The council are proposing new village boundaries which extend the built area outwards into the green belt, again clearly damaging to the Green Belt where any new building is regarded as inappropriate in government policy.

The proposed new development has been focussed on West Horsley with no Special Purpose being defined as required by policy to promote development in the green belt.

The protection of Birds in the special protection area near Wisley requires special consideration within 5 km. All of the sites in West Horsley and the site at Wisley Airfield are within this 5km. Any new development requires the possible effect on the birds to be addressed by the provision of alternative open space to draw residents away from Wisley. Effingham Common has been identified to serve this propose but in order to be usable for this purpose it requires a public car park which it has not got. Common Rights and planning permission issues may well stop this ever coming forward. This puts in doubt the feasibility of the sites in the long term.

For all of the above reasons I object to the Local Plan and request that the minister addresses the green belt points and confirms that West Horsley remains a green belt village, recognises the uncertainty relating to the protection of the birds and that as a result removes the pink coloured sites as development sites from the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1905  Respondent: 15460961 / Liz Hampshire  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 Local Plan.

As a teacher, I have a full-time job and so do not have the time or resources to respond to such a dense document. Where is the simplified version that ordinary people can understand?

It is not right that the plan prioritises development in green belt land when there is sufficient brownfield sites elsewhere in the Borough. Most people coming to the Borough wish to be close to urban centres, not stuck in rural dormitories, requiring smaller 2 or 3 bed accommodation, far more suited to an urban environment.

Also, in Horsley, the schools are full. Where are new families going to be educated? I would also point out that in and around Horsley, there is simply not the infrastructure to support the proposals, such as schools, transport, drainage, shops etc.

The proposal for Wisley Airfield will simply create a housing ghetto.
All in all, a shoddy, badly thought-out document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1944  Respondent: 15461985 / Laura Douet  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing in response to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites, June 2016. I object to the above plan.

I am a West Horsley resident, and have been my whole life. I am very concerned about the proposals. My parents moved here for the community life, and I fear that this lifestyle will be lost if the plans are approved, as the number of residences proposed will significantly change the character of West Horsley as a village.

The sites proposed in West Horsley are currently within established Green Belt. The policy on protection for the Green Belt is contained in section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which sets out the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy. Policy on development in Metropolitan Green Belt is set out in paragraphs 79 – 92 of the NPPF. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt and the NPPF states that it 'should not be approved except in very special circumstances'. No 'special circumstances' have yet been explained or detailed.

Local planning authorities are advised to 'regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt'. The Framework also states that a Green Belt review should only happen in 'exceptional circumstances'. This concept is further elaborated as being 'for example when planning for larger scale development such as new settlements or major urban extensions'. The Green Belt in Surrey is established with detailed boundaries; therefore 'exceptional circumstances' must be demonstrated to necessitate the change to its boundaries. Again, no 'exceptional circumstances' have yet been explained.

There are identified Brownfield sites in the borough which have not been seriously considered in the borough plan.

Policy P2 of the Guildford Plan states that Guildford Borough Council 'will continue to protect Metropolitan Green Belt against inappropriate development.' The expansion of West Horsley village is unsustainable for a few reasons.

The only entry to West Horsley from the A246 is The Street, which is narrow in places, and not in the best condition. The road surface would only get worse with increased traffic flow. It can be difficult to fit wider vehicles down certain parts of the road, and the necessity for more large vehicles to travel down it (increased bus services to serve more residents; more lorries carrying supplies to build houses) would not improve the situation.

Additionally, the roundabout connecting the A246 to The Street is very busy during school drop off and pick-up times, as Cranmore School is just off the roundabout. With increased volumes of traffic, the back up would only worsen, increasing journey times, not only for West Horsley residents, but for people trying to get from Guildford to Leatherhead and vice versa.

In West Horsley, there is only one small shop and no post office, and there is no where to expand the amenities to serve a larger population. East Horsley has many more shops which have always been well-used, but there are only limited parking spaces. Station Parade is populated by locally-owned and run businesses and these businesses could lose valuable custom if people cannot park close by.

Horsley railway station has always been a very busy station. The car park is usually full on week days. Unless it is expanded it will not support such a large increase in vehicles - at an exhibition about the proposed development of Wisley...
airfield, it was explained that there were no plans to expand it. There would also be increased traffic to & from the station to drop off & pick-up travellers including students going to schools in Guildford and Leatherhead.

The Medical Centre in East Horsley supports residents of both East and West Horsley, and it is currently at capacity - it cannot support the new patients that will move to the area should these plans go ahead. As well as extending the building (for which there is no space), more doctors would be required to care for residents.

In short, improving the village's infrastructure needs to be seriously considered before the building of more houses can be considered.

I support development - especially affordable and smaller houses, as I hope to one day be able to by a house of my own - but I do not support it at the cost of the community life I have been lucky enough to grow up in.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1947  Respondent: 15462081 / Tina Wyatt  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 Plan Proposals and Strategy site : June 2016

This small villages amenities only just copes with the residents it has. There are two small schools here , with very limited parking as it is . On rush hour morning traffic can tail back from Ripley Village High Street up to the Ockham motor way slip road.

The flooding would be of much greater risk too. As the proposals for three detached dwellings :R14/P/00012 on 27February 20014 Was refused. Such a High density development would put a big strain on local services and parking , Swamping our village changing its whole character

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1949  Respondent: 15462113 / Dorothy Ballentine  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a regular visitor to the Borough, I wish to submit my objections to the Local Plan.

My daughter and family live in the area, having moved to be nearer my son-in-law’s family who have lived there since the 40s. I have been visiting Horsley since the 90s and during this time the village has expanded immeasurably. The proposed development within the local plan would not change the Horsleys and the local villages for the better. I object to
the proposed housing development as it is not sustainable and will have an adverse effect on the surrounding communities, on East and West Horsley in particular. I object to the 35% increase in housing proposed in West Horsley: such a level of development would change the village forever and would simply not fit in with the character of the village and the current density of housing. Horsley simply cannot absorb this scale of development.

Traffic in the village has become a real issue in recent years and any significant developments in the area would be unacceptable and incur unsustainable pressure on roads and infrastructures. I have grandchildren in the village who can no longer ride their bikes on the roads for fear of a serious accident. The roads are simply not wide enough to accommodate the current traffic, and further congestion would be a disaster. I object to the local plan to build nearly 14,000 new homes in the borough as the additional traffic and congestion would be an accident waiting to happen, not to mention its adverse effect on air quality, which is already poor.

My experience of the local medical provision and schools indicates that little capacity is currently available and the proposed development would put increased pressure on already buckling health and education systems. With regards to education in particular, the local Raleigh School has waiting lists in every year group and as such could not accommodate additional children. The site has no room for expansion and yet plans for a new school are not indicated within the local plan.

I also strongly object to allowing development on green belt land. Green belt exists for reasons drawn up by UK law, including restricting urban sprawl, preserving the boundaries of neighbouring villages, safeguarding the countryside and preserving historic towns and villages like Horsley. Environmental issues are real and we must consider the long term impact of reckless building on precious green belt areas. All the development in Horsley will be on green belt land. How can this be a balanced plan?

Finally my understanding is that there needs to be an identified need for the level of housing, but a total of 14,000 houses planned over a 15 year timeframe during the period 2016-2031, is flawed and as yet not explained. The cited figure of a 35% increase in housing in West Horsley, much higher than in other areas, is not sustainable and must be revised.

As it currently stands, I object to the local plan for the reasons cited above.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1951  Respondent: 15462433 / Lesley Keable  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites June 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 submission local plan: strategies and sites June 2016. As a long term resident of West Horsley I am concerned about the impact on this village.

I understand the National Planning and Policy requires that new development must make due allowance for the character and density of housing in the proposed area and be suitably supported by infrastructure and local facilities. The scale of the plans for West Horsley make it a wholly unsuitable site for the scale of the proposed development, being a 35% increase in the number of houses.

West Horsley is unsuitable as it is

- a village of character and history, which would be irretrievably damaged by very large scale development on the scale proposed
- it is set amidst Green Belt land, large areas of which would be lost or affected, with currently a low density of housing whereas the proposed development areas would be of much higher density.

- the local roads are often largely rural in nature - often narrow, poorly maintained and with no footpaths in many areas. They already struggle to cope with the current traffic let alone a very substantial increase.

- the other infrastructure I and my family use or have used is already running at capacity whether it be the primary and secondary schools both of which are beyond their capacity (the Howard having being refused recent planning permission to build a larger school opposite the current one) the doctors surgery, the sports clubs, the station and the shopping facilities where parking is a problem now etc.

I also object that the scale of the proposed new housing at a 35% increase on the existing village appears to be so out of line with the proposals for other areas. Why select West Horsley for such an increase particularly when it's village infrastructure is so ill equipped to support it and it is self evidently harmful to precious Green Belt land? What exceptional reasons can be advanced for the destruction of this high quality Green Belt land?

I am also aware of the reasons why nearly 14,000 new homes are required in the area, or how this number has been arrived at. Whilst accepting that nationally new homes need to be built and this area of Surrey needs to take its share the scale of the local plans is simply not sustainable, and in an age where government funding is scarce, probably the more so post Brexit, it is impossible to imagine the necessary supporting infrastructural funding will be found.

For all the above reasons, and the many more that will be advanced by more informed residents and local bodies more familiar with the national and local planning regulations, I oppose and reject the local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1959  Respondent: 15462721 / Michael Clark  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to please register my objections to the proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt for the following reasons:

- The 'exceptional circumstances' required before taking this decision have not been demonstrated.
- No sound reasons have been given for the proposed changes, in particular the local infrastructure is overloaded - for instance the local football club is full and hence children have to travel elsewhere to play football. Similarly, medical services and car parks are operating at capacity.
- The potential development of thousands of new houses on Wisley Airfield is simply baffling given the complete inability of the local resources and infrastructure to cope - for instance have you ever tried to park at Effingham Junction Station? How do our narrow roads cope - is the Council proposing to upgrade roads, stations and build new facilities to cope with more than doubling the number of houses?
- The Horsleys have already outgrown the facilities, so proposing large numbers of new houses ignores the ability of the Horsleys to absorb them, for the sake of developers profits - note that the Wisley Airfield developers are a Cayman Islands company, presumably to avoid paying UK tax!

I ask that you please conduct a much more rigorous assessment of the proposal, which I believe will confirm the points above.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I am writing to object to proposals contained in the Guildford Borough Council New Local Plan 2016. I am a resident of West Horsley and I am really concerned about the impact of the significant level of proposed new development on our community and on our quality of life.

I am particularly concerned about the likelihood of increased flooding in our village as a result of this proposed development. Our local road, The Street in West Horsley, has a major flooding problem and development in West Horsley to the south of the railway line will just add to this flooding problem. I therefore object to the housing development proposals due to the likely impact on flooding. Since we have lived in West Horsley we have seen no improvement in the Council’s ability to deal with this flooding problem so I am very concerned that it will simply get worse with more housing developed in the area.

My children both attend the local primary school, the Raleigh School in West Horsley. It is already clear to me that the school’s infrastructure can barely cope with the existing number of children. With around 400 pupils already at the school, by way of examples, the playground and playing fields are far too small and when there are class assemblies, there is often insufficient room for all parents who turn up to fit into the assembly hall to watch their children.

When dropping off my children in the morning and picking them up in the afternoon, it is often a real problem to park near the school. Cars of parents are often parked on the pavements in the narrow roads surrounding the school which forces parents and children to walk into the roads to get to school, this is very unsafe and is not satisfactory. I object to any further housing development in the Horsleys due to the increased pressure that this will add to the Raleigh School and the surrounding roads.

I further object to the proposed level of new Housing development in the Horsleys due to the added strain this will place on our community of sports and social clubs. Many of our local sports and social clubs are over-subscribed and there are waiting lists to get our children into these clubs. This already means that many local children miss out on sport and social activities that they so very much want to do. More housing will make this problem worse and force children to join clubs further afield which will damage our community.

The proposed level of new housing development in the Horsleys will require a substantial number of heavy goods vehicle movements during the construction phases, which will last for years. The condition of many of our roads including The Street, East Lane and Long Reach in West Horsley and Ockham Road North, Ockham Road South and The Drift in East Horsley are already dreadful in many places and this is both dangerous (cycles and cars swerving) and costly in the damage that it causes to our vehicles and cycles.

Significant HGV movements that will be needed to facilitate these developments will make this position far worse. Since we have lived in West Horsley (over 4 years) we have seen no improvement in the condition of our local roads, but in fact a clear deterioration. In addition to the damage to our roads that HGVs will cause, I am also very concerned about the safety of community, especially children, in living in close proximity to these very large vehicles. Our roads are simply not large enough to cope with these large trucks, existing cars, the many cycles and many of the pavements are very narrow which is especially dangerous for older people and children. I therefore object to the housing proposals in the Horsleys due to the damage to our roads and pavements that it will cause and the very real safety risk to our communities.

I also object to the increased levels of pollution and dust that will be caused by HGV movements and the construction process itself in delivering hundreds of new homes in the Horsleys. My daughter has allergies to dust and airborne pollutants and I am very concerned that this will become worse in our villages if significant development occurs. I do not want us to become prisoners in our own homes.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2015  Respondent: 15466433 / Caspar Walker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The local plan has suggested a 35% increase in housing for West Horsley by 2022 and only 11% for Guildford town.

The village has no shops, no post office, no petrol station, no train station, no medical centre and a very limited bus service. It also offers no employment opportunities for residents. The national planning policy framework requires that new residential development must be limited in quantity by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities- this policy has been ignored in the Local plan.

The density of houses on the proposed sites is completely out of keeping with the rest of the village and will change the character of the village forever. The national Planning policy framework requires that new residential development must respect the character and density of housing in the area- this policy has been ignored in the local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2024  Respondent: 15468193 / Juliet Soley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to voice my grave concern for the proposed housing developments taking place around The Horsley's. I am totally opposed to the village’s removal from the Green Belt by insetting and extending the 003 Local Plan Settlement Area boundaries. est Horsley Parish is one of a rich and varied mix of all established lb housing density settlements with a considerable number of historic buildings. Positioned on the north side of the North Downs, partly in the Surrey Hills AONB, it attracts a considerable number of recreational visitors through the seasons each year. This added to your proposed circa 3,000 additional houses ill ensure the Village infrastructure falls apart.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2054  Respondent: 15472801 / Carmel Webb  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I live in London but come to visit my grandparents in West Horsley as often as I can when I am on holiday. It is a lovely village and so peaceful to come away from all the noise and traffic in Ealing where I live. I love to go walks with my cousins who also live in the village and see the horses in the fields. My Granddad and Grandma have told me that you want to build lots and lots of houses which will mean more cars and I think this will spoil the village which is really beautiful.

Where I live young people have plenty of things to do and there are tubes and buses which can take you where and when you want to go such as to friends, school, cinemas, shops clubs and other activities but West Horsley hardly any buses and none at weekend. Have you thought what all the extra children who would come to live in West Horsley would do unless their parents had cars and would be prepared to take them to places where they wanted to go to? Also where would they go to school since my grandparents have told me that the school in the village is already full and so is the senior school in the next village.

I love to visit and enjoy being in the country, but if I had to come to live in this village after you had built all those extra houses then I do not think I would be very happy since there would not be much for me to do.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2091  **Respondent:** 15476353 / Jake Smith  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I believe that the local plan for the Horsleys is a terrible idea. Not only will the roads not be able to cope, and the train station being too small with no room to expand, but this will be building on the green belt which the elected government promised to protect. There are plenty of brown sites available to build on and so this is simply unacceptable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/214  **Respondent:** 15478209 / Sally Daboo  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

**Policies A37, 38, 40, 42, 44 & 45 – My Objections**

Some 295 houses in various smaller developments in West Horsley, 100 in Send and 15 in Ripley. These will generate traffic on the A 247 to access the A3.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2134  **Respondent:** 15478497 / Enid Woodford  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

...
I wish to object to the number of new houses proposed in the new Local Plan. I think that integrating the huge number of new residents would be almost impossible as the local facilities such as the Medical Centre, Schools, and indeed the roads themselves, are already under great pressure. Some things like car parking at the Railway Station cannot be made bigger as there is no space available.

I also feel that any building that does take place should be infill building, and not seen from the roads through the village, as this would not alter the look of the village too dramatically.

I am also against your suggestion that we should be removed from the Green Belt as I believe this would in time lead to extensive building on our open fields and green areas.

I know that we must have some new homes built but not in the numbers you are suggesting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
should be a 30 mile an hour zone, but where cars in reality drive much faster. In a village where people regularly walk
dogs and walk to children to and from school etc, a serious accident would just be waiting to happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2225  Respondent: 15482273 / Sally Markwell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

As a resident of West Horsley I would like to register my objection to the new Guildford Plan.

I object to the proposal for the following reasons;

• I feel that tinkering with the green belt boundaries, to extend land available for building houses, is a travestying
misuse of power
• The Green Belt was agreed to protect the beautiful countryside and the unique character of villages such as East
and West Horsley and preserve it for future generations I object to this misuse of power.
• The local infrastructure is unable to cope with the proposed number of new residents; schools and primary
healthcare would all be affected by an increase in the population negatively impacting on the well-being of
residents.
• Current residents have difficulty securing places for their children in primary schools.
• The number of vehicles using local roads is currently pushing the boundaries of acceptability and increase would
quickly tip the balance creating danger for children, young people and other vehicles.
• The kind of machinery needed for extensive building increases the dangers, in particular Tipper Trucks
employed to remove earth are often driven very dangerously and at great speed.
• The roads are already in need of repair; damage caused by the increased volume of building related traffic would
be devastating.

I believe the New Guildford Plan lacks probity and does not concede any ground to the residents concerns registered in
past consultations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2226  Respondent: 15482337 / David Bound  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 changes to Green Belt area.

I am particularly concerned with the over development proposed for the Horsleys, Send, Ripley and the proposals for the
Wisley Airfeld.

Such overdevelopment will change the character of the area beyond all recognition. The proposed removal of the
Horsleys from the Green belt would leave the area to the mercy of developers.
The green belt is essential to maintain an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure pursuits can flourish. This is exactly what has happened here and with the ever increasing outward pressure from London, it is even more important that the countryside is preserved for all to enjoy.

Brownfield sites in the surrounding towns should be developed before open countryside is decimated.

The ensuing increase in traffic along wholly unsuitable narrow lanes will lead to a increased likelihood of accidents with the many cyclists enjoying this area.

Huge demand will be placed on local services which are already stretched.

It will turn this part of Surrey into another anonymous urban sprawl.

With greater creativity and thought, I am sure a balance can be achieved between the needs for housing and preserving the countryside for future generations.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2237</th>
<th>Respondent: 15482657 / S Harkin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 our villages being taken out of the Green Belt. This is an area of outstanding beauty for all to enjoy including those who live in towns.

The infrastructure is not there for increased use of poorly maintained roads. Overfull schools, shortage of car parks.

The drainage is poor with flooding in many places when it rains heavily.

I do wonder whether people from planning actually come and look at the area in question.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2303</th>
<th>Respondent: 15483809 / Garret &amp; Sinead Tynan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 Guildford Borough Council Proposed Local Plan (June 2016).

We wish to register our objection to the draft Local Plan. More specifically, we wish to object to the removal of East and West Horsley from the Greenbelt and to the proposed developments in these villages and the surrounding areas for reasons outlined further below.

The Local Plan fails to take due consideration of the detrimental impact such extensive development will have on transport, local roads and road safety. The proposals will have a
materially negative impact on the quality of life for existing residents. We specifically object to:

(i) Traffic and parking: Assuming that every new house has at least 2 cars, this means potentially 6,000 more cars within a three mile radius of East and West Horsley. For example, parking at Horsley & Effingham junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the medical centre and at the village halls will all be affected.

(ii) The significant increase in traffic will cause severe congestion on the local narrow rural roads (which are already busy). This will be exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements.

(iii) The increased traffic will pose a danger to local cyclists and pedestrians given that there is an absence of cycling paths and lack of pedestrian footpaths (and no space to provide them).

(iv) The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

(v) The large increase in volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment - already a cause for concern in several areas in the Borough.

(vi) Local Road Network: In respect of the proposals for development at Wisley Airfield and for an upgrade the current A3 junction at Burntcommon to a full 4-way junction, SCC traffic modelling anticipates increased use of Guileshall Lane, Hungry Hill Lane and Tithebarns Lane for traffic accessing the A3 at Burntcommon in order to travel to Guildford and beyond. The SCC report states that "consequently, it indicates that further thought may have to be given to managing traffic in this area as part of a transport assessment should the development be progressed". It appears that the Plan is proposing a strategic site at Wisley Airfield without having given due consideration to the improvements which will be needed to the local road infrastructure. If that is the case for Wisley Airfield, then it is almost certainly true for the proposed developments in East and West Horsley as well.

We object on the grounds that local primary and secondary schools are already at capacity with no immediate plans for expansion. No extra places are planned in the Horsleys, and the school places proposed at Wisley Airfield are not planned until many years into the project.

We object on the grounds that the East Horsley Medical Practice is already operating at (or close to) capacity and there are no provisions in the plan for addressing this.

Flooding: The site behind Ockham Road North in East Horsley is partially a level 3 flood risk area, and local residents are well aware of how much standing water there is in their gardens after rain. Building on such land will only exacerbate the problem. Furthermore, the existing drainage system cannot cope, evidenced by the river which materialises on Ockham Road North following heavy rain.

We object to the removal of East and West Horsley from the Greenbelt. Taken together with other sites such as the former Wisley Airfield (also known as Three Farm Meadows), Greenbelt status serves a vital role in protecting against urban sprawl from London. Under the National Planning Policy Framework, no exceptional circumstances have been established to warrant removing the land from the Metropolitan Green Belt.

We object to the disproportionate allocation of housing in this particular part of the borough. More than 23% of the Plan's new housing is proposed for the immediate localities of Ockham, Ripley, Send and the Horsleys.

We object to the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to the environmental and ecological value of the former Wisley Airfield site, in relation to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI). Serious concerns about this site have been raised by a broad number of authoritative sources across the UK, including Highways England, Thames Water, NATS and the Environment Agency.

We object to the continued inclusion of the former Wisley Airfield/Three Farm Meadows site - where the planning application has already been unanimously rejected by GBC's
Planning Committee. After 14 months of consideration (and various extensions and amendments), Wisley Property Investments Ltd's planning application was unanimously rejected by GBC on 6th April 2016 on the recommendation of GBC Planning Officers, who cited the same grave concerns highlighted in this letter. We would also note that the projections for economic and population growth were formed before the "Brexit" referendum result was known. Given the potential impact the result is expected to have on the economy and population growth (including migration), we object to developments which fundamentally alter the nature of the local area while relying on outdated projections which possibly now need to be significantly revised downwards.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2317  Respondent: 15484193 / Fergus Johnson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

To whom it may concern,

As a resident of West Horsley I would like to strongly object to the proposed plan to build additional houses on the green belt in and around Horley.

The character of the village would be total changed and we have too few green areas near London as it is and no more should be lost to housing when there are other options available.

Kind regards,

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2327  Respondent: 15485313 / Richard P. Bell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I often stay with my sister Anne at the above address and have done so for the last 30 years. It is a true pleasure to roam around this lovely area of Surrey. So green and verdant. A true gem.

I was upset to hear of the proposed building by Guildford Borough Council to build so many houses in the Horsley area. Over 2000 on Ripley Airfield and over 500 in the Horsley area.

I find the situation appalling to even consider. My reasons are:-

The local roads will not be able to sustain another 4000 cars

The trains to London will have to board another 1400 people
Where are 1400 people going to park their cars?

There is no local Bus service

The local schools will not be able to take another 2000 children

I am told by locals that the local Medical Centre are full to capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I Object to your local plan as currently proposed for the Horsleys

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I have read your proposed local plan and particularly the suggestions with regard to East and West Horsley – including Wisley airfield.

I fully understand the need for a steady increase in new housing to meet the demands of a growing population. But your plan seems far too aggressive in its proposal to increase the size of settlement areas such as East Horsley and to effectively take the village out of the green belt. Based on previously declined proposals for Wisley airfield I fail to see how you could find a workable proposal to put a new town on this site without the essential amenities – it would become a strange ghetto.

The Horsleys should contribute to meeting the need for increased housing in the borough. But this should be done in a way that is sensitive to the current environment and without any need to remove green belt ‘status’.

I Object to your local plan as currently proposed for the Horsleys.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I would like to object to the housing plan for the Horsley’s
For taking Horsley out of the greenbelt, lack of planned infrastructure and doubt over the proposed housing numbers

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2348  Respondent: 15485729 / Rica Jepsen  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

I wish to object to the above proposed Local Plan which affects the Horsleys.

My reasons for objection are as follows:

1. Both West Horsley and East Horsley villages will be removed from the Green Belt and there is legal no justification for this approach to be adopted.
2. The proposed new homes to be built within a very short space of time will increase the burden on the existing infrastructure including inadequate roads, car parking, local schools and medical facilities. In addition, there is also inadequate drainage to deal with wastewater and surface water and many places suffer flooding when there is heavy rainfall.
3. The density of the proposed development appears to concentrate on three major development sites in West Horsley which will completely destroy the rural village effect of West Horsley. I have lived in West Horsley since 1979 and I have specifically chosen to stay in West Horsley where there are open fields retaining the rural feel of the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2367  Respondent: 15486817 / O.J. Howe  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

I am 29 years old and have lived in Horsely most of my life and I write to object to the above proposed new local plan and what you propose to do with taking land out of the green belt to create additional housing in West Horsely of up to 385 homes.

This is totally unfair for everyone that lives in the village- what right do you have to propose a plan that does not account for the views of the local residents?

These proposals will have massive detrimental effect on our homes and our lives. All the initial consultation on the strategy and the various objections appear to have been ignored.
West Horsley as a village does not have the facilities for the population to be increased by this amount. The school is oversubscribed and so is the medical centre.

I therefore strongly object to this proposal.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPA16/2383  Respondent: 15488001 / Mark Batterbury  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am a resident in West Horsley and I wish to inform you of my very strong objection to this village and surrounding areas being taken out of the Green Belt. The plans for development will destroy everything that makes the Horsleys a wonderful place to live. I moved to the area last year purely on the basis of the setting of the village, the community, the relatively small population and of course the beautiful countryside.

I previously lived within the M25 with its large estates, pollution, high levels of traffic and crime. I certainly do not want Horsley to go the same way, which would be inevitable if removed from the green belt.

The village is already struggling to provide for its current residents i.e. parking at the doctors surgery is always very difficult, schools over-subscribed and some of the roads are in a dangerous state (East Lane being a prime example)

I STRONGLY OBJECT to Horsley being removed from the Green Belt and to the proposed planning developments.

Please do not destroy one of only a few areas of outstanding beauty. I fully appreciate the need for more housing and for it to be affordable housing, but I think it more appropriate to expand already existing urban areas rather than destroy country villages

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2392  Respondent: 15495265 / Stephen McGuckin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 Sites A36 to A41 (East and West Horsley)

The Spatial Vision proposes… ‘To protect the existing character of the borough through the clear distinction between urban and rural areas and safeguarding the natural, built and historic environment.’ Furthermore, the Spatial Vision promises that the…. ‘Preferred location for this development is existing brownfield sites’

Please explain how the proposed development of 533 new homes in these small villages will maintain a clear distinction between the urban and rural, will safeguard the natural, built and historic environment and utilises existing brownfield sites.

Of course when the development of 2000 new homes at Wisley Airfield only two miles away is included then Guildford Borough Council will have created a new urban area which will have destroyed the character of the existing villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I would like to take this opportunity to express my views of your proposed developments in the village in which I live (West Horsley) and it's surrounding areas.

I, like many other villagers moved here (30 years ago) deliberately because of the green belt and the village settings. Over the years I have seen modernisations and developments of the area but I feel extremely strongly about this latest proposed plan due to its size - East & West Horsley and the other villages detailed in your scheme would become more like towns than villages without adequate infra structure in place nor the ability to extend or develop the necessary infra structure to meet the proposed requirements. The effect on the roads -lots of them currently in poor condition with pot holes therefore the impact of heavy machinery to construct the developments alone would be extremely detrimental to the roads, then combine this with the extra traffic long term due to volume of people, would create chaos especially in current bottle necks, created by previous expansion, at peak times especially. The roads around the villages are narrow and many of them built up on either side yet some of the developments in the proposed plan intend to increase traffic on these, turning them into main throughfares as opposed to the country lanes to gain access only to the houses they were constructed for and in some instances with a knock on effect on roads adopted by the residents; totally unacceptable!. The safety of drivers, pedestrians and cyclist will be put at risk due to the proposed volume of vehicles- some roads have no pavements, the bends in the roads make it hazardous as it is for drivers and cyclist alike (whose numbers have hugely increased, more so recently, if these developments go ahead it will be an accident waiting to happen. Rarely a day goes by now without hearing one of the emergency services dashing along the A246 this has only come about in recent years due to the increases of population. Some of the sites chosen for development are on busy bends and even of the approaches are not directly on these roads they will clog up the narrow village roads leading up to them!

The schools are already enlarging their buildings to accommodated expected increases in current numbers and their sites are restricted to how much if any further development would be possible. The village school has been sold for housing in the past so even this will not be an option for taking some year groups of pupils. The entrances to both the Raleigh and The Howard of Effingham are in a built up area that currently struggles to cope with the increased volume!

As for the knock on effect on the other amenities/services such as the Doctors surgeries, shops, library, car parking to enable use of the amenities, railway travel and utilities it will be put a tremendous strain on already overburdened services.

I would therefore request that the proposed plans for the villages are carefully reconsidered for the above mentioned reasons and would ask that the nature of our chosen villages are not allowed to be destroyed/changed for ever.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

In response to the new local plan 2016 for the Horsley development sites, I would like to strongly object for the following reasons.

1. **The greenbelt**: Removing green spaces and removing this area from the green belt is a *permanent, irreversible* action that will impact us and many generations in the future. This will destroy the beauty, and be a real tragedy for the
environment, particularly considering there are many brownfield sites in the country that one could use for development. An entire new infrastructure will need to be created to cope with the massive increase in homes - this could therefore happen elsewhere, where no natural beauty will be needlessly destroyed.

I do understand that there is a need for housing, but cannot fathom why it needs to be here. Particularly considering my next point:

2. Infrastructure: The Horsleys cannot realistically cope with the proposed increased population: the narrow roads, limited parking, sewage systems, drainage, the already full train station parking lot, to name just a few. Where would an additional (minimum of) 533 cars go?

3. Schooling: A significant personal objections is that I live within 2 miles of the local school and my child cannot get in, due to it's increasing over subscription. By no stretch of the imagination will Horsley be able to school any more children. This is a great pity as it stands already. Why would we want to make this any worse??

4. This is a peaceful village: with a wonderful sense of community, a treasure so uncommon in today's world. People move and stay here to enjoy and appreciate the quieter village lifestyle. The development of chain stores and other facilities would ruin it for the existing and proposed homes.

I hope that you will kindly consider these points.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2455  Respondent: 15498209 / Wendy Smith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing with respect to the GBC draft Local plan which I strongly oppose.

I strongly disagree with building on Green belt land.

In no way would the current infrastructure support the number of houses proposed in East and West Horsley. Horsley station is already congested. The medical centre is barely sufficient for the number of people already living here. The Raleigh school is bursting at it's seems. The roads could not cope with such a traffic increase.

I appreciate the need for housing however, I think it is important that we protect the green belt for generations to come. I love London but I chose to move out to the Horsleys to give my children green open spaces and the chance to be brought up within a small rural community.

I sincerely hope that you take account of this letter, and of the many other people who I know are unhappy with your local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4337  Respondent: 15498273 / Naomi Salmon  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Please find below my objections to the Guildford Local Plan.

West Horsley is defined by Guildford Council as a Green Belt Village.

Policies in the Governments National Planning Framework (NPPF) require that new building is regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt.

These Policies also say that only limited infilling with Housing is appropriate.

Neither of these policies support substantial new development in the green belt.

The Councils Proposals total some 500 new dwellings in the green belt, which is clearly contrary to the above policies.

Previous objections to the Local Plan by West Horsley residents have been totally ignored by the council, who have shown no community engagement in producing the current plan with the increase in housing and the expansion of the village contrary to their wishes.

In producing the new Local Plan larger sites are proposed west of Guildford to reduce the pressure on the green belt. No benefit is evident to the residents of West Horsley from this reappraisal and in fact an increased requirement for housing in their green belt is proposed.

The existing roads, schools and health facilities have no plan for funding set out in the plan to address 500 new houses.

Several of the new sites proposed extend the built area out into the countryside, which is clearly damaging to the Green Belt where any new building is regarded as inappropriate in government policy.

The council are proposing new village boundaries which extend the built area outwards into the green belt, again clearly damaging to the Green Belt where any new building is regarded as inappropriate in government policy.

The proposed new development has been focussed on West Horsley with no Special Purpose being defined as required by policy to promote development in the green belt.

The protection of Birds in the special protection area near Wisley requires special consideration within 5 km. All of the sites in West Horsley and the site at Wisley Airfield are within this 5km. Any new development requires the possible effect on the birds to be addressed by the provision of alternative open space to draw residents away from Wisley. Effingham Common has been identified to serve this propose but in order to be usable for this purpose it requires a public car park which it has not got. Common Rights and planning permission issues may well stop this ever coming forward. This puts in doubt the feasibility of the sites in the long term.

For all of the above reasons I object to the Local Plan and request that the minister addresses the green belt points and confirms that West Horsley remains a green belt village, recognises the uncertainty relating to the protection of the birds and that as a result removes the pink coloured sites as development sites from the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4162  **Respondent:** 15501217 / Luke Sarti  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**
I OBJECT to the disproportionate amount of development in this small area of the borough; The area surrounding East and West Horsley will attract in excess of 5000 new homes, which accounts for over thirty-six percent of development. The area is predominantly rural in structure, nature and environment and does not have the infrastructure to cope.

I OBJECT to the disproportionate increase in housing in West Horsley. The local plan proposes an increase of thirty-five percent for a rural village, this is totally out of character. The density suggested by the council is not in keeping with the current environment, almost double the levels within the majority of the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2495  Respondent: 15502465 / Mark Bourner  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 local plan for the Horsley villages. I live in East Horsley and object on the following points:

1. **Removal of the Horsleys from the Green Belt** – The Green Belt was put in place to stop towns and villages running into huge unbroken settlements. I feel it is wrong for our council to over-turn a national environmental protection scheme to meet inflated housing quotas. The removal of the Horsleys is an arbitrary decision with no logical basis and is a needless destruction of a historic village. The national plan states that Green Belt land may be removed in ‘exceptional circumstances’ No exceptional circumstances have been presented within the plan to justify this act. Building on Greenfield sites in the UK is significantly cheaper than developing Brownfield sites and the decision to build large tracts of houses rather than infilling or developing these smaller sites is purely economic. Developing smaller sites is good for the local economy, supporting local developers and generating sustainable jobs in the local area. Large developments will import labour and export profits.

2. **Significant changes to the character of the village** - The plan aims to build 593 new houses within the Horsleys and a further 2000 between the Horsleys and the A3 at Wisley Airfield. The national plan definition for Green Belt infill states that gaps in housing within villages can be in-filled and villages can be expanded so as not to alter their character. I have no objection to this sensible approach to development within the village and recent developments including the development near the Horsley railway station have been in keeping and at a scale which does not alter the village character. The proposed plan would irreversibly alter the character of the village, increasing the number of houses and population by over 50%, turning what is a busy and thriving village into a gridlocked satellite town with insufficient amenities and infrastructure.

3. **Infrastructure concerns** – Despite living in East Horsley only a short distance from the Raleigh school, my oldest son was ineligible for a place in reception, as the school was filled from a catchment less than a mile from the school. If we have an additional 600 houses, or roughly 600-1200 children, the pressure on places will be even more extreme.

Ockham Road south, the major thoroughfare of East Horsley is already overloaded and leads to significant queues at rush hour to get through the village and onto the A246. This leads to people taking huge risks to get onto the 246, as they are so fed up they pull out just in front of oncoming traffic. It is a major accident waiting to happen. Also, the road is so narrow that when a bus and a lorry meet on this road, it all comes to a grinding halt which results in significant congestion and pollution in the village. The plan aims to build an additional 3000 homes within a 3 mile radius of the Horsley’s and the current road system is just not able to cope with this additional load. There is no indication of how construction would occur (how many additional lorries)!

---
Horsley station car parks are already full and cannot deal with increased numbers. Trains to Waterloo are full and adding an additional station and houses will just add to this issue. There is not sufficient capacity on the Guildford-Surbiton-Waterloo rail network to cope with the additional housing. It only takes one late train on a weekday morning to cause chaos on this route leading to dangerous overcrowding of trains and platforms. I do not see this addressed in the plan at all and therefore it lacks understanding of basic infrastructure needs.

Adding slip roads to the A3 will further increase congestion. The junction with the M25 is a dangerous intersection and adding a slip road in this area will cause additional accidents with traffic filtering onto congested inner lanes with

1. **Major doubts concerning housing numbers** - The inflated number of new houses proposed arises from a SHMA that has not been shared as part of the local plan. This SHMA target housing number if further increased by GBC to give a population increase which is almost 70% higher than official national estimates for population growth in the borough. There is simply no need for the number of houses projected.

1. **Flooding** - During the heavy winter rains we have experienced over the past couple of years the Horsley area has suffered with terrible flooding, which particularly affect the main roads though the village which all flood. With additional building and additional cars, this issue and the congestion it causes will get much worse. Storm water management in the area is at capacity and I have personally witnessed backup of sewer systems and the forcing off of drain covers due to the lack of capacity for rain events. This causes polluted discharge into the local rivers from the sewer system leading to long term environmental damage. The increased housing will further reduce the permeable surface, even considering modern paving and surfacing technology. Much of this excess peak flow will end up in local streams and rivers and significantly increases the risk of flash floods, maybe not in our borough, but certainly in those downstream.

1. **Designation of East Horsley as a ‘District Centre’** - I understand that a district centre can be described as 'a LARGE group of shops, together with supporting non-retail facilities and services. They normally feature not less than 50 units'. We are a village with a handful of shops and therefore should not be classed as a district centre. The parking in the village for shopping consists of a single row of spaces in front of the shops and an area for around 4 cars to the side of the Budgens store. This area is already congested and increasing demand by 50% would cause gridlock in the village.

1. **Plan omissions** - Within the local plan I would expect to see a vision for sustainable growth which includes the infrastructure required to support the proposal and the impact on peoples health and the environment. The current plan is about meeting housing quotas which are at the top end of forecasts, with no thought for the impact of the proposal on the environment or on the people living in these areas. There is no clear plan on how capacity for water, waste water, and electricity will be met and the impacts to storm water management within the borough and the incidental impacts to other boroughs such as Elmbridge and Mole Valley through increased instantaneous river volumes. I would like to see average traffic volumes and speeds forecast in the plan and the resulting impact to air quality and life expectancy for local residents especially those suffering from COPD and asthma. The implementation of this plan will lead to higher incidence of environmentally triggered respiratory disease and will decrease the overall appeal of living in the Guildford area. If you envisage the future with this plan implemented in the Horsleys you will see a grid-locked, polluted suburb where there was once a very pleasant community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4543  Respondent: 15503041 / Anne Williams  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Horsley and the surrounding areas are quiet rural villages and we are FULL. The roads in Horsley are constantly being repaired due to all the pot holes caused by too much traffic.

The Medical Centre is full, the schools are full and the trains are full during rush hour. There will be insufficient parking space and our Bus service is inadequate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2529  Respondent: 15503937 / Justin Thorne  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objection to Horsleys Draft Local Plan and removal of Horsleys from the Green Belt

I object to the proposed development of the Horsleys for the following reasons;

- The road and rail infrastructure would not cope with an increase traffic. The local roads are already water logged and full of pot holes and are not developed enough for any more traffic. The access to the A3, should the Wisley proposal go ahead, would be impossible at peak times of the day.
- The infrastructure within the Horsleys is not capable of withstanding a huge increase to it’s current population. Namely, the doctor’s surgery and car parks within the village would be over subscribed. Although, my family does not use the local school, I would imagine this to be full to capacity too.
- There is no reason to remove the Horsleys from Green Belt status. No exceptional circumstances have been given and as such, the Horsleys should remain Green Belt.
- The proposed percentage increase to such a small village, appears excessive and alarming and would affect the core of the village life itself. I have lived in the village for almost seven years and my above concerns are because of the personal and local knowledge, built up over this time.

I hope you take my concerns into consideration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3924  Respondent: 15503969 / Katy Denham  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It is fundamental that there are no grounds for East and West Horsley to be taken out of the Green Belt. I object to the extension of the settlement boundaries by the redrawn insetting boundary. These can only be to try and make more land available for what has been shown to be inappropriate development and included in an enormous document so that they will probably be missed by residents. I particularly object to the inclusion of Kingston Meadows, land owned by GBC and previously dedicated as open space for the use and benefit of the community. No change to the settlement boundary has been justified. I object to the inclusion in the Plan of six large housing sites in the two villages (A36 - 41). They should be removed from the Plan as they are contrary to the Green Belt and to include them preempts proper decision making.
In addition I draw your attention to the very serious existing problems in the village with infrastructure - roads, flooding and drainage, sewage, etc - and facilities - schools, doctors, failing businesses, no useful buses, to mention just a few. For these reasons a large increase in housing is not feasible. It would also destroy the character of the village. For all the reasons given above, I am against any additions to housing in East and West Horsley.

I object to the revised Settlement Hierarchy with another meaningless tick box exercise. East Horsley is not a rural district centre within any ordinary meaning of the phrase. People do not come from outlying area to East Horsley for shopping or work, they go to Guildford, Dorking, Leatherhead or other urban areas, including Surbiton, Kingston and London. East Horsley is not suitable for town centre type developments and I object to these policies (E8).

I object to the revised Settlement Hierarchy with another meaningless tick box exercise. East Horsley is not a rural district centre within any ordinary meaning of the phrase. People do not come from outlying area to East Horsley for shopping or work, they go to Guildford, Dorking, Leatherhead or other urban areas, including Surbiton, Kingston and London. East Horsley is not suitable for town centre type developments and I object to these policies (E8).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2650  
Respondent: 15508225 / John Allan  
Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to your proposal to increase the number of houses in the villages of West and East Horsley by about 500.

My reasons for objecting are firstly the local infrastructure is already severely overloaded and more importantly there is no land other than Green Belt available.

Should this plan go ahead the pleasant village life experienced in these two villages will be carelessly wasted all for what will at be at best a brief respite from further creaping urbanisation.

For the above reasons I urge you to reconsider your Local Plan proposals and resubmit them to better reflect the wishes of your local constituents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2655  
Respondent: 15508961 / Abby Allen  
Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extension of the boundaries of the settlement areas of the Horsleys - no sound reasons have been given for this proposal.

I strongly object to the proposal to develop Green Belt land for housing, particularly sites A37, A38, A39, A40 and A41. All of which play an important part in the character of the Horsleys, in terms of the green and leafy environment. The requirement for this many new houses in the Horsleys has not been demonstrated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPA16/2678  Respondent: 15568545 / Eleanor Bound  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have grown up in Horsley and strongly object to the new plans for increasing the number of housing to the area and removing us from the green belt. The green belt was put in place to protect rural areas from development so I find it bizarre that such intensive urbanisation is being purposed in an area that has previously been categorised as an region worth conserving. The roads are already overcrowded and, at peak times, fail to cope with the volume of traffic and size of larger veichals. This issue will be magnified if these plans go through. Doctors surgeries and schools are already struggling with numbers.

Moreover, many people from the city move out to places, such as horlsey, to escape from busy city life and enjoy the picturesque surroundings found in the Green belt. Not only is it a stunning location for city workers to set up a family life, but Surrey's countryside is often used as day trips for Londoners. Small villages such as Shere, which recieve many tourists due to its classic English village feel, will no longer posses they're traditional charm but be transformed into heavily developed and overcrowded centres; no longer appealing to tourists. We don't want london to end up like cities in America, such as LA, which expanse over huge areas with no clear Center and boundaries.

I don't want to see this beautiful area be ruined so strongly object to these new plans.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2681  Respondent: 15568865 / Lawrence Catt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 express my views and concerns regarding your plans for building development in East and West Horsley.

Having been born and living in West Horsley for 48 years, I have noticed many changes over the years in regards to a lack of smaller housing and infrastructure.

Though I believe there is a need for housing, I also believe your quantities of houses and time scales are far to brutal (ie: an increase of 35% I believe) for the current infrastructure ie: Shops, Roads, schools, doctors appointments, parking etc.

I think a more prudent approach to new houses and building timescales will allow problematic local issues to arise in a more controllably fashion, and therefore will be resolved more easily.

Which in turn will be less traumatic for current residents and future one

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2687  Respondent: 15569025 / Nic Clarke  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2692</th>
<th>Respondent: 15569249 / Nick Fox</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 the proposed housing planning and number of houses in the Horsley area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is totally unacceptable, far too many as the infrastructure cannot cope. I worry this is a proposal to get through some houses which I would also object to, as we cannot cope with anymore houses in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So please I do not wish any houses to be built at all.</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>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/271</th>
<th>Respondent: 15570081 / Mark Stevenson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 am writing to raise objections to the proposals set out in the above document. In particular, the proposals for sites A41 and A38 in the 'Sites' section of the Plan, appear to be at odds with Policy P2 (p42) and with the Council's obligations to retain local distinctiveness and to conserve and enhance the natural environment (as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework NPPF).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site A41 is an area of sheep-grazed pasture adjoining an area of ancient semi-natural woodland to the east and south.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The area is very clearly an integral part of the green belt landscape of sheep and cattle grazed pasture, with blocks of deciduous woodland, which forms a coherent landscape that stretches to the North Downs AONB. Policy P2 (p42) of the Plan allows for limited infilling, but the proposals for site A41 aren't infilling anything other than the landscape of woodland and pasture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In addition, the ancient semi-natural woodland which adjoins A41 is listed on Natural England's priority habitat inventory, which shows the locations of habitats of principal importance (which can be viewed here: Magic Map Application.) The site is already in poor condition due to illegal construction of cycle tracks and jumps, which is denuding the characteristic flora of ancient woodland. All public bodies have a duty to conserve habitats of principal importance under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act. The Plan does not articulate how the Council intends to discharge this duty. In fact the Plan does not even register the nature conservation interest of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site A41 suffers from similar issues. Whilst an argument could be constructed that the southern part of the site might constitute limited in-filling, the northern part of the site clearly extends the village boundaries and intrudes once more into the blocks of woodland and pasture that make up the characteristic green belt landscape.

As the largest proposed development in the West Horsley area (135 homes), the site seems completely out of proportion to the surrounding village. Longreach is a tiny lane, and the area has a rural character. Construction of 125 house would appear to be at odds with Policy D1 as set out in the plan. D1 states that all new developments will:

1. be designed to facilitate and promote walking, providing a high quality environment for pedestrians, and where possible allowing short walking distances to amenities
2. promote and reinforce local distinctiveness to create a sense of place, with innovative architecture encouraged and supported in the appropriate context

Site A41 will simply create more journeys. It is too far to walk to the shops or to the station. In addition, the area is locally distinctive because it is rural. 125 house will change the character - the site will lose its distinctiveness.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4418  **Respondent:** 15570081 / Mark Stevenson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to express strong disapproval of the plans to remove West and East Horsley villages from the Green Belt and to build 485 new homes here.

We moved to West Horsley 6 years ago, as we were looking for a semi-rural location in which to bring up our young family, with all the benefits of low traffic, outdoor amenities and countryside, a small village school and a village community feel. The Horsley's are characterised by varied housing and buildings of historic value, with small green pockets of land in between, including ancient woodland and pastures. Green spaces are never far away. Under the current proposals, this would be irretrievably lost.

In addition, I do not believe that the infrastructure - the roads, drainage, schools, shops, parking, GPs, existing amenity areas - could cope with a 35% increase in housing over 5 years. The huge increase in the numbers of cars would destroy the quiet feel of the village and make travelling around and through the village very difficult and time consuming.

I accept the need for some more housing locally, but this needs to be in keeping with its Green Belt location and the size and character of the village.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2777  **Respondent:** 15573825 / James Clarke  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing with concerns regarding proposals for the Horlsey Villages. These are some points I would like to make.
• Why have GREENBELT in the first place when you just take it away without making ‘the exceptional circumstances’ for doing so more clearer and you do what you want anyway?
• Why is West Horsley to increase 35% more - making it larger than any other single area in the Borough to be expanded?
• The Proposals will eradicate the two villages beyond recognition and this will be gone forever!
• What effect will all these proposed housing have on the roads – lets face it you do not keep the current ones in good repair – we can count on around two further cars per households so our villages will not be villages anymore.
• The effect on our GP surgery will be immense.
• 2,000 houses being built in Ockham will have a significant impact in The Horsleys in itself.
• Why is the SHMA target for housing been increased by Guildford Borough Council?
• Parking for the station will be overloaded.
• Why blur the boundaries of the two villages?
• THE VILLAGES WILL BE GONE FOREVER DESTROYING THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA COMPLETELY.

I hope that these concerns will be seriously looked into.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2810  Respondent: 15574753 / Richard G Page  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have been a resident at the above address for 39 years.

My objections are:-

1. The proposal to remove the Horsley’s from the Green Belt seems arbitrary. Exceptional circumstances are prescribed for this action and so far none have been put forward.
2. The infrastructure in East Horsley in particular is only just adequate at the present time. Parking in shopping locations are over crowded, station parking is very congested, medical practices are overburdened and the roads are dangerously busy. In East Horsley several years ago such was the concern for the elderly or handicapped villagers crossing Ockham Road South that a crossing light was installed at significant cost. Since then traffic has increased and with a higher density population traffic will be a significant danger to pedestrians in the area. No plan has been produced to show how to deal with these serious infrastructure problems.
3. The Thatchers Hotel site (48 properties) on a bend on the A246 will cause dangerous congestion on an already very busy road during the rush hour.
4. Proposed infills near St Matins Church on Ockham Road South will completely change the character and the environment in a village setting that will be destroyed.
5. Station Parade to be designated a District Centre seems to be a proposal that lacks all sense. The facilities at the location are fully stretched. I do not feel that the planners have fulfilled their responsibilities to fully understand the nature of the facilities in our villages centre. If this proposal happens a sensibly size village will be turned into an urban sprawl. This will totally change the environment in which I had selected to live.

6. May I have an acknowledgement that this has been received.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2829</th>
<th>Respondent: 15575649 / India P Donnell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 want to OBJECT to what is planned all around West Horsley in the Guildford Local Plan.

As young citizen of this area and country my voice must be heard.

What is proposed is an utter disgrace and shows a total lack of understanding of the areas needs and totally disregards local opinions. At least we live in a democracy so I can have a say.

I have lived here for 15 years and have seen how the village operates and has grown to a point where local facilities are full; Roads, Schools, Drs, Dentists, Car parks and there is NO capacity for more houses/people.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

| Attached documents: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2857</th>
<th>Respondent: 15577793 / Susan Hughes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 has been no consideration for our locality, our wildlife, our natural beauty, transport impact on our roads and our noise pollution. The proposals in Green Belt area are excessive and will cause huge harm to Green Belt areas such as the Horsleys.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

| Attached documents: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4536</th>
<th>Respondent: 15577793 / Susan Hughes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

- Our village schools are full, the addition of three more in villages not near us, will not service the increased numbers if the plans go ahead;
- In Horsley cars are already parked dangerously on our roads – often making two way traffic difficult, and this will become all the more so with more cars/buses etc).
- Parking is difficult already – for example our train station is already full – and our small station cannot service more people.
- And drainage is an issue.
- Our doctors are already too busy to cope with daily life of the current inhabitants.
I also dispute the number of proposed houses needed for Guildford’s development: I believe the numbers are significantly higher than official estimates for population growth in the borough.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2875  **Respondent:** 15578561 / Catherine Thiesson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to voice my strongest objections to the proposed plan to build on West Horsley’s Green Belt. Whilst I fully understand the need for more housing in the area for the ever increasing population, I would beg you instead to use “brown field sites” and conversions of existing, unused properties in order to preserve our precious and vital Green Belt landscape. The vast number of proposed houses would simply massacre this area of outstanding natural beauty and the pressure from developers must be fought with all possible strength, integrity and respect for our fragile natural environment. The village would be destroyed forever by such a massive strain on it’s resources, both natural and social.

I urge you, please, to stand by your previous pledge to protect the Green Belt and to find alternatives that respect the precious beauty and character of the area so that it is protected for generations to come.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2879  **Respondent:** 15578721 / Millicent Hughes  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to you about my objections to the proposed Guildford Borough Council Local Plan 2016. I consider it relevant, as a resident of West Horsley, to state my opinions on this matter.

**Removal of the Horsleys from the Green Belt**

Firstly, I object to the Horsleys being withdrawn from the Green Belt. The Green Belt was established for the main reason of preserving England's rolling hills and green pastures for generations to come. Horsley is a rural village and was even given the name "horse meadows" as a result of it being so green and agricultural. It should be kept this way to protect its rich heritage. By removing it from the Green Belt, it would would no longer be the country village that we know and love and I strongly object to this.

**Over-population**

Secondly, our villages are at maximum capacity. The suggested developments will put further strain on public transport, such as the trains at Horsley station, which I object to.

Furthermore, I object to there being insufficient parking space in the villages if vehicle numbers increase.
I also object because drainage will become more of an issue when already congested main roads become even more flooded than they presently are due to an increase in water waste and sewage.

**Infrastructure overload**

Tying in with overpopulation, our public services will completely overflow as they are not being suitably developed to meet the needs of a 35% increase in housing.

I object because children will be forced to go to school further afield because there is no space locally.

Residents will receive poor healthcare because the medical clinics are full and so I object to this as well.

I object because the road traffic will be even worse and the community buildings will be busier than ever.

In conclusion, I object because the large number of new houses being proposed in this plan is unsustainable, unsuitable and certainly unwarranted in the Guildford boroughs, particularly the Horsleys, for the reasons I presented in this letter.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I would like to raise my concerns for the planning proposals that you will be hearing for the Horsleys.

My reasons for concern are:

1) Schooling - schools are already full.
2) Medical centre is full to capacity.
3) Sewage farm at Wisley would need to be enlarged.
4) The roads and carparking would need adjusting for the amount of housing that has been proposed. Carparking at the station already overflowing.
5) Proposed housing on Ockham Road North would cause danger by the bridge.
6) I agree that some housing does need to be carried out but this must take into consideration affordable housing for local families and single people.
7) Please leave the Green Belt as it is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am writing to you to express my concern about the proposed development plans for and the (over) development of the Horsleys, and surrounding areas.

1. I strongly object to the proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green belt. The reason I chose to live here is precisely the fact that it is a green belt area and nature reserve for local wildlife. I do not believe that there are any circumstances requiring to reduce the greenbelt area, and no sensible rationale/reason has been demonstrated to warrant proceeding with such a proposal.

2. The defined land boundaries for existing settlement areas should not be increased. We should not consider the creation of any new settlement areas for any kind of developments within the greenbelt or village boundaries.

3. Our infrastructure is already overloaded. We have had multiple electricity supply failures over the years. It can be difficult to park in the villages for local shopping, even during non-busy periods. Our medical centre is already operating beyond its capacity. The drainage is also a problem and even in my own home, inadequate at times. Adding further housing or developments to our infrastructure may likely completely overwhelm it.

I understand that there are proposals to designate Station Parade as a ‘District Centre’. This is not appropriate and is a fundamental misunderstanding of what the nature of the facilities in the village centre are. This may open up the area to urban development in the future. I do not agree with and I oppose the designation of Station parade as a ‘district centre’.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2982   Respondent: 15583457 / Claire Parker   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I herewith write to vehemently object to the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategies and Sites June 2016. The number of proposed new homes is too high and unsustainable for Guildford’s villages.

I object on the following grounds:

I object to the erosion of the Green Belt. By extending the boundaries of the village mentioned in 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area, the village has been removed from the Green Belt. This is in conflict with the statement in Policy P2, “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt against inappropriate development.”

I also object on the grounds that the village and surrounding areas do not have sufficient infrastructure to support such developments.

-Schools and doctors’ surgeries are at/near maximum capacity

- Roads, bus services and trains into London are already under immense strain.

- Surface water drainage is already a problem and would become hazardous if the problem became worse.

As a resident of West Horsley, I object to the targeted 35% increase in current village housing by 2022. This is clearly inconsistent with the likely population increase over this period and the need for so many houses to be built in West Horsley over the first 5 years of the Plan period 2018 to 2023 is totally unproven. The Parish Council has identified a limited need for some 20 affordable homes for local people who want to remain in the village, i.e. for the young and elderly.

West Horsley, a small, Greenbelt village can simply not sustain this development.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attended documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3867  Respondent: 15583457 / Claire Parker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 up to 385No homes within the Parish along with the 100No homes along the West Horsley Parish Boarder near the station. I believe the number of proposed new homes is too high and unsustainable for Guildford’s villages. I feel the village and surrounding areas do not have sufficient infrastructure to support such developments... Schools and doctors’ surgeries are at/near maximum capacity. Roads, bus services and trains into London are already under immense strain. Utilities and public highways are under strain, with numerous pot holes in roads and surface water issues which cause floods during heavy rains. Waste water systems are under pressure and Thames Water have already highlighted the fact that their systems will not cope with the developments proposed as they currently stand.

In West Horsley, we have already lost our small green Grocer at the southern end of the village, so we need to travel to East Horsley to do general shopping, where parking and access is already an issue.

No exceptional circumstances have been stated to remove the vilalge from the greenbelt and I cannot see any concrete evidence of any requirement to build such large developments within the village as the Parish Council has only identified a limited need for some 20 affordable homes for local people who want to remain in the village, i.e. for the young and elderly.

West Horsley, a small, Greenbelt village can simply not sustain this development.

I sincerely hope that our villages will be protected from these development proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attended documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2989  Respondent: 15583649 / Sheila Attridge  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I especially OBJECT to policies A36, A37, A38, A39, A40 & A41:

- The amount of new housing far exceeds local need.
- Housing density would be excessive when compared with existing development.
- The plan would transform the Horsleys into a sizable town, something for which no case is made.
- There is no local support.
- The collective impact of these 6 sites on a small part of the borough is not considered. These should not be treated as isolated, separate sites.
- The sites are unsustainable. Key infrastructure is lacking, and no adequate provision is made to increase it - eg poor wastewater capacity, lack of schools, absence of traffic management plan, flooding.
- No account has been taken of additional impact of Wisley Airfield site on Horsleys.
- The extension of settlement boundaries is too permissive. The Horsleys are characterised by streets with development along only one side of the road. The policies allow too many adjacent green fields to be developed by squaring off boundaries and claiming they don’t contribute to Green Belt “openness”.

- The Green Belt gap with neighbouring settlements would be hugely narrowed, especially if Wisley Airfield is built on.
- Policy A40 is especially unviable because of high water table and poor drainage, leading to regular winter flooding.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3015</th>
<th>Respondent: 15584033 / Andrew Hutton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>is Sound? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing in connection with the New Local Plan published on 26th June 2016

Main Objections and Concerns in respect of East and West Horsley

Removal of both Horsleys from the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been detailed.

Extension of the boundaries of the Settlement areas of the Horsleys. No reasons given to the above.

Current infrastructure is already a disgrace. Roads are incapable of managing existing traffic volumes. Car parks at local stations are full. No scope to widen roads in either of the Horsleys. The local schools are full and waiting times at medical centres are long.

The revised development of 2000 houses at the old Wisley Airfield will have an enormous impact on the Horsleys. An extra 4000 vehicles will raise pollution levels dramatically and create gridlock on the current potholed road system. The plan also includes large developments at Waterloo Farm, Manor Farm, Ockham Road North, East Lane, Thatcher's Hotel and Bell & Colvill.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/192</th>
<th>Respondent: 15584033 / Andrew Hutton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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>is Sound? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**West Horsley**

I object to Policy A37 as this site, proposed by GBC for 40 houses (many times the existing density of the village), would be an inappropriate development in a **Conservation Area within 500 metres of at least 5 listed houses**. House no 20 The Street, and its land has been added to this site (called the Bell and Colvill site) since the publication of the 2015 Draft LP, but is not shown on the new DLP as a change. What value, if any, would Conservation areas have, if GBC allows building in this area?
Also, note that permission has already been granted for 9 houses on the former Bell and Colvill workshop, small show room and 3 cottages, all perfectly acceptable as this is a brownfield site, the rest is not.

I approve of the decision to remove site 41 in West Horsley from the DLP.

I approve of the decision to remove the Thatchers Hotel site from the DLP.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3052  **Respondent:** 15585153 / Robert Batterbury  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Dear Sir/Madam,

I STRONGLY OBJECT to the Guildford Local Plan Proposal.

I am a resident of West Horsley and I OBJECT to the local area being removed from the Green Belt zone, and the consequent residential homes and estates being built.

I am a new resident to West Horsley, after my family paid a premium to move to a beautiful semi-rural environment surrounded by natural scenery. I have just moved from an already overdeveloped and high density area. I have witnessed the pressures that overpopulated areas cause, such as increased:

- **CRIME**
- **TRAFFIC**
- **POLLUTION** (Increased CO2 emissions, light pollution)
- **OVERCROWDED PUBLIC TRANSPORT**
- **INSUFFICIENT PARKING IN THE VILLAGE**

I STRONGLY OBJECT to Horsley being removed from the Green Belt and to the proposed planning developments.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3101  **Respondent:** 15586049 / Les Perkins  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I currently work in the borough and on reading the local plan i was appalled and its lack of important detail and its glossy presumption of predetermined facts.

I work in some of the local villages that would be affected by the proposal and am shocked at the harm i see this plan doing, i am generally on the road during school drop of time and think the amount of traffic on small country roads such
as in East Horsley as positively dangerous, just last week i saw a group of children have a narrow escape whilst waiting to catch the bus to the Howard, the increase in traffic associated with the local plan brings the likelihood of fatalities all the closer the fact there have not been any yet is extremely fortuitous, for this mainly and other obvious facts such as lack of amenities, public services i object to the plan as it stands.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3599  Respondent: 15587041 / Martin Goodchild  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (  ), is Sound? (  ), is Legally Compliant? (  )

The plans indicate a further 173 homes in East Horsley and 420 in West Horsley, a total of 593. This results in an approximate increase of households of 10% in East Horsley and 35% in West Horsley. This will substantially increase the volume of traffic in the village not least when added to the likely number of motor vehicles if the proposed Wisley airfield development also takes place. It will also put a strain on the village facilities such as schools, the medical centre and the stations all of which are at capacity now.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3956  Respondent: 15587041 / Martin Goodchild  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (  ), is Sound? (  ), is Legally Compliant? (  )

1. New homes in the Horsleys:

The plans indicate a further 173 homes in East Horsley and 420 in West Horsley, a total of 593. This results in an approximate increase of households of 10% in East Horsley and 35% in West Horsley. This will substantially increase the volume of traffic in the village not least when added to the likely number of motor vehicles if the proposed Wisley Airfield development also takes place. It will also put a strain on the village facilities such as schools, the medical centre and the stations all of which are at capacity now.

In summary it appears to me that the proposals for new homes in the Horsleys and at Wisley Airfield have been poorly thought out with little regard for the Metropolitan Green Belt rules. There has been a complete failure to consider the impact on the infrastructure and environment across a widespread area, the strain on local facilities and the fact that the proposed developments are totally out of character for the rural area of this part of Surrey.

I would therefore urge Guildford Borough Council not to countenance any development at the Wisley Airfield site and to considerably reduce the planned housing increase in the Horsleys.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3143  Respondent: 15587489 / Thomas Batterbury  Agent:
I live in West Horsley and object to the Guildford local plan. I strongly OBJECT to West Horsley and the surrounding area being taken out of the green belt.

This will undoubtedly lead to even more houses being built in the future, increased population density and over crowded spaces. We paid a premium to move to this lovely area and do not want to watch it turn into a less desirable area.

I commute to central London 5 days a week, the trains are already very busy with the current train service, which quite simply would not be able to cope with a larger number of commuters.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3149  **Respondent:** 15587553 / Malcolm Stuart  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Why. why 593 MORE houses in the Horsley Green Belt? Justification? Why, why the Horsleys taken out of the Green Belt? Justification? Infrastructure could not cope with that number of houses! Why REMOVE Thatchers Hotel when there is a shortage of hotels in area?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3151  **Respondent:** 15587585 / Philip Mason  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites: June 2016**

I am writing to make comment on the above in respect of West Horsley.

The proposed number of new dwellings proposed for the 4 parish development sites (385) is excessive and would result in an increase of 35% on the current number of homes. I object to this most strongly as it will change the character of the village entirely and without any increase in infrastructure cause a dramatic strain on local service such as roads, schools and medical facilities. There would be an increase of at least 1500 residents and probably 1000 cars and this seems in complete contradiction to Strategic Policy S1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Of particular concern is the current level of flooding in the village which should be covered by Policy 11 waste water infrastructure in which West Horsley is not mentioned. The gullies in this part of the village were recently cleared which is a good thing but the result of this in the following storm downpour was that the water cleared by the gullies then shot out of the manhole in Ripley Lane like a tropical waterfall causing the road to flood. What effect would an extra 385 dwellings and their waste water have on this infrastructure?
There is no evidence of the need for this number of homes in West Horsley. Local surveys show that there is the need for a small number of affordable homes for local people not large estates. The proportion of dwellings proposed for the green belt areas is disproportionate to those proposed for brownfield sites in Guildford itself which are much more sustainable being served by Public Transport, employment and other facilities. It is a mark of shame that GBC appears incapable, and has been for many years, of facilitating development of the vast tracks of derelict land it owns in and around North Street which could provide large numbers of dwellings for young people and others who may wish to downsize as well as families.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3154  Respondent: 15587745 / Paul Gates  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

/ I OBJECT to the building & development of new houses in the A3 corridor.

2/ I OBJECT to the very idea of Garlick’s Arch (Ripley/Send/Burnt Common) being developed any more.

3/ I OBJECT to any proposal that will increase Traffic in the local area – it is already like Piccadilly Circus at times.

4/ I OBJECT to any proposal that removes/reduces the sacred green fields and common land in the Ripley/Send/Clandon/Burnt Common areas.

5/ I OBJECT to the limited consultation period.

6/ I OBJECT to ALL erosion of the Green Belt.

7/ I OBJECT to the last minute inclusion of new sites with less than two weeks notice.

8/ I OBJECT to any new Exit/Entry roads of the A3 at Burnt Common – this can only make things worse.

9/ I OBJECT to any schemes that change the fundamental ‘rural countryside’ feeling of Wisley, Ripley, Send, Clandon etc.

10/ I OBJECT to the lack of immediate provision for new schools.

11/ I OBJECT to the lack of any immediate provision for Doctors Surgeries.

12/ I OBJECT to the lack of any evidence for the ‘fictitious’ alleged ‘housing need’ numbers.

13/ I OBJECT to the disproportionate amount of development in one area of the Borough.

14/ I OBJECT to ANY proposals that will turn Ripley/Send/Clandon/Burnt Common into a Goldsworth Park/Knaphill/St Johns look-a-like.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3165  Respondent: 15587969 / F Bell  Agent:
As a long term resident of West Horsley, I would like to submit my strong objection to the Draft Local Plan for Guildford. West Horsley is currently a semi-rural barrier to the onward urban sprawl which has relentlessly paved over Surrey. There are actually fields here and country walks for all to enjoy including people who I know who come down from London to walk here. I can see no justification for the following:

- removing West Horsley from the Green Belt
- building another 35% more houses - this is way, way too much although I fully accept the need for some new housing
- building on fields!

To do the above would permanently destroy one of Surrey's remaining rural villages beyond recognition.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I am writing to strongly object to proposals in relation to four Development sites in West Horsley village as laid out in The Guildford Plan. My reasons for objecting to the proposals are that I believe that the proposed addition of 385 homes is wholly inappropriate and would not be sustainable within the boundaries of our small village due to the local infrastructure. Such high density housing will inevitably result in more vehicles moving around the village which will cause more traffic congestion, noise and pollution. Currently:

- The population of West Horsley is increasing. This is due to the ongoing trend throughout the village of demolition of many single storey dwellings, typically with 2/3 bedrooms, which are being replaced with large 4/5 bedroom properties, as well as people extending existing properties to provide extra bedrooms. Most households have at least 2 cars per household, with larger houses and extended properties this is likely to increase to at least 3 or 4 cars per household.
- The roads and lanes in West Horsley are narrow in parts and are already very busy, especially at peak times. East Lane is not passable by two way traffic in parts (there are some traffic management measures in place) and this, coupled with the increasing number of parked cars on East Lane and The Street means there are regularly queues of cars waiting to pass through from one end of the village to the other. The problem is compounded by heavy vehicles (diggers, grabbers etc.) and lorries which are constantly moving around the village and parking in the streets and lanes to service the high level of building work to which I have previously referred.
- I commute to London on a daily basis via Horsley station. The station car park is regularly full to capacity on weekdays and I have recently witnessed stressful situations where people cannot access parking spaces. Increased residents will ultimately result in extra commuters who need use the station car park. There will simply be nowhere for them to park. Station Approach, which is the short, narrow, steep road that leads to the car park is already dangerously busy at peak times with cars, cyclists and pedestrians all trying to access or leave the station at the same time. This results in congestion at the bottom of Station Approach with vehicles trying to get on to Ockham Road North which is already very busy with moving traffic. There have recently been several accidents at this junction.
- There is also the concern about potential further strain on the village environment when Grange Park Opera takes up residency at West Horsley Place. This will inevitably cause traffic congestion, more noise and pollution, albeit at specific times through the year, but on top of nearly 400 extra planned homes within such a
small area, I feel these proposals will impose an unsupportable burden on the entire infrastructure of not only West Horsley, but also of neighbouring East Horsley.

- The proposals also completely go against the National Planning Policy Framework which states that new residential development must respect the character and density of housing in the area and be limited in quantity by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities.

My worry is that the current proposals will result in West Horsley village becoming effectively strangled by traffic congestion and overcrowding and be negatively impacted which will result in its character being changed for future generations. Finally, I would like to add that I am totally opposed to the proposal to remove West Horsley from the Green Belt by insetting and extending the 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area boundaries as I believe this would alter the genuinely rural nature of the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/509  Respondent: 15588225 / Martin Barry  Agent:

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 proposals in relation to the Development sites in West Horsley village as laid out in The Guildford Local Plan. My reasons for objecting to the proposals are that I believe that the proposed addition of some 395 homes is wholly inappropriate and would not be sustainable within the boundaries of our small village due to the local infrastructure. Such high density housing will inevitably result in more vehicles moving around the village which will cause more traffic congestion, noise and pollution. Currently:

- The population of West Horsley is increasing. This is due to the ongoing trend throughout the village of demolition of many single storey dwellings, typically with 2/3 bedrooms, which are being replaced with large 4/5 bedroom properties, as well as people extending existing properties to provide extra bedrooms. Most households have at least 2 cars per household, with larger houses and extended properties this is likely to increase to at least 3 or 4 cars per household. The proposal to support self build housing on the sites will no doubt follow this trend
- The roads and lanes in West Horsley are narrow in parts and are already very busy, especially at peak times. East Lane is not passable by two way traffic in parts (there are some traffic management measures in place) and this, coupled with the increasing number of parked cars on East Lane and The Street means there are regularly queues of cars waiting to pass through from one end of the village to the other. The problem is compounded by heavy vehicles (diggers, grabbers etc.) and lorries which are constantly moving around the village and parking in the streets and lanes to service the high level of building work to which I have previously referred.
- I commute to London on a daily basis via Horsley station. The station car park is regularly full to capacity on weekdays and I have recently witnessed stressful situations where people cannot access parking spaces. Increased residents will ultimately result in extra commuters who need use the station car park. There will simply be nowhere for them to park. Station Approach, which is the short, narrow, steep road that leads to the car park is already dangerously busy at peak times with cars, cyclists and pedestrians all trying to access or leave the station at the same time. This results in congestion at the bottom of Station Approach with vehicles trying to get on to Ockham Road North which is already very busy with moving traffic. There have recently been several accidents at this junction.
- I am also confused by the removal of the site of the Thatchers Hotel complex as a potential site for development when it has infrastructure and access to the main Portsmouth Road already. If there is to be some limited development in the Horsleys why not do it here as an existing site rather than build on areas of local beauty and greenery with no appropriate access to main roads.
The proposals also completely go against the National Planning Policy Framework which states that new residential development must respect the character and density of housing in the area and be limited in quantity by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities.

My worry is that the current proposals will result in West Horsley village becoming effectively strangled by traffic congestion and overcrowding and be negatively impacted which will result in its character being changed for future generations.

Finally, I would like to add that I am totally opposed to the proposal to extend West Horsley village boundary into the Green Belt land especially around the west side of Silkmore Lane. This will effectively grant development rights on the paddocks in the area behind the lane. This will be another erosion of the beautiful landscape which many people including walkers and cyclists enjoy in this part of our rural village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3173  Respondent: 15588257 / P Day  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. wish to register my strong objection to the local plan in the Horsley area, which will have a severely detrimental impact on our neighbourhood. I object in particular to -
2. The density of proposed additional housing in East and West Horsley. To add 593 houses to already overcrowded schools, medical facilities and the railway will have a major negative impact on the daily life of local residents.
3. The proposal to remove the Horsley Green Belt is outrageous. No "exceptional circumstances" have been demonstrated. The Council has a duty to protect the Green Belt for future generations.
4. No sound reasons have been given for the proposed extension of the settlement areas of the Horsleys.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3174  Respondent: 15588289 / Maurice Button  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objection to Guildford Local Plan – Impact on East and West Horsley Villages

As a resident of East Horsley (see below), I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed Guildford Local Plan, which would, if implemented as proposed, have a very harmful effect on East and West Horsley Villages.

My objections are as follows:

Proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt: The ‘exceptional circumstances' required before taking this action have not been demonstrated.
Extension of the boundaries of the settlement areas of the Horsleys: No sound reasons have been given for the proposed changes, which seem to be aimed solely at increasing the land available within the settlements for future additional developments.

Station Parade’s designation as a ‘District Centre’: This ‘classification’ results from a complete misreading of the nature of the facilities in the village centre and would inappropriately target the area for future urban developments.

Traffic and parking: Assuming that every new house has at least 2 cars, this means potentially 6,000 more cars within a three mile radius of the villages. The impact on local roads will be tremendous. Parking at Horsley & Effingham junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the medical centre and at the village hall will all be affected.

Local Road Network: In respect of the proposals for development at Wisley Airfield and for an upgrade the current A3 junction at Burntcommon to a full 4-way junction, SCC traffic modelling anticipates increased use of Guileshall Lane, Hungry Hill Lane and Tithebarns Lane for traffic accessing the A3 at Burntcommon in order to travel to Guildford and beyond. The SCC report states that “consequently, it indicates that further thought may have to be given to managing traffic in this area as part of a transport assessment should the development be progressed”. It appears that the Plan is proposing a strategic site at Wisley Airfield without even knowing what improvements to the local road infrastructure will be required. If that is the case for Wisley Airfield, then it is almost inevitably true for the proposed developments in East and West Horsley as well.

Pollution: The large increase in volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment – already a cause for concern in several areas in the Borough.

Flooding: The site behind Ockham Road North in East Horsley is partially a level 3 flood risk area, and local residents are well aware of how much standing water there is in their gardens after rain. Building on such land will only exacerbate the problem. We already know what happens to local roads when it rains – the drains can’t cope.

Schools: Local schools are already at capacity – where will newcomers go to school? No extra places are planned in the Horsleys, and the school places proposed at Wisley Airfield will not planned until many years into the project.

Medical facilities: Similar situation to the schools.

Loss of Green Belt land: Sadiq Khan, new Mayor of London, has instructed London planners not to approve development on Green Belt Land within the M25. If we continue to build on our countryside it won’t be many decades before we have none left. Creeping development has led to almost continuous housing from Central London to Effingham. Is this to carry on to Guildford and beyond? (1,700 houses are planned for the Guildford end of the Hogs Back and 1,000 new houses on greenfield sites in Normandy.)

Transport: Misery for commuters, nowhere to park and full trains at commuting times.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3177  Respondent: 15588321 / Zoe-Amber Purves  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 Horsleys from the Green Belt.

There are no exceptional circumstances, these have not been demonstrated.
To the proposed planning of hundreds of houses in the West Horsley and East Horsley villages.
I wish to register objections to the local plan job 13,860 new proposed houses, as not sustainable.

There will be damage to local communities, these will not be villages any more.

We need to check unrestricted sprawl of large buildup areas,

We need to protect our Green Belt land and fields.

We live here because it is a village and surrounded by green fields and farmland.

We like the village atmosphere, knowing our neighbours and meeting them in our villages, being part of a small community.

I OBJECT To: the huge influx of traffic this planning will cause. Our little country roads cannot cope with the traffic as it is. The condition of our local roads is Appalling! Pot holes everywhere, causing dangerous driving, trying to avoid the holes, damaging cars. We have narrow country roads, not suitable for hundreds more ‘large family cars’. We don’t want yellow/white lines all over our village and road signs, which are quite unnecessary, which will only increase with your planning proposals. The car parking facilities are inadequate and no room for expansion.

I OBJECT To: the lack of facilities suitable for thousands more people using our Doctors Surgery. We cannot get an appointment within a week as it is, there is nowhere to expand the Surgery, are you planning to build another? The medical facilities are over stretched as it is. The local hospital The Royal Surrey is overcrowded already, there is nowhere else for us in our villages to go.

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>PSLPA16/3178</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15588321 / Zoe-Amber Purves</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 OBJECTTo: the influx of thousands more families with school age children, when our local junior school, The Raleigh, is full and they want to move to a larger site now! If they took one of your sites and you took over their 2 sites, at least the planners would have a few hundred more houses and the school would be able to accommodate more new children, but only a few! Not the hundreds you propose to bring into our little villages.

We cannot accommodate these new children into the local Senior schools either. Where do you propose to build these new schools? They would then need adequate transportation, so parents cars would not always be on these country roads, emitting yet more pollution!

We are villages, people want to move here, as we did because of the quiet, the fields, the village atmosphere, and the safety of a village. Children need open spaces, greenery, the safety of a village to grow up in.

I OBJECT

there is no infrastructure which has been confirmed.

The flood plans in these areas get flooded every winter. West Horsley is known for being a flood plain area, totally unsuitable for hundreds more houses.

Thames Water has advised that the current wastewater network is unlikely to support the demand from all these developments!

I OBJECTTo: the overcrowding at our shops, we have two little parades of shops for the use of the two villages, not thousands more people using them. There is only limited parking, only one little supermarket, Budgens, and no access to any larger Supermarket.
Station Parade is an inappropriate target in the area for future expansion and development, the only shops we have to walk to.
The train does not take us into Cobham centre, only Stoke D’Abernen, miles away from the Cobham town Centre, how do all these new people get to ships?
We have no bus which has a regular timetable to Cobham, our nearest town, there would have to be in place public transport regularly into Cobham and Guildford.

I OBJECTTo: the state of our roads when thousands more people will be using them. The Drift, which is a narrow lane from West Horsley to Effingham, is already used by lorries, coaches from the schools, and many local businesses, it is full job potholes from constant use, how is that going to cope?
All our roads are narrow, we are a village, the drainage is already a problem through the village every winter.

BROWNFIELD ARE BEING IGNORED
We need more houses in the centre of towns, not out in our villages, therefore using more cars, more pollution, more congestion on our already crowded roads.
Recycle derelict and urban land.

I OBJECT To: The SHMA target housing number, which will then be increased further by the GBC to give a population increase, which is almost 70% than the official National estimates for population growth in the BoroughThis would bring alarming results of an increase of up to 35% in the existing West Horsley households, more than any other single area in the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3190  Respondent: 15588737 / Terry Kimber  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• Serious consideration needs to be given to the type of properties built in any development within the Horsley village boundaries: it should not be assumed that 4 and 5 bedroom family houses are the only properties required. The addition of high quality apartments, similar to Maranello House, should be considered to accommodate people in the area wishing to downsize. This would free up larger family properties and increase the population density without destroying Green Belt lands.

I trust my views will be taken into account by the Council when they are considering the Local Plan.

• It is totally unacceptable to consider violating Green Belt lands when the potential for the redevelopment of brown field sites in the county have not been exhausted. Clearly the redevelopment of the Thatcher’s Hotel and Bell & Colvill sites should be encouraged together with improving the existing house stock through infill developments etc providing funds are made available to repair and maintain the existing roads and utilities infrastructure.
• East and West Horsley are both small historic villages that have expanded over the last 50 years; further major expansion will not be possible without destroying the character and ambiance of the area. The current levels of traffic passing through East Horsley is barely tolerable and the social infrastructure is straining at the moment even without further development on Green Belt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
General Comment

GBC’s proposed Local Plan proposes a total of 4,993 new dwellings within a 5-mile radius of The Horsleys, not including many smaller sites in nearby villages, comprising.

- 533 houses on large sites in East and West Horsley (The Horsleys)
- 60 houses on small sites in The Horsleys
- 2000 houses on Wisley Airfield
- 400 houses on Burnt Common
- 2000 houses at Gosden Hill Farm (on the A3 near Burpham)

Currently there are 2808 dwellings in The Horsleys (EH 1697, WH 1111).

Thus the plan represents the following increase in dwelling places:

- 21% within The Horsleys.
- 178% within a 5-mile radius of The Horsleys.

I can find no reason for building such large numbers of homes in The Horsleys or neighbouring villages given in the document ‘Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2031. Most of the Strategic Employment Sites proposed in Policy E1 are over 5 miles away from them.

I have commented previously under Policies I1, I2 and I3 on the existing shortcomings with, and deficiencies in, the infrastructure of The Horsleys. The proposed increase in dwellings for The Horsleys set out in the draft local plan will make matters far worse.

These policies also run contrary to NPPF paragraph 17 which specifically states that planning should be about “empowering local people to shape their surroundings”. As I have said earlier under Policy P2 and its attendant paragraphs, but it bears repeating, comments on local social media sites, notice boards by the side of our local roads and so on show the depth of local feeling against these policies. Thus I conclude that Site Policies A35-A41 do not shape the surroundings in the way in which local people would wish. There seems little doubt that the local populace feel victimised by GBC’s policies when The Horsleys will be required to build, in percentage terms, twice the amount of housing than for the Guildford urban area.

I OBJECT therefore to Site Policies A35-A41.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
POLICIES A37, A38, A40 & A41, located in West Horsley

These policies propose a total of 385 dwellings from these four sites. The 2011 Census showed West Horsley had 1,124 dwellings at that time. This represents an increase of 36% over the plan period, a very high proportion by any standards.

These sites all currently lie within the Green Belt. Development on them requires settlement boundary movements. As I have stated in the objection to Policy A39 above, the NPPF is quite clear that every movement in settlement boundaries must be justified by ‘exceptional circumstances’. I do not believe these policies demonstrate any such circumstances and are therefore unjustified and contrary to NPPF rules. If this boundary movements are invalid then these sites remains a part of the Metropolitan Green Belt. Therefore the housing development proposal would be invalid.

I OBJECT to Policies A37, A38, A40 and A41 as they do not demonstrate the exceptional circumstances required to move the settlement boundaries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3218  **Respondent:** 15589217 / Amelia Young  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I am writing with regard to the Draft Local Plan for the Guildford Borough, with particular concern for the proposed changes in East and West Horsley. I object to all policies which include development of land situated on the green belt. I believe that the land on the green belt should be preserved for future generations and we should not opt to destroy it before fully examining the consequences and how this will affect the environment in the future.

Recently, I have been learning about brownfield and greenfield sites in my geography lessons at school and I have come to the conclusion that there are plenty of derelict brownfield sites which need redevelopment in the inner city and central business district. This land already has foundations built into it and the infrastructure surrounding it is much more advanced. For example, there are sufficient road networks that are able to deal with an increase in population within that area. Consequently, this would fulfil the need for more housing but leave the green belt untouched. This land is currently neglected and many declining businesses would welcome new residents, giving a purpose to the land.

The original purpose of the green belt was to prevent urban sprawl so that the environment is protected in rural areas, this has resulted in many more benefits. For example, air quality is improved in both rural and urban areas, nature is successfully conserved, and the unique landscape is protected in many rural areas. So then, what are the benefits of destroying this policy? I would argue that yes, this is a very straight-forward way to provide housing for those who need it, however, where will we draw the line? This development can only be temporary and before long, more housing will be needed and therefore more of the green belt will be destroyed. This completely defeats the objective of the green belt and I believe that to prevent this development leading to a slippery slope we must not go ahead with the local plan.

I have noticed on the Guildford Borough Council website that one of the aims of this local plan is to 'protect our most important countryside, landscapes and heritage' however I am at a loss as to how this can be claimed whilst at the same time, both of the Horsleys are to be removed from the green belt altogether along with many other villages in Surrey. The green belt policy was made with thought and consideration, it provides protection for the environment and is often what defines the historic status of many English villages. Therefore I ask you to rethink the plans which have been put forward and what would be best for the country in the long term.

I leave you with my objections, and ask you to remember that building upon the green belt is an irreversible process and therefore more time and effort needs to be put into finding other areas which would be more suitable for fulfilling the
needs of the British population, a plan in which both those who need homes and those who are already homed are satisfied.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3219  Respondent: 15589249 / E B Hutchins  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 name to the countless others ( I suspect ) who are unhappy with your plans for our neighbourhood.

1. I object to the proposal to remove us from the Green Belt.
2. I'm unsure of the reasons why you propose to change either boundaries.
3. Our infrastructure is not suitable, at present for any additional pressure to add to the area is, road routes, schools, surgery practise are already over stretched, no improvement mentioned of these important needs for the community.
4. Wisley Airfield, the impact again of the locality would be enormous for the surrounding area and beyond, the same applies to Burnt Common, also.
5. Thatchers Hotel is the nearest proposed site to where I live and I'm concerned about the road system, already a bad bend and lots of entrances and exits to contend with.

I moved here originally for the quiet, peaceful neighbourhood and I would hate to see that ruined for future generations therefore I feel it's important to add my voice to those who are very unhappy with your proposed proposal.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3222  Respondent: 15589345 / Matt Cornwell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objection to Guildford Borough Council Draft Local Plan (June 2016)

I am a student who currently lives in West Horsley and am deeply concerned by the proposed plans and the effect these will have on not only my generation, but generations to come. I am objecting to this plan on a number of grounds which take into account social, economic and environmental aspects; all of which in my opinion will be hugely detrimental to the areas around Guildford and their peoples.

1. **Green Belt.**

   - “The green is a policy for controlling urban growth. The idea is for a ring of countryside where urbanisation will be resisted for the foreseeable future, maintaining an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure can be expected to prevail.” It is an area which is only able to be removed in ‘exceptional circumstances’ and it is clear that such circumstances have not been met. The green belt is crucial for the local area in providing such facilities
but also for the local ecosystems. Such developments will destroy habitats of local species and the removal of species could potentially lead to trophic cascade- which will be extremely damaging to the area, highlighting the environmental damage. In the long run it is more than likely the local economy will be damaged as a result.

- Therefore the Horsleys must remain in the green belt and I object to the proposal to take them and the Former Wisley airfield (Three Farm Meadows) out of the green belt.

1. **Congestion and Public Transport**

- Having used the local train services for the last 7 years, it is evident that the service provided is not adequate. Trains are often overcrowded and prices are already too high. With the thousands of houses being built this service will only get worse. Prices will rise to fund “improvements” and services will become even more overcrowded. As a student, public transport is crucial for me to get around and with increased demand for these services there is little evidence to suggest they will cope, pointing only to extreme difficulties. I can’t stress enough how important an efficient and sufficient public transport system is for the local economy.

- Similarly the roads around the area of the proposed sites will not be able to cope. Many of the sites are in areas where single track roads are extremely common and any improvements in these will lead to further damage to the ecosystem. However, more importantly, the A3 will not be able to cope. It already struggles and with thousands of more cars in the area there can only be negative consequences. Increased journey times and congestion will mean increased costs to business and could affect locals’ ability to have jobs further away from their homes. There is no sufficient plan as to how the area will cope and this worries me for my future.

1. **Infrastructure and Local services**

- The proposed increase of up to 35% in existing West Horsley is greater than any other single area in the Borough. The proposals for West Horsley are unbalanced and unsustainable and would change the character of the village forever. I object to this. Such character is what attracts people to the area and enables local businesses to thrive.

The local infrastructure would not be able to cope and I cannot see any circumstance in which one can argue that it will firstly, be sufficient and secondly, have a positive effect on the area.

Schools are full, drainage systems are struggling and medical facilities are stretched.

These are only a few of the many issues these plans will create and highlight to me that there has not been sufficient research on the consequences, as anyone with common sense and an understanding of the area would realise that what has been proposed is utterly ludicrous.

As a young individual it angers me how these plans can be proposed and I am worried for the future and sustainability of an area I love living in and hope to do so in time to come.

Further to this, it worries me how little information there is on these plans. Having spoken to my peers many are unaware of what is going on. These peers of mine will be most affected by what is proposed. There needs to be more information for the younger generation without a doubt, the plan is not accessible to people in my age group and needs to be. The fact little information is being pushed towards those of my age and younger shows that something other than the future for our generation is more important.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3266 **Respondent:** 15590433 / Debra Edwards **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I write regarding the above and ask that the following comments be taken into account when considering the same.

I live in the village of West Horsley and therefore many of my comments relate to the specific issues relating to that village alone.

The Issue

I am aware of Central Government's desire to increase the UK’s housing provision, particularly in the South East, and within this context Guildford Borough Council (GBC) is under pressure to adopt a deliverable Local Plan for the borough for the period until 2031 and with particular reference to housing provision.

Within this context, I believe that the extra housing provision in discussion should ideally be located on existing brownfield sites within the borough and be located as near as possible to the centres of employment. I do not believe that the current document has given sufficient consideration to this issue, seeking instead an over-reliance on the proposed utilisation of the currently designated Green Belt land around local villages, particularly to the east of the borough, to meet such needs.

In my opinion (and this is formulated through extensive research and professional advice taken) this is a fundamental flaw in the Guildford borough Submission Local Plan 2016 (Proposed Local Plan) as it proposes extensive residential development that will be remote from the existing centres of employment or where indicated within the Proposed Local Plan; these being largely on the opposite side of the borough. Such a policy would be counter to the principles of sustainable development and would undoubtedly put further pressure on the already struggling transport infrastructure. I would like to see this approach rejected and the bulk of new proposed housing allocated nearer to the existing and proposed centres of employment, i.e. within and around Guildford town centre/urban area, rather than in the borough’s outlying, and previously protected, villages.

But I also think that semi-rural villages in the borough, such as West Horsley should and be expected to bear some of the brunt of the future housing provision as it is necessary to increase the number of houses within the village, amongst other reasons, for the young to be able to stay within the village and the older residents to have the opportunity to downsize within the village, but any such housing provision must only be allocated having considered many factors, such as: environmental issues (inc Green Belt), housing needs, local character and architecture, transport and highway situations, infrastructure (schooling, doctors, cap parking in and around the village and at the rail stn, ptn development sites amongst others.

I will therefore set out my views on each topic with regard to West Horsley below.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 182, advises that a Local Plan can only be adopted if it is sound.

As a matter of government policy, soundness requires a plan to be:

- positively prepared;
- justified;
- effective;
- consistent with national policy.

Within these four heads it should enable, over its plan period, the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF.

I have several strong concerns as to whether this is the case within the Proposed Local Plan, as currently drafted, and believe that some of the current policies are not justified nor consistent with national policy, thereby rendering the same unsound without significant revision.
I therefore **OBJECT** to the Guildford borough Proposed Submission Local Plan – Strategy & Sites 2016 as currently drafted.

**ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (INC. GREEN BELT)**

In my opinion, the Metropolitan Green Belt and its special natural environment is a defining characteristic of Guildford borough and, indeed, West Horsley.

I believe that there should remain a general presumption that it should be protected. The Green Belt should only be sacrificed as a last resort, as once lost it can never be reclaimed. Many many villages in Guildford borough are still threatened with removal from their long established Green Belt designation, including where I live, the village of West Horsley. Personally, I do not believe that West Horsley’s currently defined Settlement Area boundaries (ref. 2003 Local Plan) needs such a significant extension, as is being proposed, and perhaps only needs a smaller scale review. In this context, paragraph of Policy P2: Green Belt; is in my opinion so badly worded. For GBC to state “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt, as shown on the proposals map, against inappropriate development” is not being represented at all in the way they are proposing removing so much of the Green Belt, and I do not agree with the proposals map and its proposed new Green Belt boundary.

The national policy regarding protection for the Green Belt is contained within section 9 of the NPPF. Paragraph 79 confirms that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts.

The main and probably the most important aim of national Green Belt policy, which is repeated word for word by GBC in item 4.3.11, is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of the Green Belt being its openness and permanence.

As the Green Belt in Surrey is long established and has detailed boundaries, “exceptional circumstances” must be demonstrated to necessitate the change to its boundaries. I do not believe that this Proposed Local Plan is an “exceptional circumstance”.

Paragraph 84 of the NPPF advises that “When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary”.

GBC states in item 4.3.12 that “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”.

I believe that West Horsley’s open, semi-rural character makes an important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt in this part of the borough. This is the specific and differentiating characteristic of West Horsley over its more ‘leafy’ and more tightly developed neighbour, East Horsley, which I believe GBC and its consultants have failed to recognise or protect.

It is a strong feeling that the semi-rural landscape character of the village is greatly valued by West Horsley residents and is detailed in general terms within the Guildford Borough Council Landscape Character Assessment.

A huge amount of the character of West Horsley is defined by the open views, (via paths, gates, farm entrance openings, bridle ways etc) from the roads either entering or passing through the village settlement.

Throughout the village, stretches of undeveloped countryside on just one side of Ockham Road North, then East Lane, Ripley Lane and Long Reasch, and also The Street boldly reinforce this characteristic. The clearly defined precedent is of the village settlement being on one side of the route and there being open vistas across fields and meadows and paddocks or into woodlands on the other. This should be protected not compromised by any developments.

Also the fact that the main traffic route through the village (along East Lane and The Street) currently benefits from a ‘green gap’ of woods and fields to the north (between The Rectory, roughly opposite Northcote Road to Grovelands Farm, beyond the railway bridge) and to the south (between Roundtree Farm and the listed Railway Cottages, at the
Railway bridge). This natural green area, centred on the Lollesworth Lane and Long Reach junction, is in many ways the real centre of the village.

Clearly Green Belt everywhere is under pressure, but in my opinion, I strongly feel that any linear extensions of the existing settlement boundaries should be strongly resisted.

I therefore believe that the parish of West Horsley’s open, semi-rural, character does indeed make clear and important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt, and therefore I believe that, under national planning policy it should remain “washed over by” the Green Belt, rather than being “inset from the Green Belt” as proposed.

Policy on development with the Metropolitan Green Belt is set out in paragraphs 79 – 92 of the NPPF.

Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt and paragraph 87 of the NPPF clearly states that it “should not be approved except in very special circumstances”. Furthermore paragraph 89 advises local planning authorities to “regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt”.

Whilst I accept that it is possible for a local planning authority to conduct a review of Green Belt land and consider redefining boundaries which add or take away Green Belt land in order to meet these “very special circumstances”, paragraph 83 of the NPPF states, “Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.”

This paragraph clearly sets out that a Green Belt review should only happen in “exceptional circumstances”. This idea is further explained on in paragraph 82 as being “for example when planning for larger scale development such as new settlements or major urban extensions”. The proposals for West Horsley are neither a NEW SETTLEMENT NOR A MAJOR URBAN EXTENSION.

I note that within item 4.3.16 GBC states that “We consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify the amendment of Green Belt boundaries in order to facilitate the development that is needed and to promote sustainable patterns of development.” - in my opinion these are absolutely not EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES and therefore I am requesting that this sentence is removed.

I cannot see how GBC have directed sustainable development towards existing urban areas and also have not directed it next towards town and villages already inset with the Green Belt.

Removal of any land from the Green Belt should only be allowed after long and thoughtful consideration of the individual sites concerned. I fear that the proposed ‘wholesale’ removal from being “washed over by the Green Belt” to being “inset within the Green Belt” will forever change the nature of West Horsley and, once lost, the character of our village and many surrounding villages will be changed for the worse forever and will clearly be irreversible, which would be a tragic and very sad loss to West Horsley.

I am therefore OBJECTING to the proposals map and the proposed amendment of the Green Belt boundary around West Horsley in particular. I would ask that the proposals map be rejected, reconsidered and amended.

HOUSING NEED

The target house building programme proposed by GBC represents a 25% increase in the housing stock of the borough, whilst we have been advised that the Office of national Statistics (ONS) projects a population increase of some 15% for the borough of Guildford over the same period, I THEREFORE CANNOT SEE OR UNDERSTAND WHY GBC DEEMS IT SO NECESSARY TO INCREASE THE TARGET HOUSE BUILDING PROGRAMME BY A 25% INCREASE IN THE HOUSING STOCK OF THE BOROUGH.
Without a doubt the proposed increase in the number of new houses required has NOT been proven for the village of West Horsley. In my opinion the Proposed Submission Local Plan in respect of West Horsley is excessive in terms of the potential residential provision currently indicated.

I do not believe that the scale of development proposed, in any way, reflects the actual need, or that it respects the local character and existing built density of the village. But I do strongly feel the Horsleys (both East and West) should have new houses built for reasons already stated (PARTICULARLY FOR THE YOUNG AND OLD) but in a much less excessive way. The necessity for 385 new houses on the four proposed sites is grossly excessive.

The population of West Horsley is circa 2828 – to build 385 houses with an increasing family size per household according to new data from Eurostat (according to a Telegraph article of August 2015) stating that the average of 2.4 children is now growing and there are more four baby families now in Britain than almost all of Europe. If we assume that it is still only 2.4 children per family then 385 houses will equate to circa 1700 people – that is a 60% increase on the already existing population of West Horsley – I cannot comprehend the thought process of GBC if they actually want to increase the population of West Horsley by 60% - the village will quite literally just not be able to cope in anyway whatsoever. If the population was increased by 15-20% then it would be necessary to build circa 130 more houses or circa 33 per the four proposed sites, which would be so much more appropriate and within the desires of circa 95% of the Horsleys (East and West).

I therefore OBJECT to the current site allocation and housing densities proposed for all four sites in West Horsley.

I understand that in March 2014 the Government published a new web-based Planning Practise Guidance (Housing & economic land availability assessment, Methodology – stage 5: Final evidence base, 6 March 2014) to accompany and give further detail about the policies in the NPPF. This guidance set out that unmet housing need in a particular area is unlikely to meet the “very special circumstances” test to justify development within the Green Belt. It states “Unmet housing need 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 the Green Belt”.

On 4th October 2014, I understand that the Government announced that it had updated its online Planning Practise Guidance. The aim of this was to reaffirm local authorities’ abilities to “safeguard their local area against urban sprawl, and to protect the green lungs around towns and cities”. The Government said that it wanted to make planning policy clear that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.

The new guidance read: “Do housing and economic needs override constraints on the use of land, such as Green Belt? - The NPPF should be read as a whole: need alone is not the only factor to be considered when drawing up a Local Plan. The Framework is clear that local planning authorities should, through their Local Plans, meet objectively assessed needs unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted. Such policies include those relating to sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives, and/ or designated as sites of special scientific interest, land designated as Green Belt, local green space, an area of outstanding natural beauty, heritage coast or within a national park or the Broads; designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion.

The Framework makes clear that, once established, Green belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan.

Do local planning authorities have to meet in full housing needs identified in needs assessments? – Local authorities should prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess their full housing needs. However, assessing need is just
the first stage in developing a Local Plan. Once need has been assessed, the local planning authority should prepare a strategic housing land availability assessment to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period, and in so doing take account of any constraints such as Green Belt, which indicate that development should be restricted and which may restrain the ability of an authority to meet its need.”

On the 19 December 2014 the Planning Minister wrote to the Chief Executive at the Planning Inspectorate about Strategic Housing Market Assessments. This letter set out the relationship between housing figures produced as part of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment and those in a Local Plan and how to take into account constraints such as Green Belt land: “However, the outcome of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is untested and should not automatically be seen as a proxy for a final housing requirement in Local Plans.

It does not immediately or in itself invalidate housing numbers in existing Local Plans. Councils will need to consider Strategic Housing Market Assessment evidence carefully and take adequate time to consider whether there area environmental and policy constraints, such as Green Belt, which will impact on their overall final housing requirement. They also need to consider whether there are opportunities to co-operate with neighbouring planning authorities to meet needs across housing market areas. Only after those considerations are complete will the council’s approach be tested at examination by an inspector. Clearly each council will need to work through this process to take account of particular local circumstances in responding to Strategic Housing Market Assessments”.

It is strongly of my opinion that the overall extent of development required in the borough necessary to meet the employment and housing needs in the borough, as set out in Policy S2, has not been satisfactorily defined having regard to the methodology summarised above.

The West Surrey Strategic Housing Market assessment (SHMA) assesses an Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) of 633 dwellings per annum “but does not take into account land supply or other constraints to development”, as per paragraph 1.2 of the Guildford Summary Report – October 2015. This figure is acknowledged as including upwards adjustments to support growth in student numbers and higher migration levels than are shown in the 2012-based Population Projections and represents an OAN 23% higher than need calculated through London sensitivity analysis, as per paragraphs 4.1 – 4.2 of the same Guildford summary Report.

Policy S2 of the Proposed Local Plan applies uncritically this OAN figure to identify a housing requirement of 13,860 dwellings for the plan period (20 years at 693 dwellings per annum). There is no evidence to indicate that in defining this figure GBC has undertaken a careful consideration of “whether there are environmental and policy constraints, such as Green Belt, which will impact on their overall final housing requirement” and which indicate that development should be restricted.

In my opinion, the Proposed Submission Local Plan’s proposal to make provision for 62% of this total dwelling requirement on land that is currently Green Belt is simply NOT ADEQUATELY JUSTIFIED OR SUPPORTED WITH SOUND ARGUMENT OR TAKING INTO ACCOUNT GOVERNMENT POLICY REGARDING THE PROTECTION OF GREENBELT AND EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES.

Furthermore, I also understand that GBC will not release details of the methodology used by their third party consultants to arrive at the OAN figures used, which, in my opinion, also makes the likelihood of the Proposed Local Plan being considered unsound in this respect. Given that these OAN figures then play such a fundamental role in many of the Site and Strategy issues (and in particular Site Allocation) I believe that much of the Proposed Local Plan is very much open to challenge, possibly including judicial review.

A disproportionate burden of meeting what GBC has chosen to define as its development needs is also proposed to fall on the more rural east of the borough.
Within this eastern area, West Horsley is then allocated to bear an excessive proportion of this proposed development (as stated above, circa 60% increase of the population of West Horsley), despite the numerous countervailing reasons and objections put forward in previous consultation rounds by many local residents (e.g. narrow roads; areas of flood risk; access to both senior and junior school places; medical facilities, parking availability at the station, etc.) If adopted, the draft plan will put an unsustainable pressure on all local resources and infrastructure.

I would further make the point that the Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013 – 2031 made no such case for siting large numbers of residential units within West Horsley. As previously stated, West Horsley is remote from the existing centres of employment and the new Economic Development Site proposals, which are focussed on the opposite side of the borough.

I just cannot understand why it is deemed necessary for such an excessive number of houses to be proposed to be built in West Horsley. To me it seems like total opportunism on behalf of GBC and local and owners which would be massively detrimental to the village of West Horsley.

I therefore **OBJECT to the borough housing targets set out in Policy S2.**

Furthermore, I am also concerned that all of the proposed Site Allocation sites are currently designated for years 1 – 5 of the plan, which I feel would only exacerbate local infrastructure problems.

**CHARACTER OF THE LOCAL AREA**

It is incredibly important that West Horsley’s local character, distinctiveness, history and architecture is clearly defined and then promoted and reinforced within the Proposed Local Plan. Poor or average design or execution within the village just cannot be accepted.

I therefore **SUPPORT Policy D1: Making better places;** where these sentiments are further reinforced by stating that “All developments will: …be laid out to make the best use of the natural features such as trees and hedges and levels, and enhance views into and out of the site….promote and reinforce local distinctiveness to create a sense of place….be expected to use art and materials of a nature appropriate to their setting”

Any new development should work to retain existing natural features and trees, rather than being allowed to clear all existing features to facilitate the standardised approach of volume house builders.

Also, and whilst I object to the principle of ‘inssetting’ so many rural villages and West Horsley in particular, in general terms I can also **SUPPORT Policy D4: Development in urban areas and inset villages.**

Furthermore, I **SUPPORT Policy H1: Homes for all,** particularly the statements under the heading Housing Mix; that states “New development should provide a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes appropriate to the site size, characteristics and location….. and under the heading Density states that ”New residential development is required to make the most efficient use of land whilst responding to local character, context and distinctiveness. Residential densities will vary dependent upon the local area context and character and the sustainability of the location.”

- **SITE ALLOCATION**

At present there are four sites in West Horsley included as sites allocated for development within the Proposed Local Plan. Two further sites are being proposed for East Horsley, one of which immediately abuts the West Horsley parish boundary, which will no doubt primarily utilise the same local resources and infrastructure.

The four sites allocated within West Horsley are:

- Policy A37 – Land at and to the rear of Bell & Colvill, Epsom Road, WH (40 homes / 1.4 hectare / 28.6 dwellings per hectare)
• Policy A38 - Land to the west of West Horsley (Manor Farm, between East Lane and Long Reach) (135 homes / 8.4 hectare / 16.1 dwellings per hectare).

• Policy A40 - Land to the north of West Horsley (Waterloo Farm at rear of Ockham Road North) (120 homes / 8 hectare / 15 dwellings per hectare).

• Policy A41 - Land to the south of West Horsley (on East Lane) (90 homes / 4.8 hectare / 18.8 per hectare).

This is a total of 385 homes on 22.6 hectares, at an average density of 17 per hectare.

ADDED, Policy A39 - Land near Horsley Railway Station (off Ockham Road North and at rear of Heatherdene) (100 homes / 5.7 hectare / 17.5 per hectare) is immediately abutting the West Horsley Parish boundary, however it is not in West Horsley (as referred to incorrectly on page 125 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan) but is actually in East Horsley.

I would reiterate that I am not opposed to new housing in West Horsley per se; however this scale of potential development in, and around, West Horsley is excessive. I would strongly question the need for the inclusion of all four sites and certainly not at the densities proposed.

In particular I would like to STRONGLY OBJECT to the inclusion of Policy A41: Land to the south of West Horsley.

The Policy A41 site is, in my opinion, essential to the village’s semi-rural identity and character and it is vitally important that this open green aspect is maintained through what is, in so many ways, the centre of the village.

If the Proposed Local Plan is adopted, Policy A41 would allow this open space to become the only development (existing or proposed) of any significant depth along the whole of the southern side of the East lane / The Street corridor and would severely compromise this ‘green gap’ between the northern and southern parts of West Horsley.

This is contrary to at least two of the five essential purposes of Green Belt as defined at NPPF paragraph 80 (namely to check unrestricted sprawl and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment – functions which this part of the Green Belt, including this site, is recognised as performing at paragraph 8.2 of the Guildford Green Belt and Countryside Study).

This site had not previously been include as a potential development site within previous draft versions of the emerging Local Plan and assessment of this site, in background studies forming the evidence base for this Site Allocation, is based on incorrect information.

In particular:

1. In the Guildford Borough Land Availability Assessment (LAA) 2016 – Page 388 in respect of site reference 2063 (‘the site of East Lane’) it states under ‘summary of land designations’ – “Green Belt adjoining settlement boundary”. This is incorrect. Unlike any of the other three sites proposed in West Horsley, this site currently has no boundary that adjoins the village Settlement boundary as defined in the GBC Local Plan 2003.

1. Also, The Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study produced by Pegasus Planning Group, Volume III – Appendix VI – Sustainability Walking Distance Plans for Land Surrounding the Villages refers to the above site, plus the field beyond that the Council now propose removing from the Green Belt (together with a section of Lollesworth Wood) as site D. All assumed walking paths to (i) Nearest Local Centre, (ii) Healthcare Facility and (iii) Railway Station are presuming that access could have been gained to Lollesworth Lane via the undesignated (save that it has been proposed to be removed from the Green Belt) field to the south and fronting Lollesworth Lane. This field is currently used for grazing sheep and is owned by Mr & Mrs. Richard Wills of Lollesworth Farm who are my direct neighbours and they have HAVE MADE IT ABUNDANTLY CLEAR TO ME THAT UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES WHATSOEVER THEY WILL PERMIT SUCH ACCESS ROUTE ACROSS THEIR FIELD, therefore the assumption used by Pegasus Planning Group is incorrect and may well have a material effect on their conclusions.
Furthermore, any development on this site would not be consistent with the distinctive settlement pattern of the village and the important relationship between the built environment and the surrounding landscape (i.e. development on one side of the route only). In my opinion, there will be considerable harm to important views of the village from surrounding landscape (from Lollesworth Lane) and from within the village of local landmarks (of Lollesworth Wood), contrary to Policy D4 of the Proposed Local Plan.

Allocation of the site will not “promote sustainable patterns of development” and the wildlife / environmental amenity loss of this site is likely to result in a significant detriment to the village’s character. Furthermore it will cause harm to the biodiversity and natural environment of the adjoining Lollesworth Wood SNCI. Indeed, this is contrary to Sustainability Objective 1 of the Sustainability Appraisal framework set out at Table 4.1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal.

Indeed Policy I4: Green and blue infrastructure; states 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.” Local Sites are earlier defined in the policy as including Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI).

I cannot think of any reason for this amendment, save for a potential second phase development in the next Local Plan and surely it cannot be considered to be justified by “exceptional circumstances” when no alternative use is currently proposed and its current and historic use is as pasture?

Added to which, if the allocation of this site under Policy A41 is adopted, the prospect of further infilling and extension of the village settlement defined in the 2003 Local Plan on adjacent undeveloped, but currently protected, sites south of East Lane and north of Lollesworth Wood would significantly increase, raising the chances of further subsequent harm to the Green Belt and the purposes for which it has been designated in this area. Development of any nature in this location would result in the greater risk of encroachment and merging between the two built settlements in West Horsley and would fundamentally harm to the existing open and natural character of the village.

The proposed amendment to the Green Belt boundary in this location, resulting from the allocation of the site, does not therefore potentially have sufficient regard to its intended permanence in the long term or its capacity of enduring beyond the plan period. Indeed, in my opinion it is contrary to NPPF paragraph 83.

Added to which and contrary to the guidance of NPPF paragraph 85 it has not been clearly defined using “physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent”. In my opinion, the proposed revision to the Green Belt boundary in this location has been poorly considered.

I would therefore specifically OBJECT to the amendment of the Green Belt in this area, to both the site encompassed by Policy A41 and to the field and wood beyond Policy A41 site, whereby an adjacent field and part of the Lollesworth Wood (SNCI & Ancient Wood designated) to the south have been removed from the Green Belt.

Finally, if any of the above mentioned five sites (four in West Horsley and one in East Horsley) are ultimately to be included within the adopted Local Plan then very careful consideration should be given to the proposed density of any future developments. I think that it far more appropriate that a density of circa 8-10 homes per hectare and a maximum density of 15 homes per hectare is more appropriate for such semi-rural village locations, and certainly are more in keeping with the village’s existing character and density. The existing village settlement largely comprises low density housing, with a considerable mix of ages and housing styles. The number of houses proposed on each of the potential development sites in West Horsley, and thereby their densities, are completely out of character with the existing village, where a density of around 8-10 homes per hectare is much nearer to the norm.

West Horsley requires a balanced mix of homes to meet the community’s needs. West Horsley will require some smaller scale ‘affordable’ homes, both for young people starting home ownership or independent rental and for more elderly residents who wish to downsize for obvious reasons. I believe that a significant number of the ‘affordable’ housing should be available for shared ownership, enabling younger people and families to gain a foothold on the housing ladder,
which they would otherwise be unable to due to the high cost of local housing. These younger residents would however contribute significantly to the fabric of the local community and would ensure a balanced community of all ages.

**TRANSPORT & HIGHWAY CONSIDERATIONS**

Any traffic generated from the proposed Site Allocation housing sites will further contribute to traffic congestion in the area. The existing road system is only appropriate for a semi-rural village, such as West Horsley; indeed its appearance and scale is one of the characteristics of the village.

Many of the traffic routes are little more than lanes, many with pavements on only one side of the carriageway. With many households now having at least two cars, the potential increase in traffic could overwhelm the existing infrastructure and lead to serious, and potentially life threatening, safety concerns.

No specific proposal as to how GBC intend to address these concerns has been detailed in the Local Plan or the Draft Guildford borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016.

Furthermore, GBC are still championing the creation of a new significant settlement under Policy A35: Land at former Wisley Airfield, Ockham. This is potentially a double whammy for local infrastructure, and in particular local roads, from which it may never recover!

I would therefore **OBJECT** to Policy A35: Land at former Wisley airfield, Ockham.

Is at capacity. There is no adjacent land available for additional car parking provision. A significant increase in the village population will increase the pressure on station car parking and traffic movements to and from the station on already narrow and, at times, congested local roads.

There is currently a regular bus service operating along the A246 between Guildford and Leatherhead, however this is really only of use to residents at the southern end of West Horsley. There is also currently an extremely limited bus service along East Lane and The Street, through West Horsley village, which only operates 2 or 3 times per day between Monday to Friday only. There is no service at the weekends. Any significant development of new homes at this end of the village would necessitate an improvement in this service for it to be in any way considered sustainable.

In Policy I3: Sustainable transport for new developments; GBC proposes that “We will expect developments will contribute...”. The policy as drafted is weak and non-specific and as such has no real specific directive that developers must contribute towards sustainable transport and is open to abuse from developers or housebuilders.

I would therefore ask that **Policy I3: Sustainable transport for new developments should be AMENDED** to state that GBC require this rather than expect them!

**INFRASTRUCTURE**

West Horsley is a small village with few local facilities. There is currently just one shop at the southern end of the village, where local car parking is very limited. Most people in West Horsley already have to travel, largely by car, to East Horsley for their day to day shopping, banking, doctors visits etc. The existing car parking facilities in East Horsley are already at capacity and any increase in the local population will add to the already existing problems. Any new development would not “support the continued viability” of the existing village infrastructure, as has been said by GBC in the past. In my opinion it would only serve to overload the same beyond breaking point.

State educational provision, both at junior (The Raleigh) and senior (The Howard of Effingham) school level, is already under strain and has been a real and sensitive issue for Surrey County Council and the local community for some years. The Raleigh School, which endeavours to serve both West Horsley and East Horsley, is full every year and has been so for decades. Its site is already fully developed and the opportunities for further expansion are limited. The Raleigh has however recently indicated to local residents that it cannot further increase capacity on its existing site and is considering its options for relocating, raising further concern about possible future erosion and harm to the Green Belt.

Secondary school places are already restricted in number at the Howard of Effingham School for children from West Horsley and all other available secondary schools are considerably further afield in either Guildford or Woking. Potential
residential development in Effingham and Bookham would only further increase the problems for local West Horsley children, as children from these developments would, by being closer to the school, have priority. This, however, could push West Horsley children out of its potential catchment, with no currently sustainable local alternative.

I understand that a new junior school and senior school is proposed at the Wisley redevelopment site, although this will not be delivered until well into the plan period and certainly after the currently proposed residential development in West Horsley is well underway or finished.

In the Independent school sector, both Glenesk and Cranmore private schools are supported not just by local Horsley families, but also by many families from Guildford and other surrounding villages, some travelling significant distances. In term time each of these schools contributes to significant local traffic problems on Ockham Road North and the A246 respectively.

The Horsley Medical Centre is already at capacity, as it serves both East and West Horsley, and any additional development would necessitate an expansion of this facility. Possible extension is mentioned in the Draft Guildford borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016 but scant detail, except for envisaged timescale, is given, which is completely unacceptable.

Finally, I also believe that the existing utilities infrastructure in the area would be further stretched, probably beyond acceptable limits.

Surface water drainage along East Lane has been a continual problem throughout the autumn and winter months. The addition of further built environment would just make these problems worse. I understand that Thames Water have already advised GBC that the area’s waste water network is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all the local developments.

I also understand that there may also be a serious under capacity of existing foul water sewers. The foul drainage system from West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley will, I understand, all need to be upgraded to cope with the increased demand. Thames Water has apparently advised GBC that a two or three year lead-in period will be needed to install the necessary waste water network and treatment capacity after planning permission for any significant development is granted. Unfortunately I’m sure that housing developers will not be waiting that period before they want to build / sell their new houses! This is clearly unacceptable and again shows a flaw in the proposals put out for consultation by GBC.

Water pressure in the area is already poor.

I note that GBC states in Item 4.6.1 that “Timely provision of suitable, adequate infrastructure is crucial to the well-being of the borough’s population, and its economy. Guildford Borough Infrastructure baseline 2013 summarises the capacity and quality of existing infrastructure, including planned improvements. Historically infrastructure provision and upgrading has not always kept pace with the growth of population, employment and transport demands, and in parts of the borough some infrastructure is currently at, or near to, capacity or of poor quality.” I have no doubt that West Horsley must fit into this category.

I was pleased to note that Policy I1: Infrastructure and delivery; states its aim as being “To support delivery of this Local Plan, infrastructure needed to support development should be provided and available when first needed to serve the occupants and users of the development...”. However it then goes on to say “where the timely provision of necessary supporting infrastructure is not secured, development may be phased to reflect infrastructure delivery, or will be refused.”

I don’t think that GBC can offer this “timely provision of necessary supporting infrastructure” – it either happens in full when developers commence construction or they are not granted planning permission.

WEST HORSELYS HISTORY

West Horsley has many listed buildings, flint and Lovelace houses and any new developments need to be built in keeping with the existing architechture and not just bland developments from the volume house builders.
CONCLUSION

I fully appreciate that more houses need to be built both for the young and the old but it needs to be measured, proportionate and not excessive (ie not increase the population of West Horsley by 60%) and the Green Belt which is a real asset to West Horsley, the borough, the county and the whole of the UK NEEDS TO BE PROTECTED AS FAR AS IS POSSIBLE. And thus all new housing should be built to a measured quantity (eg 120 houses in total in West Horsley with circa 25 houses on each site) and before any Green Belt avenue is explored existing brownfield sites close to areas of employment must and have to be utilised.I do not believe that the Proposed Submission Local Plan : Strategy and Sites 2016 has completely reviewed the possibilities for residential development on such land. The proven need (OAN) for the full extent of new housing proposed I completely disagree with. The proposed potential development in West Horsley is excessive and inappropriate and over dense and certain locations should be removed.

The inclusion of the proposed allocation to the south of West Horsley under Policy A41 is unsound in that, having regard to the advice at paragraph 182 of the NPPF. Allocation of this specific site and its Policy is neither consistent with national policy, nor is it justified. This proposed allocation site (Policy A41) should be removed from the Local Plan and it should be returned to the protection that its present Green Belt designation gives it. The case for “exceptional circumstances” has not been proven for the proposed change in Green Belt boundary here, and actually the same goes for many other locations in the borough.

- Also the proposed removal of the field and part of Lollesworth Wood to the south of the above site is completely wrong and should be reconsidered and returned to the protection that its present Green Belt designation gives it.. Added to which the field is owned by Mr and Mrs Richard Wills and they absolutely will not give access rights for a footpath through their land.

- I do not accept the case for “exceptional circumstances” has been proven for the proposed change in Green Belt boundary here either.

- High density development in West Horsley is completely inappropriate and a more appropriate level of density (as highlighted earlier) would be right for the village with small houses aswell as apartments for the young and old alike. To finish any significant new housing in West Horsley would need huge improvements in the existing infrastructure (education, doctors, drainage, parking, improvements of the road network).

It seems to me over the next 3-5 years West Horsley is line for a disproportionate no of new houses. If West Horsley sites Policy A37,38,40 and 41 and Policy A39 which immediately abuts the West Horsley Parish boundary are all built out that is just under 500 new houses, where the tarhet is 693 homes per year in the borough for 20 yrs – that is just under 15% of the boroughs quota per year which is clearly grossly excessive for West Horsley to be dealt this blow.

Why are 70% of new homes being proposed to be built on Green Belt or on other countryside. I object to building on the Green Belt because the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its openness and permanence (National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 79)

I object to the scale of new building throughout the borough, which is disproportionate and unjustified, particularly in West Horsley. I think the calculation of housing need is unsubstantiated. The model has not been scrutinised and fundamental assumptions are flawed. The housing target is unconstrained.

I object to the fact that brownfield land would be disproportionately used for commercial development and unnecessary retail expansion. This means Green Belt land is used for housing development unnecessarily.

I object to the fact that new sites have been proposed in this consultation which have not previously been considered, which is not appropriate at this stage.

OVERALL I OBJECT TO THE GUILDFORD BOROUGH PROPOSED SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN : STRATEGY AND SITES 2016 as large parts are excessive, unsound and technically incorrect.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I write regarding the above and ask that the following comments be taken into account when considering the same.

I live in the village of West Horsley and therefore many of my comments relate to the specific issues relating to that village alone.

The Issue

I am aware of Central Government’s desire to increase the UK’s housing provision, particularly in the South East, and within this context Guildford Borough Council (GBC) is under pressure to adopt a deliverable Local Plan for the borough for the period until 2031 and with particular reference to housing provision.

Within this context, I believe that the extra housing provision in discussion should ideally be located on existing brownfield sites within the borough and be located as near as possible to the centres of employment. I do not believe that the current document has given sufficient consideration to this issue, seeking instead an over-reliance on the proposed utilisation of the currently designated Green Belt land around local villages, particularly to the east of the borough, to meet such needs.

In my opinion (and this is formulated through extensive research and professional advice taken) this is a fundamental flaw in the Guildford borough Submission Local Plan 2016 (Proposed Local Plan) as it proposes extensive residential development that will be remote from the existing centres of employment or where indicated within the Proposed Local Plan; these being largely on the opposite side of the borough. Such a policy would be counter to the principles of sustainable development and would undoubtedly put further pressure on the already struggling transport infrastructure. I would like to see this approach rejected and the bulk of new proposed housing allocated nearer to the existing and proposed centres of employment, i.e. within and around Guildford town centre / urban area, rather than in the borough’s outlying, and previously protected, villages.

But I also think that semi-rural villages in the borough, such as West Horsley should and be expected to bear some of the brunt of the future housing provision as it is necessary to increase the number of houses within the village, amongst other reasons, for the young to be able to stay within the village and the older residents to have the opportunity to downsize within the village, but any such housing provision must only be allocated having considered many factors, such as: environmental issues (inc Green Belt), housing needs, local character and architecture, transport and highway situations, infrastructure (schooling, doctors, car parking in and around the village and at the rail stn, potn development sites amongst others.

I will therefore set out my views on each topic with regard to West Horsley below.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 182, advises that a Local Plan can only be adopted if it is sound.

As a matter of government policy, soundness requires a plan to be:

- positively prepared;
Within these four heads it should enable, over its plan period, the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF.

I have several strong concerns as to whether this is the case within the Proposed Local Plan, as currently drafted, and believe that some of the current policies are not justified nor consistent with national policy, thereby rendering the same unsound without significant revision.

I therefore **OBJECT to the Guildford borough Proposed Submission Local Plan – Strategy & Sites 2016** as currently drafted.

**ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (INC. GREEN BELT)**

In my opinion, the Metropolitan Green Belt and its special natural environment is a defining characteristic of Guildford borough and, indeed, West Horsley.

I believe that there should remain a general presumption that it should be protected. The Green Belt should only be sacrificed as a last resort, as once lost it can never be reclaimed. Many many villages in Guildford borough are still threatened with removal from their long established Green Belt designation, including where I live, the village of West Horsley. Personally, I do not believe that West Horsley’s currently defined Settlement Area boundaries (ref. 2003 Local Plan) needs such a significant extension, as is being proposed, and perhaps only needs a smaller scale review. In this context, paragraph of Policy P2: Green Belt; is in my opinion so badly worded. For GBC to state “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt, as shown on the proposals map, against inappropriate development” is not being represented at all in the way they are proposing removing so much of the Green Belt, and I do not agree with the proposals map and its proposed new Green Belt boundary.

The national policy regarding protection for the Green Belt is contained within section 9 of the NPPF. Paragraph 79 confirms that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts.

The main and probably the most important aim of national Green Belt policy, which is repeated word for word by GBC in item 4.3.11, is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of the Green Belt being its openness and permanence.

As the Green Belt in Surrey is long established and has detailed boundaries, “exceptional circumstances” must be demonstrated to necessitate the change to its boundaries. I do not believe that this Proposed Local Plan is an “exceptional circumstance”.

Paragraph 84 of the NPPF advises that “When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary”.

GBC states in item 4.3.12 that “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”.

I believe that West Horsley’s open, semi-rural character makes an important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt in this part of the borough. This is the specific and differentiating characteristic of West Horsley over its more ‘leafy’ and more tightly developed neighbour, East Horsley, which I believe GBC and its consultants have failed to recognise or protect.

It is a strong feeling that the semi-rural landscape character of the village is greatly valued by West Horsley residents and is detailed in general terms within the Guildford Borough Council Landscape Character Assessment.
A huge amount of the character of West Horsley is defined by the open views, (via paths, gates, farm entrance openings, bridle ways etc) from the roads either entering or passing through the village settlement.

Throughout the village, stretches of undeveloped countryside on just one side of Ockham Road North, then East Lane, Ripley Lane and Long Reasch, and also The Street boldly reinforce this characteristic. The clearly defined precedent is of the village settlement being on one side of the route and there being open vistas across fields and meadows and paddocks or into woodlands on the other. This should be protected not compromised by any developments.

Also the fact that the main traffic route through the village (along East Lane and The Street) currently benefits from a ‘green gap’ of woods and fields to the north (between The Rectory, roughly opposite Northcote Road to Grovelands Farm, beyond the railway bridge) and to the south (between Roundtree Farm and the listed Railway Cottages, at the Railway bridge). This natural green area, centred on the Lollesworth Lane and Long Reach junction, is in many ways the real centre of the village.

Clearly Green Belt everywhere is under pressure, but in my opinion, I strongly feel that any linear extensions of the existing settlement boundaries should be strongly resisted.

I therefore believe that the parish of West Horsley’s open, semi-rural, character does indeed make clear and important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt, and therefore I believe that, under national planning policy it should remain “washed over by” the Green Belt, rather than being “inset from the Green Belt” as proposed.

Policy on development with the Metropolitan Green Belt is set out in paragraphs 79 – 92 of the NPPF.

Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt and paragraph 87 of the NPPF clearly states that it “should not be approved except in very special circumstances”. Furthermore paragraph 89 advises local planning authorities to “regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt”.

Whilst I accept that it is possible for a local planning authority to conduct a review of Green Belt land and consider redefining boundaries which add or take away Green Belt land in order to meet these “very special circumstances”, paragraph 83 of the NPPF states, “Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.”

This paragraph clearly sets out that a Green Belt review should only happen in “exceptional circumstances”. This idea is further explained on in paragraph 82 as being “for example when planning for larger scale development such as new settlements or major urban extensions”. The proposals for West Horsley are neither a NEW SETTLEMENT NOR A MAJOR URBAN EXTENSION.

I note that within item 4.3.16 GBC states that “We consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify the amendment of Green Belt boundaries in order to facilitate the development that is needed and to promote sustainable patterns of development.” - in my opinion these are absolutely not EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES and therefore I am requesting that this sentence is removed.

I cannot see how GBC have directed sustainable development towards existing urban areas and also have not directed it next towards town and villages already inset with the Green Belt.

Removal of any land from the Green Belt should only be allowed after long and thoughtful consideration of the individual sites concerned. I fear that the proposed ‘wholesale’ removal from being “washed over by the Green Belt” to being “inset within the Green Belt” will forever change the nature of West Horsley and, once lost, the character of our village and many surrounding villages will be changed for the worse forever and will clearly be irreversible, which would be a tragic and very sad loss to West Horsley.
I am therefore **OBJECTING to the proposals map and the proposed amendment of the Green Belt boundary around West Horsley** in particular. I would ask that the proposals map be rejected, reconsidered and amended.

**HOUSING NEED**

The target house building programme proposed by GBC represents a 25% increase in the housing stock of the borough, whilst we have been advised that the Office of national Statistics (ONS) projects a population increase of some 15% for the borough of Guildford over the same period, I THEREFORE CANNOT SEE OR UNDERSTAND WHY GBC DEEMS IT SO NECESSARY TO INCREASE THE TARGET HOUSE BUILDING PROGRAMME BY A 25% INCREASE IN THE HOUSING STOCK OF THE BOROUGH.

Without a doubt the proposed increase in the number of new houses required has NOT been proven for the village of West Horsley. In my opinion the Proposed Submission Local Plan in respect of West Horsley is excessive in terms of the potential residential provision currently indicated.

I do not believe that the scale of development proposed, in any way, reflects the actual need, or that it respects the local character and existing built density of the village. But I do strongly feel the Horsleys (both East and West) should have new houses built for reasons already stated (PARTICULARLY FOR THE YOUNG AND OLD) but in a much less excessive way. The necessity for 385 new houses on the four proposed sites is grossly excessive.

The population of West Horsley is circa 2828 – to build 385 houses with an increasing family size per household according to new data from Eurostat (according to a Telegraph article of August 2015) stating that the average of 2.4 children is now growing and there are more four baby families now in Britain than almost all of Europe. If we assume that it is still only 2.4 children per family then 385 houses will equate to circa 1700 people – that is a 60% increase on the already existing population of West Horsley – I cannot comprehend the thought process of GBC if they actually want to increase the population of West Horsley by 60% - the village will quite literally just not be able to cope in anyway whatsoever. If the population was increased by 15-20% then it would be necessary to build circa 130 more houses or circa 33 per the four proposed sites, which would be so much more appropriate and within the desires of circa 95% of the Horsleys (East and West).

I therefore **OBJECT** to the current site allocation and housing densities proposed for all four sites in West Horsley.

I understand that in March 2014 the Government published a new web-based Planning Practise Guidance (Housing & economic land availability assessment, Methodology – stage 5: Final evidence base, 6 March 2014) to accompany and give further detail about the policies in the NPPF. This guidance set out that unmet housing need in a particular area is unlikely to meet the “very special circumstances” test to justify development within the Green Belt. It states **“Unmet housing need 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 the Green Belt.”**

On 4th October 2014, I understand that the Government announced that it had updated its online Planning Practise Guidance. The aim of this was to reaffirm local authorities’ abilities to **“safeguard their local area against urban sprawl, and to protect the green lungs around towns and cities”**. The Government said that it wanted to make planning policy clear that **housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.**

The new guidance read: **“Do housing and economic needs override constraints on the use of land, such as Green Belt? - The NPPF should be read as a whole: need alone is not the only factor to be considered when drawing up a Local Plan. The Framework is clear that local planning authorities should, through their Local Plans, meet objectively assessed needs unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted. Such policies include those relating to sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives, and/or designated as sites of special scientific interest, land designated as Green Belt, local green space, an area of**
outstanding natural beauty, heritage coast or within a national park or the Broads; designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion.

The Framework makes clear that, once established, Green belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan.

Do local planning authorities have to meet in full housing needs identified in needs assessments? – Local authorities should prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess their full housing needs. However, assessing need is just the first stage in developing a Local Plan. Once need has been assessed, the local planning authority should prepare a strategic housing land availability assessment to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period, and in so doing take account of any constraints such as Green Belt, which indicate that development should be restricted and which may restrain the ability of an authority to meet its need.”

On the 19 December 2014 the Planning Minister wrote to the Chief Executive at the Planning Inspectorate about Strategic Housing Market Assessments. This letter set out the relationship between housing figures produced as part of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment and those in a Local Plan: “However, the outcome of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is untested and should not automatically be seen as a proxy for a final housing requirement in Local Plans.

It does not immediately or in itself invalidate housing numbers in existing Local Plans. Councils will need to consider Strategic Housing Market Assessment evidence carefully and take adequate time to consider whether there area environmental and policy constraints, such as Green Belt, which will impact on their overall final housing requirement. They also need to consider whether there are opportunities to co-operate with neighbouring planning authorities to meet needs across housing market areas. Only after those considerations are complete will the council’s approach be tested at examination by an inspector. Clearly each council will need to work through this process to take account of particular local circumstances in responding to Strategic Housing Market Assessments”.

It is strongly of my opinion that the overall extent of development required in the borough necessary to meet the employment and housing needs in the borough, as set out in Policy S2, has not been satisfactorily defined having regard to the methodology summarised above.

The West Surrey Strategic Housing Market assessment (SHMA) assesses an Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) of 633 dwellings per annum “but does not take into account land supply or other constraints to development”, as per paragraph 1.2 of the Guildford Summary Report – October 2015. This figure is acknowledged as including upwards adjustments to support growth in student numbers and higher migration levels than are shown in the 2012-based Population Projections and represents an OAN 23% higher than need calculated through London sensitivity analysis, as per paragraphs 4.1 – 4.2 of the same Guildford summary Report.

Policy S2 of the Proposed Local Plan applies uncritically this OAN figure to identify a housing requirement of 13,860 dwellings for the plan period (20 years at 693 dwellings per annum). There is no evidence to indicate that in defining this figure GBC has undertaken a careful consideration of “whether there are environmental and policy constraints, such as Green Belt, which will impact on their overall final housing requirement” and which indicate that development should be restricted.

In my opinion, the Proposed Submission Local Plan’s proposal to make provision for 62% of this total dwelling requirement on land that is currently Green Belt is simply NOT ADEQUATELY JUSTIFIED OR SUPPORTED WITH SOUND ARGUEMENT OR TAKING INTO ACCOUNT GOVERNMENT POLICY REGARDING THE PROTECTION OF GREENBELT AND EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES.
Furthermore, I also understand that GBC will not release details of the methodology used by their third party consultants to arrive at the OAN figures used, which, in my opinion, also makes the likelihood of the Proposed Local Plan being considered unsound in this respect. Given that these OAN figures then play such a fundamental role in many of the Site and Strategy issues (and in particular Site Allocation) I believe that much of the Proposed Local Plan is very much open to challenge, possibly including judicial review.

A disproportionate burden of meeting what GBC has chosen to define as its development needs is also proposed to fall on the more rural east of the borough.

Within this eastern area, West Horsley is then allocated to bear an excessive proportion of this proposed development (as stated above, circa 60% increase of the population of West Horsley), despite the numerous countervailing reasons and objections put forward in previous consultation rounds by many local residents (e.g. narrow roads; areas of flood risk; access to both senior and junior school places; medical facilities, parking availability at the station, etc.) If adopted, the draft plan will put an unsustainable pressure on all local resources and infrastructure.

I would further make the point that the Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013 – 2031 made no such case for siting large numbers of residential units within West Horsley. As previously stated, West Horsley is remote from the existing centres of employment and the new Economic Development Site proposals, which are focussed on the opposite side of the borough.

I just cannot understand why it is deemed necessary for such an excessive number of houses to be proposed to be built in West Horsley. To me it seems like total opportunism on behalf of GBC and local and owners which would be massively detrimental to the village of West Horsley.

I therefore OBJECT to the borough housing targets set out in Policy S2.

Furthermore, I am also concerned that all of the proposed Site Allocation sites are currently designated for years 1 – 5 of the plan, which I feel would only exacerbate local infrastructure problems.

CHARACTER OF THE LOCAL AREA

It is incredibly important that West Horsley’s local character, distinctiveness, history and architecture is clearly defined and then promoted and reinforced within the Proposed Local Plan. Poor or average design or execution within the village just cannot be accepted.

I therefore SUPPORT Policy D1: Making better places; where these sentiments are further reinforced by stating that “All developments will: ...be laid out to make the best use of the natural features such as trees and hedges and levels, and enhance views into and out of the site....promote and reinforce local distinctiveness to create a sense of place....be expected to use art and materials of a nature appropriate to their setting”

Any new development should work to retain existing natural features and trees, rather than being allowed to clear all existing features to facilitate the standardised approach of volume house builders.

Also, and whilst I object to the principle of ‘insetting’ so many rural villages and West Horsley in particular, in general terms I can also SUPPORT Policy D4: Development in urban areas and inset villages.

Furthermore, I SUPPORT Policy H1: Homes for all, particularly the statements under the heading Housing Mix; that states “New development should provide a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes appropriate to the site size, characteristics and location..... and under the heading Density states that “New residential development is required to make the most efficient use of land whilst responding to local character, context and distinctiveness. Residential densities will vary dependent upon the local area context and character and the sustainability of the location.”
SITE ALLOCATION

At present there are four sites in West Horsley included as sites allocated for development within the Proposed Local Plan. Two further sites are being proposed for East Horsley, one of which immediately abuts the West Horsley parish boundary, which will no doubt primarily utilise the same local resources and infrastructure.

The four sites allocated within West Horsley are:

- Policy A37 – Land at and to the rear of Bell & Colvill, Epsom Road, WH (40 homes / 1.4 hectare / 28.6 dwellings per hectare)
- Policy A38 - Land to the west of West Horsley (Manor Farm, between East Lane and Long Reach) (135 homes / 8.4 hectare / 16.1 dwellings per hectare).
- Policy A40 - Land to the north of West Horsley (Waterloo Farm at rear of Ockham Road North) (120 homes / 8 hectare / 15 dwellings per hectare).
- Policy A41 - Land to the south of West Horsley (on East Lane) (90 homes / 4.8 hectare / 18.8 per hectare).

This is a total of 385 homes on 22.6 hectares, at an average density of 17 per hectare.

ADDED, Policy A39 - Land near Horsley Railway Station (off Ockham Road North and at rear of Heatherdene) (100 homes / 5.7 hectare / 17.5 per hectare) is immediately abutting the West Horsley Parish boundary, however it is not in West Horsley (as referred to incorrectly on page 125 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan) but is actually in East Horsley.

I would reiterate that I am not opposed to new housing in West Horsley per se; however this scale of potential development in, and around, West Horsley is excessive. I would strongly question the need for the inclusion of all four sites and certainly not at the densities proposed.

In particular I would like to STRONGLY OBJECT to the inclusion of Policy A41: Land to the south of West Horsley.

The Policy A41 site is, in my opinion, essential to the village’s semi-rural identity and character and it is vitally important that this open green aspect is maintained through what is, in so many ways, the centre of the village.

If the Proposed Local Plan is adopted, Policy A41 would allow this open space to become the only development (existing or proposed) of any significant depth along the whole of the southern side of the East lane / The Street corridor and would severely compromise this ‘green gap’ between the northern and southern parts of West Horsley.

This is contrary to at least two of the five essential purposes of Green Belt as defined at NPPF paragraph 80 (namely to check unrestricted sprawl and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment – functions which this part of the Green Belt, including this site, is recognised as performing at paragraph 8.2 of the Guildford Green Belt and Countryside Study).

This site had not previously been include as a potential development site within previous draft versions of the emerging Local Plan and assessment of this site, in background studies forming the evidence base for this Site Allocation, is based on incorrect information.

In particular:

1. In the Guildford Borough Land Availability Assessment (LAA) 2016 – Page 388 in respect of site reference 2063 (‘the site of East Lane’) it states under ‘summary of land designations’ – “Green Belt adjoining settlement boundary”. This is incorrect. Unlike any of the other three sites proposed in West Horsley, this site currently has no boundary that adjoins the village Settlement boundary as defined in the GBC Local Plan 2003.
1. Also, The Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study produced by Pegasus Planning Group, Volume III – Appendix VI – Sustainability Walking Distance Plans for Land Surrounding the Villages refers to the above site, plus the field beyond that the Council now propose removing from the Green Belt (together with a section of Lollesworth Wood) as site D. All assumed walking paths to (i) Nearest Local Centre, (ii) Healthcare Facility and (iii) Railway Station are presuming that access could have been gained to Lollesworth Lane via the undesignated (save that it has been proposed to be removed from the Green Belt) field to the south and fronting Lollesworth Lane. This field is currently used for grazing sheep and is owned by Mr & Mrs. Richard Wills of Lollesworth Farm who are my direct neighbours and they have HAVE MADE IT ABUNDANTLY CLEAR TO ME THAT UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES WHATSOEVER THEY WILL PERMIT SUCH ACCESS ROUTE ACROSS THEIR FIELD, therefore the assumption used by Pegasus Planning Group is incorrect and may well have a material effect on their conclusions.

Furthermore, any development on this site would not be consistent with the distinctive settlement pattern of the village and the important relationship between the built environment and the surrounding landscape (i.e. development on one side of the route only). In my opinion, there will be considerable harm to important views of the village from surrounding landscape (from Lollesworth Lane) and from within the village of local landmarks (of Lollesworth Wood), contrary to Policy D4 of the Proposed Local Plan.

Allocation of the site will not “promote sustainable patterns of development” and the wildlife / environmental amenity loss of this site is likely to result in a significant detriment to the village’s character. Furthermore it will cause harm to the biodiversity and natural environment of the adjoining Lollesworth Wood SNCI. Indeed, this is contrary to Sustainability Objective 1 of the Sustainability Appraisal framework set out at Table 4.1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal.

Indeed Policy I4: Green and blue infrastructure; states 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.” Local Sites are earlier defined in the policy as including Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI).

I cannot think of any reason for this amendment, save for a potential second phase development in the next Local Plan and surely it cannot be considered to be justified by “exceptional circumstances” when no alternative use is currently proposed and its current and historic use is as pasture?

Added to which, if the allocation of this site under Policy A41 is adopted, the prospect of further infilling and extension of the village settlement defined in the 2003 Local Plan on adjacent undeveloped, but currently protected, sites south of East Lane and north of Lollesworth Wood would significantly increase, raising the chances of further subsequent harm to the Green Belt and the purposes for which it has been designated in this area. Development of any nature in this location would result in the greater risk of encroachment and merging between the two built settlements in West Horsley and would fundamentally harm to the existing open and natural character of the village.

The proposed amendment to the Green Belt boundary in this location, resulting from the allocation of the site, does not therefore potentially have sufficient regard to its intended permanence in the long term or its capacity of enduring beyond the plan period. Indeed, in my opinion it is contrary to NPPF paragraph 83.

Added to which and contrary to the guidance of NPPF paragraph 85 it has not been clearly defined using “physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent”. In my opinion, the proposed revision to the Green Belt boundary in this location has been poorly considered.

I would therefore specifically OBJECT to the amendment of the Green Belt in this area, to both the site encompassed by Policy A41 and to the field and wood beyond Policy A41 site, whereby an adjacent field and part of the Lollesworth Wood (SNCI & Ancient Wood designated) to the south have been removed from the Green Belt.

Finally, if any of the above mentioned five sites (four in West Horsley and one in East Horsley) are ultimately to be included within the adopted Local Plan then very careful consideration should be given to the proposed density of any
future developments. I think that it far more appropriate that a density of circa 8-10 homes per hectare and a maximum
density of 15 homes per hectare is more appropriate for such semi-rural village locations, and certainly are more in
keeping with the village’s existing character and density. The existing village settlement largely comprises low density
housing, with a considerable mix of ages and housing styles. The number of houses proposed on each of the potential
development sites in West Horsley, and thereby their densities, are completely out of character with the existing village,
where a density of around 8-10 homes per hectare is much nearer to the norm.

West Horsley requires a balanced mix of homes to meet the community’s needs. West Horsley will require some smaller
scale ‘affordable’ homes, both for young people starting home ownership or independent rental and for more elderly
residents who wish to downsize for obvious reasons. I believe that a significant number of the ‘affordable’ housing
should be available for shared ownership, enabling younger people and families to gain a foothold on the housing ladder,
which they would otherwise be unable to due to the high cost of local housing. These younger residents would however
contribute significantly to the fabric of the local community and would ensure a balanced community of all ages.

**TRANSPORT & HIGHWAY CONSIDERATIONS**

Any traffic generated from the proposed Site Allocation housing sites will further contribute to traffic congestion in the
area. The existing road system is only appropriate for a semi-rural village, such as West Horsley; indeed its appearance
and scale is one of the characteristics of the village.

Many of the traffic routes are little more than lanes, many with pavements on only one side of the carriageway. With
many households now having at least two cars, the potential increase in traffic could overwhelm the existing
infrastructure and lead to serious, and potentially life threatening, safety concerns.

No specific proposal as to how GBC intend to address these concerns has been detailed in the Local Plan or the Draft
Guildford borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016.

Furthermore, GBC are still championing the creation of a new significant settlement under Policy A35: Land at former
Wisley Airfield, Ockham. This is potentially a double whammy for local infrastructure, and in particular local roads, from
which it may never recover!

I would therefore **OBJECT to Policy A35: Land at former Wisley airfield, Ockham.**

Is at capacity. There is no adjacent land available for additional car parking provision. A significant increase in the village
population will increase the pressure on station car parking and traffic movements to and from the station on already
narrow and, at times, congested local roads.

There is currently a regular bus service operating along the A246 between Guildford and Leatherhead, however this is
really only of use to residents at the southern end of West Horsley. There is also currently an extremely limited bus
service along East Lane and The Street, through West Horsley village, which only operates 2 or 3 times per day between
Monday to Friday only. There is no service at the weekends. Any significant development of new homes at this end of the
village would necessitate an improvement in this service for it to be in any way considered sustainable.

In Policy I3: Sustainable transport for new developments; GBC proposes that "*We will expect developments will
contribute* .... The policy as drafted is weak and non-specific and as such has no real specific directive that developers
must contribute towards sustainable transport and is open to abuse from developers or housebuilders.

I would therefore ask that **Policy I3: Sustainable transport for new developments should be AMENDED** to state that
GBC require this rather than expect them!

**INFRASTRUCTURE**

West Horsley is a small village with few local facilities. There is currently just one shop at the southern end of the village,
where local car parking is very limited. Most people in West Horsley already have to travel, largely by car, to East
Horsley for their day to day shopping, banking, doctors visits etc. The existing car parking facilities in East Horsley are
already at capacity and any increase in the local population will add to the already existing problems. Any new
development would not “support the continued viability” of the existing village infrastructure, as has been said by GBC in the past. In my opinion it would only serve to overload the same beyond breaking point.

State educational provision, both at junior (The Raleigh) and senior (The Howard of Effingham) school level, is already under strain and has been a real and sensitive issue for Surrey County Council and the local community for some years. The Raleigh School, which endeavours to serve both West Horsley and East Horsley, is full every year and has been so for decades. Its site is already fully developed and the opportunities for further expansion are limited. The Raleigh has however recently indicated to local residents that it cannot further increase capacity on its existing site and is considering its options for relocating, raising further concern about possible future erosion and harm to the Green Belt.

Secondary school places are already restricted in number at the Howard of Effingham School for children from West Horsley and all other available secondary schools are considerably further afield in either Guildford or Woking. Potential residential development in Effingham and Bookham would only further increase the problems for local West Horsley children, as children from these developments would, by being closer to the school, have priority. This, however, could push West Horsley children out of its potential catchment, with no currently sustainable local alternative.

I understand that a new junior school and senior school is proposed at the Wisley redevelopment site, although this will not be delivered until well into the plan period and certainly after the currently proposed residential development in West Horsley is well underway or finished.

In the Independent school sector, both Glenesk and Cranmore private schools are supported not just by local Horsley families, but also by many families from Guildford and other surrounding villages, some travelling significant distances. In term time each of these schools contributes to significant local traffic problems on Ockham Road North and the A246 respectively.

The Horsley Medical Centre is already at capacity, as it serves both East and West Horsley, and any additional development would necessitate an expansion of this facility. Possible extension is mentioned in the Draft Guildford Borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016 but scant detail, except for envisaged timescale, is given, which is completely unacceptable.

Finally, I also believe that the existing utilities infrastructure in the area would be further stretched, probably beyond acceptable limits.

Surface water drainage along East Lane has been a continual problem throughout the autumn and winter months. The addition of further built environment would just make these problems. I understand that Thames Water have already advised GBC that the area’s waste water network is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all the local developments.

I also understand that there may also be a serious under capacity of existing foul water sewers. The foul drainage system from West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley will, I understand, all need to be upgraded to cope with the increased demand. Thames Water has apparently advised that a two or three year lead-in period will be needed to install the necessary waste water network and treatment capacity after planning permission for any significant development is granted. Unfortunately I’m sure that housing developers will not be waiting that period before they want to build / sell their new houses! This is clearly unacceptable and again shows a flaw in the proposals put out for consultation by GBC.

Water pressure in the area is already poor.

I note that GBC states in Item 4.6.1 that “Timely provision of suitable, adequate infrastructure is crucial to the well-being of the borough’s population, and its economy. Guildford Borough Infrastructure baseline 2013 summarises the capacity and quality of existing infrastructure, including planned improvements. Historically infrastructure provision and upgrading has not always kept pace with the growth of population, employment and transport demands, and in parts of the borough some infrastructure is currently at, or near to, capacity or of poor quality.” I have no doubt that West Horsley must fit into this category.

I was pleased to note that Policy I1: Infrastructure and delivery; states its aim as being “To support delivery of this Local Plan, infrastructure needed to support development should be provided and available when first needed to serve the
occupants and users of the development...”. However it then goes on to say “where the timely provision of necessary supporting infrastructure is not secured, development may be phased to reflect infrastructure delivery, or will be refused.”

I don’t think that GBC can offer this “timely provision of necessary supporting infrastructure” – it either happens in full when developers commence construction or they are not granted planning permission.

WEST HORSLEYS HISTORY

West Horsley has many listed buildings, flint and Lovelace houses and any new developments need to be built in keeping with the existing architecture and not just bland developments from the volume house builders.

CONCLUSION

I fully appreciate that more houses need to be built both for the young and the old but it needs to be measured, proportionate and not excessive (ie not increase the population of West Horsley by 60%) and the Green Belt which is a real asset to West Horsley, the borough, the county and the whole of the UK NEEDS TO BE PROTECTED AS FAR AS IS POSSIBLE. And thus all new housing should be built to a measured quantity (eg 120 houses in total in West Horsley with circa 25 houses on each site) and before any Green Belt avenue is explored existing brownfield sites close to areas of employment must and have to be utilised.I do not believe that the Proposed Submission Local Plan : Strategy and Sites 2016 has completely reviewed the possibilities for residential development on such land. The proven need (OAN) for the full extent of new housing proposed I completely disagree with. The proposed potential development in West Horsley is excessive and inappropriate and over dense and certain locations should be removed.

The inclusion of the proposed allocation to the south of West Horsley under Policy A41 is unsound in that, having regard to the above at paragraph 182 of the NPPF. Allocation of this specific site and its Policy is neither consistent with national policy, nor is it justified. This proposed allocation site (Policy A41) should be removed from the Local Plan and it should be returned to the protection that its present Green Belt designation gives it. The case for “exceptional circumstances” has not been proven for the proposed change in Green Belt boundary here, and actually the same goes for many other locations in the borough.

- Also the proposed removal of the field and part of Lollesworth Wood to the south of the above site is completely wrong and should be reconsidered and returned to the protection that its present Green Belt designation gives it. Added to which the field is owned by Mr and Mrs Richard Wills and they absolutely will not give access rights for a footpath through their land.
- I do not accept the case for “exceptional circumstances” has been proven for the proposed change in Green Belt boundary here either.
- High density development in West Horsley is completely inappropriate and a more appropriate level of density (as highlighted earlier) would be right for the village with small houses aswell as apartments for the young and old alike. To finish any significant new housing in West Horsley would need huge improvements in the existing infrastructure (education, doctors, drainage, parking, improvements of the road network).

It seems to me over the next 3-5 years West Horsley is line for a disproportionate no of new houses. If West Horsley sites Policy A37,38,40 and 41 and Policy A39 which immediately abuts the West Horsley Parish boundary are all built out that is just under 500 new houses, where the target is 693 homes per year in the borough for 20 yrs – that is just under 15% of the boroughs quota per year which is clearly grossly excessive for West Horsley to deal this blow.

Why are 70% of new homes being proposed to be built on Green Belt or on other countryside. I object to building on the Green Belt because the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its openness and permanence (National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 79)
I object to the scale of new building throughout the borough, which is disproportionate and unjustified, particularly in West Horsley. I think the calculation of housing need is unsubstantiated. The model has not been scrutinised and fundamental assumptions are flawed. The housing target is unconstrained.

I object to the fact that brownfield land would be disproportionately used for commercial development and unnecessary retail expansion. This means Green Belt land is used for housing development unnecessarily.

I object to the fact that new sites have been proposed in this consultation which have not previously been considered, which is not appropriate at this stage.

OVERALL I OBJECT TO THE GUILDFORD BOROUGH PROPOSED SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN: STRATEGY AND SITES 2016 as large parts are excessive, unsound and technically incorrect.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Re: Station Parade designated as ‘District Centre’. This classification results from a complete misreading of the nature of the facilities in the village centre and would inappropriately target the area for future urban developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Re: Major doubt concerning housing numbers. The inflated number of new houses proposed arises from a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) that was generated by a consultant’s mathematical model which is not revealed in the plan. Nor, apparently, to Guildford Borough Council, GBC. This SHMA target housing number is then further increased by GBC to give a population increase which is almost 70% higher than the official national estimates for population growth in the borough. The scale of this increase has alarming results eg., an increase of up to 35% in existing West Horsley households – greater than any other single area in the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Re: Station Parade designated as ‘District Centre’. This classification results from a complete misreading of the nature of the facilities in the village centre and would inappropriately target the area for future urban developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I write to you to provide my objections to the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

I am a resident of West Horsley and I am deeply dismayed by the scale of the building that is proposed in this area.

The summary for Horsley is:
- Removal of greenbelt land
- 35% additional housing by numbers
- New housing at a significantly higher density than is typical in these villages
- Development completed within 5 years without any proposed increase to supporting local amenities

When reviewing the data to support the proposed plans I find it very difficult to determine what evidence is behind the number and density of the housing proposed for this villages of Horsley. The source of the data to support population growth is absent.

The proposed plans will irrevocably change the Horsley villages. The local plan does not represent a plan that considers the character and sustainability of the village of Horsley.

I strongly urge the independent assessor to visit the villages of Horsley to see first hand how the village is today.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• The proposed scale of development in West Horsley will result in dramatic permanent change to the character of the area, and is unsustainable given the local infrastructure. The local schools are over-subscribed and full every year; the doctors surgery in East Horsley is invariably busy today and appointments hard to come by; the roads (especially Ockham Road North/South and East Lane) are very busy at peak times; and the basic services, especially sewerage/drainage, are already incapable of dealing with the current demand as the widespread flooding that invariably accompanies periods of heavy rainfall in the village shows (further development will mean more surface water runoff, and more immediate demand on outdated sewers and storm drains which in turn will mean more flash flood episodes around the village).

• Additionally, there is no proven case for the supposed demand for such a large number of houses in this area. West Horsley Parish Council’s own analysis suggests that approximately 20 properties would be needed in order to meet demand from local people otherwise unable to stay living in the village - a development of that scale and for that explicit purpose would be entirely understood, but what is proposed is anything but. It is unreasonable to expect a few villages in the Borough (of which West Horsley is the most extreme case) to take a share of the burden of future development that is wholly disproportionate to the scale of those villages today, when the equivalent number of houses added to already well-established urban centres (e.g. Guildford) would result in far less significant change to the character of the area.

• Removing the Horsleys from the Green Belt is fundamentally unjustified and contrary to the stated Government policy (see Hansard ref. Queen’s Speech, 5th June 2014). GBC’s need to find space for housing does not constitute an “exceptional circumstance” that could in principle otherwise justify the deletion of the Green Belt designation. Removing the village(s) from the Green Belt will lead to further urban sprawl and the unique character and community of East and West Horsley, as well as that of much of the surrounding countryside, will be lost forever to future generations. It is furthermore key to note that the National Trust aspire to pursue the further northward extension of the current Surrey Hills AONB to cover this area, which provides recognition at the most significant level of the importance of the rural nature of this region.

• The scale of the proposed Wisley Airfield development is hugely out of keeping with the local area, and a development of that magnitude will have an unsustainable impact on our shared infrastructure, not least on the A3 which already experiences long tailbacks at peak times around the Ockham Park and M25 junctions (which will be those most burdened by the addition of such a large, new town on the airfield site) and on the already overcrowded South West Trains railway service from Horsley into London and Guildford.

I trust that you will take this opportunity to revise these points in the Local Plan, and insodoing ensure that future generations are able to benefit from the rurality of this area as much as previous generations have done.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3345   Respondent: 15594753 / Charles Defreitas   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 removal of West Horsley from the green belt. There appears to be no exceptional circumstances or other justification for the new Green Belt boundaries. West Horsley’s defined current defined Settlement Area boundaries do not need to be extended. West Horsley is a rural village at the foot of the North Downs, partly in the Surrey Hills AONB, extending the settlement area will turn it in to a quite different and more urban place that will detract from the green belt and interfere with views from such places as Sheepleas – with an outlook over an urban area.
Adding to the current settlement in this piecemeal way will just add strain to an already stretched infrastructure – roads, shops, schools and the medical centre. This issue not addressed in the local plan and no evidence is given as to how this change would be sustainable.

The development proposals would also be at a higher densities than the village currently is. This would make the village unbalanced and a totally different place. There is no evidence of the need for 385 new homes in West Horsley. Local surveys show that there is the need for a small number of affordable homes for local people not large estates. The proportion of dwellings proposed for the green belt areas is disproportionate to those proposed for brownfield sites in Guildford itself which are much more sustainable being served by Public Transport, employment and other facilities. Brownfield sites should be developed first before there is an consideration of building on the green belt.

If all developments outlined in the plan were to go ahead Guildford would be left sitting in an urban area surrounded by suburbs rather than at the moment surrounded by a rural hinterland with villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I therefore object to the development on the grounds of its severe impact on local schools.

**Incompatibility of the proposed development of Wisley Airfield with the character of the surrounding area**

I understand that it is part of planning policy that new developments should be in keeping with the local character, context and distinctiveness.

However the proposed development will create a new settlement that will be larger than any other settlement in Guildford Borough, outside of Guildford itself, in an area that is characterised by small developments in a country / rural setting.

Furthermore the density of around 49 dwellings per hectare of the proposed development compares to an overall density of around 8 dwellings per hectare in East Horsley. Clearly the density of the proposed development is out of keeping with that of the surrounding area.

Also, the development includes the building of five-storey apartment blocks. As there are no such buildings in the area, this is obviously out of keeping with the local area.

I therefore object to the development on the grounds that it is entirely out of character with the surrounding area.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3362  **Respondent:** 15595201 / Carole Manning  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have been a resident of West Horsley since 1976. We selected this area for its quiet, rural charm and the last 40 years have not disappointed.

The proposal to take East and West Horsley out of the Green Belt is unacceptable when there are other more suitable and less damaging options; there are brownfield sites in the area and only when all such sites are developed should more sensitive areas be carefully considered. In my view, the development of Wisley Airfield is an obvious unused brownfield site with space, and excellent access, for the creation of a new development with all the infrastructure needed to take the pressure off local schools, doctors’ surgeries and shops. A large development on this site could provide housing needs for 10-15 years.

I feel that the first line of Policy P2 – “we will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt against inappropriate development” should not be treated as a casual remark and should be guarded very responsibly by those who live in and care for this rural and special area. Short sighted and short term solutions to cater for housing needs must not be allowed to damage protect countryside.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3381  **Respondent:** 15595425 / Colin Bailey  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**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 local plan proposals to build many more houses within the Horsley settlements.

I believe that these massive additional numbers are unnecessary and would impose an unsupportable load on the local infrastructure, transport and medical services.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3453  **Respondent:** 15601633 / Katherine Ray  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**OBJECTION TO “THE GUILDFORD PLAN” – JUNE 2016” (sent by email)**

As a very frequent visitor to see my brother, sister-in-law and nephew who live in West Horsley, I am dismayed at the proposals for future housing developments in the West and East Horsley parishes contained in the “Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites – June 2016” (The Guildford Plan).

The proposal that you can increase the number of households by 35% is hard to comprehend particularly when there seems to have been little or no consideration in “The Guildford Plan” of the effect such a huge increase will undoubtedly have on the local infrastructure and services.

As a Surrey resident myself, I understand the need for building more affordable housing in the County, but the proposals on the scale set out in the Plan are way in excess of what is acceptable and sustainable.

In view of my observations set out above, I strongly object to the proposals set out in the “The Guildford Plan” and urge the Council to have a serious reconsideration about the numbers and sizes of developments proposed and come up with a much more realistic Plan in keeping with the local infrastructure, services and rural setting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3460  **Respondent:** 15602113 / Janet Woodward  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT ESPECIALLY TO 6 POLICIES: A36, A37, A38, A39, A40 & A41: • Amount of new housing far exceeds local need. • Housing density excessive when compared with existing development. • Would transform the Horsleys into a sizable town, something for which no case is made. • No local support. • Collective impact of these 6 sites on a small part of the borough not considered. Should not be treated as isolated, separate sites. • Total amount of new building out of scale with the planned development elsewhere the borough, especially less sensitive urban areas not protected by Green Belt. • Sites unsustainable. Key infrastructure lacking. No adequate provision is made to increase it – e.g. poor wastewater capacity, lack of schools, absence of traffic management plan, flooding. • No account taken of additional impact of Wisley Airfield site on Horsleys. • Extension of settlement boundaries too permissive. Horsleys characterised by streets with development along only one side of the road. Policies allow too many adjacent green fields to be developed by squaring off boundaries and claiming they don’t contribute to Green Belt “openness”.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3465  **Respondent:** 15602273 / Phillip Herrington  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Secondly, I specifically **object** to policies A36, A37, A38 A39, A40 and A41. The proposed developments will utterly change, irrevocably, the nature and character of the villages of East and West Horsley.

What is being proposed - more than 500 homes and a 35% increase - changes the Horsley’s from a village into a small town overnight. To my mind this is crazy, insensitive, unjustified and sadly, plain wrong.

Also, the scale of the proposed developments, and % increase in the housing stock, is utterly out of proportion with what is being proposed elsewhere in the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3477  **Respondent:** 15602785 / Tony Hodges  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Over the past years considerable houses have been built, both villages, but at a moderate rate. This has resulted in turning a peaceful place, into a busy and at times a congested and much noisier place to live. Without any major improvements in the roads and services, in particular the amount of car parking available near the shops.

Whilst accepting the need for some continued piecemeal small scale developments, the proposals for the size of developments you propose, are unacceptable if the village is to remain an attractive place to live.

You have not provided the reasons for the removal of the Horsleys from the GREEN BELT, other than your own drive to meet unrealistic Government targets. We are well aware of your proposals for other near by sites, which if proceeded with will place further strain on the roads and other services in this area. Only the other day I could not make a appointment a the Surgery without a six day wait to see a doctor

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3481  **Respondent:** 15603201 / Stephanie Hinson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Section page number  Page 537 of 599  Document page number 654
I would like to register my objections to the proposed draft plan and the removal of East and West Horsley from the Green Belt. Detailed Objections below:

Transport

I object to the draft local plan because of the strain it would put on the rail service. I use the train into London regularly and they are already very crowded before 8.30am in the mornings. The trains would not be able to cope with the increase in passengers with the proposed development. In addition you already struggle to park in the station car park at Horsley and this will only get worse. There is currently nowhere to extend this car park so it will just be nightmare trying to use the train.

Traffic & Parking

I object to the draft local plan because of the increase in traffic and the strain put on the road infrastructure and parking. A lot of local roads are already in a poor condition and increased traffic will put additional strain on them. Parking at Horsley & Effingham junction stations (which is already at capacity), the shops, medical centre and at the village halls will all be adversely affected. I already struggle to park at the medical centre for some appointments and have had to park ‘unauthorised’ at the East Horsley village hall or in a side road.

Doctors Services

I object to the draft local plan because of the strain that will be put on the Medical Centre. It is very difficult to get an appointment at short notice already and the proposed increase in houses and consequently people will exacerbate the situation.

Loss of Green Belt land:

I object to the removal of East and West Horsley from the Green Belt because this is a beautiful area of surrey and if we continue to build on our countryside it won’t be many decades before we have none left. Getting out in the countryside has really good health benefits both mentally and physically, turning East and West Horsley into a built up area will have an adverse affect on the lives of all the people who live here.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Doctors Services

I object to the draft local plan because the doctors’ surgery in East Horsley is already pretty much at capacity and adding more patients would result in unacceptable delays for appointments and service, possibly leading to the threat of life.

Transport

I object to the draft local plan because there simply isn’t capacity on the rail network to satisfy the expected needs of new commuters. The station car park is at capacity and many rush-hour trains are already close to full.

Traffic & Parking

I object to the draft local plan because the size and capacity of the roads isn’t capable of coping with the additional traffic caused by additional housing. Extra local traffic would cause further pot-holes to the already worn roads. Traffic at rush-hour/school times is already causing queuing at main junctions.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3495  Respondent: 15603809 / Sian Buller  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to voice my objections with regards to the proposed plans as detailed below:

1. I object to the Local Plan with regard to the amount of house building that is planned in East and West Horsley. This will have cause irrevocable damage to the community and character of these two villages and the surrounding area. This extra amount of houses is wholly inappropriate for villages of this size.

2. I also object to the extra traffic these plans will bring into the area. Most of the roads around here are quite narrow and not suitable for a large influx of traffic on a daily basis. The Ockham access to the A3 is already congested in the morning and this will only make matters worse, leading to more accidents and hold ups.

3. I also object to the removal of the protection of the Green Belt, for the areas around The Horsleys, Effingham, Ripley, Clandon and Send. This will see the extension of urban sprawl out from Leatherhead and along the A3. Our British Wildlife is already under increasing pressure from changing farming practices and loss of habitat, especially hedgerows and this kind of development will only continue that decline due to more loss of habitat and bio diversity. Plans for house building should be utilising Brownfield sites such as the one at Burnt Common, rather than carving up our Green Belt. Also, the directive from The Government, clearly states that housing need is not sufficient cause to encroach on the Green Belt.

4. I object to this Guildford Borough Wide Strategy of a proposed 13,860 new houses without any constraints. This is wildly different from many other Borough Councils in Surrey. Also, there appears to be a disproportionate amount of development earmarked for this area, as it represents 36% of the total housing planned for the whole Borough and the area around here is only a small proportion of the whole Borough area.

I certainly hope that common sense will prevail and a consideration of what we will lose as a Borough if this erosion of the Green Belt is allowed. If this plan goes ahead the generations to come will suffer from the lack of green space and countryside within easy reach of their homes. Once the Green Belt has gone it can not be replaced, it will be gone forever!
**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3553  **Respondent:** 15608417 / Denise Horsey  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am horrified at the plans for building in the Horsleys where we have lived for many years. We chose to live here as they are villages, not towns. The Conservatives at the last election promised to keep Horsley in the green belt and protect it. How can we ever trust politicians who renege on their promises? The number of houses that your draft plan says is needed is based on growth that is now not valid as we have left the European Union.

The local roads are now full of traffic and will be unable to cope with lots more cars. The schools and doctors are full. Junction 10 on the M25 is very often blocked - it will be unable to handle significantly more traffic.

We want to continue to live in a village where we can have lots of open spaces to walk with children and dogs. We do not want the spaces filled with lots of rabbit hutch houses with postage stamp gardens. Houses like that are still going to be unaffordable for youngsters.

Why doesn't the government develop less advantaged regions of the UK?

I object to all policies involving building in the green belt. Why were the clearly expressed views of residents in previous consultations ignored?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3558  **Respondent:** 15608737 / Nick Purdue  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I live in West Horsley at [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] and I cannot even now get my daughter in her desired school and constantly have issues parking at Horsley station. Both these issues will be exacerbated by the proposed plan.

I therefore strongly object to this ill conceived plan, that will have an appalling effect to our local community.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3559  **Respondent:** 15608769 / Heather Mason  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I therefore strongly object to this ill conceived plan, that will have an appalling effect to our local community.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I am writing to object to the proposals to remove West Horsley village from the Green Belt by insetting and adding up to 385 homes to four Development sites in the village as laid out in The Guildford Plan.

The proposals as set out in The Guildford plan fail to provide adequate justification or exceptional circumstances for the proposed insetting of West Horsley and will only serve to have a significant detrimental effect on the village and its environment. Also, the proposed addition of 385 homes is completely inappropriate for the size of the village and would not be sustainable for the following reasons:

- The burden on local infrastructure would be unsupportable. Many roads and lanes are narrow and already congested with traffic at peak times queueing to pass through the village. Even the limited public transport service struggles to pass through the village uninterrupted which causes congestion and delays.
- The small village shop will be closing soon which will result in West Horsley village residents having to travel to East Horsley more frequently to shop. Parking facilities near and around the main parade of shops at Station Parade, East Horsley are already often full during most times of the day.
- It is difficult to make appointments at the Medical Centre in Kingston Avenue if you need to seek medical advice less than two weeks in advance. The planned population increase would impact on the Centre’s capacity to cope with resident’s needs. Parking at the Medical Centre is also currently under significant pressure, the car park is frequently full making access to it very difficult and frustrating.
- Several roads throughout the village frequently flood after severe bouts of wet weather and drainage is a constant problem. I am concerned that the construction of nearly 400 additional properties would only serve to make the situation much worse and negatively impact the local infrastructure and environment.
- Other facilities in the village (e.g. the village hall, local churches and halls) are well used but parking at these sites is either non-existent or inadequate for the number of cars that need to be parked. The consequences of this is already causing problems because cars are being parked in lanes nearby (especially Silkmore Lane, where I live) or in The Street which results in through-traffic being unable to pass through the village on both sides of the road.

Planning Practice Guidance as outlined in the National Planning Policy framework states that once Green Belts have been defined, local authorities should plan positively to enhance its beneficial use (p 81) and that new boundaries should only be established under exceptional circumstances (p83). It also states that local planning authorities should take into account the need to promote sustainable patterns of development (p84). I believe The Guildford Plan is categorically not achieving this and entirely fails to make a justifiable case for locating such large number of homes in West Horsley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3579  Respondent: 15609473 / Ed Baker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Proposals for West Horsley can be summarized as an assault on the Green Belt. The settlement area should not be, and does not need to be, extended. The current housing is very varied in size and style and importantly of low density. It is inappropriate to build clusters of 100 or so houses at much higher density.

? Such a dramatic increase in population cannot be supported with the current infrastructure network, taken holistically the required as yet unspecified infrastructure with destroy the village.

? Over the years the number of households in East and West Horsley have increased slowly due to a few houses being built each year but spread throughout the two villages. To build the 500 houses proposed would overwhelm the villages
and their facilities.

The local primary school (The Raleigh) is oversubscribed - even children living in the Horsleys cannot all obtain a place. This school and the two independent schools create high volumes of traffic approaching and through the village. The Howard of Effingham School secondary school is also oversubscribed. The proposed development of over 500 additional homes in East and West Horsley will result in hundreds of additional school-aged children in need of a school place. This is unachievable.

There are only two roads through the Horsleys, they are both narrow and unlit and both are crossed by low narrow railway bridges. Most residents would have to commute to work via A3 or A246 or drive through East and/or West Horsley to get to the station or school. An increase in population will cause serious transport problems which would be challenging to overcome given the limited routes through the villages and their narrow width.

The proposed development is disproportionate increasing the village by some 35% and by building at a higher density that is characteristic of the village. Development of the proposed sites is unnecessary and illogical.

Fields and gardens alongside Ockham Road North flood regularly and the water table is high for the majority of the year. If site A40 is developed this will exacerbate the impact on neighbouring areas. Flood mapping in the consultation document recognizes this problem but the site remains as one for potential development. I am puzzled how houses can be sold in good faith with this risk.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3635  **Respondent:** 15611393 / Alison Bishop  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Having appraised the proposed plans for West and East Horsley, Ockham and Wisley I am horrified by the scale of the proposals - these will alter the character of the villages for ever plus put an enormous strain on the ever burgeoning demand currently expected of the facilities and utilities.

The safety of the villagers should be re-considered in view of the increased volume of road traffic on very narrow twisty roads that are already under strain due to previous in-filling/developments plus from the effect this number of people will have on the level and standard from the Doctors, schools, utilities, amenities, rail transport, road links etc. These are currently full or at bursting point. Many of them are limited by the size of their sites or capacity they were built to take.

The villagers have made a deliberate choice to live in small villages and certainly speaking for myself, I do not take kindly to having the area developed in such a huge way. As far as I can see they can only be detrimental on so many levels; and for these reasons I request you re-consider your proposed plans for these lovely villages. They were not meant to take the volume of people you are proposing to accommodate.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3637  **Respondent:** 15611521 / Sue Woods  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to The New Local Plan regarding the developments proposed with the Horsleys, as well as enlarging the village boundary and removing them from the Green Belt.

Over 500 new homes in the area would have a massive impact on our villages. Bringing 1000 cars, or more, to an area with few pavements, streetlights would bring dangers to pedestrians and cyclists. The railway station car parks are already at capacity, few local buses, and so cars would be used by new residents.

Our villages are important to us, we moved here to live in an area of beauty and peace, slightly removed from urban towns.

The infrastructure of our villages would not be able to support the needs of 1000 plus new residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3655  **Respondent:** 15613953 / Chris White  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
I am writing to express my concerns over the proposed 2016 Draft Local Plan and the impact it will have on East and West Horsley and neighbouring villages. Whilst acknowledging that more housing does need to happen and our village should be prepared to "do its bit" I object to the scale of what is being proposed which makes it significantly disproportionate. Three grounds in particular I would like to continue to bring to your attention and specifically object to:

1 Building on Green Belt Land should only be permitted in highly exceptional circumstances.

2 The biggest two proposed developments just don't appear to have been thought through in terms of the necessary infrastructure (schools, medical facilities and parking)

3 Flooding: in recent years it is has been very evident that the drainage system cannot cope so building on land already adversely affected by flooding will only exacerbate the problem

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

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] and I am six years old. I have asked my mummy to write this email on her work computer so you can hear what I think.

Please don't build lots of houses in West Horsley. I have asthma and life threatening allergies and my mummy said living in the countryside would help me. If you take away the fields and trees, I won't live in the countryside any more and that makes me a bit scared.

If you take away all the fields and trees, where will the animals live?

My schools is lovely and I have lots of friends. If you make it too big, it will be harder to know everyone and knowing everyone is what makes it friendly and why so many children are happy living in Horsley.

When I am finished in year 6, I want to go to the Howard School as my Reading Buddy Rachel went there last year. If you make lots of new people live here, they won't have room for me. This would be a shame as I don't want to go to school far away and I will miss Rachel even more.

I want to ride my bike and walk to school, but mummy won't let me as the pavements aren't big enough and the cars drive too fast. If you make lots of houses, this will get worse and there will be SO much pollution as everyone will drive and make the clouds go all black and yucky.

My brother would like to say his thoughts on an email but he is only 1 and can't speak. I can read his thoughts though and he agrees with me. He would say, "build a few houses, not too many, as we like the open space and fresh air".

Please listen to what I say.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
As a very frequent visitor to see my brother-in-law and his family who live in West Horsley, I am appalled at the proposals for future housing developments in the West and East Horsley parishes contained in the “Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites – June 2016” (The Guildford Plan).

The proposal that you can increase the number of households by 35% is hard to comprehend particularly when there seems to have been little or no consideration in “The Guildford Plan” of the effect such a huge increase will undoubtedly have on the local infrastructure and services.

As a Surrey resident myself for over 10 years now, I understand the need for building more affordable housing in the County, but the proposals on the scale set out in the Plan are way in excess of quite frankly what is acceptable and sustainable.

In view of my observations set out above, I strongly object to the proposals set out in the “The Guildford Plan” and urge the Council to have a serious rethink about the numbers and sizes of developments proposed and come up with a much more realistic Plan in keeping with the local infrastructure, services and rural setting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

### Comment ID: PSLPA16/3660  Respondent: 15614497 / Hannah Yandle  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

<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 ESPECIALLY TO 6 POLICIES: A36, A37, A38, A39, A40 &amp; A41:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amount of new housing far exceeds local need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Housing density excessive when compared with existing development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would transform the Horsleys into a sizable town, something for which no case is made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No local support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collective impact of these 6 sites on a small part of the borough not considered. Should not be treated as isolated, separate sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No account taken of additional impact of Wisley Airfield site on Horsleys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extension of settlement boundaries too permissive. Horsleys characterised by streets with development along only one side of the road. Policies allow too many adjacent green fields to be developed by squaring off boundaries and claiming they don’t contribute to Green Belt “openness”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Green Belt gap with neighbouring settlements hugely narrowed, especially if Wisley Airfield is built on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy A40 especially unviable because of high water table and poor drainage, leading to regular winter flooding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• 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:*

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3675  **Respondent:** 15616161 / Anna Joyce  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**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 local plans and do not agree with the scale at which Guildford Borough Council is planning to build.

I was born and raised in West Horsley, and attended The Raleigh and Howard of Effingham schools. My greatest joy is seeing how the villages and local area have continued to thrive while still maintaining their natural beauty, green space and historical integrity.

Having said this, the Horsleys are at capacity with regards to certain facilities and have been for a number of years. Namely, the train station carpark, doctors surgery, parking at local shops and schools. The proposed plans to increase the housing in this area are ludicrous if there is inadequate infrastructure to support this growth. The only primary school in the village will not be able to cope with the proposed 150 additional children as it is already at capacity. The proposals do not suggest how this will be dealt with.

*What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?*

*Attached documents:*

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3679  **Respondent:** 15616449 / Monica Heilpern  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

We would like to put forward our strong objection to the Guildford Council proposal for the area of Horsley for being so ferociously drastic when it could easily be preparing a softer solution, better use of brownfield around Guildford area, respecting the importance of the Green Belt in Horsley and it surrounding villages. Current infrastructure cannot cope with the Council’s proposal. Amongst other reasons are the following:

The impact of the proposals on East & West Horsley:
- proposal to remove East & West Horsley out of the Green Belt (along with many other Surrey villages)
- 385 new homes in West Horsley (a 35% increase on the existing housing number - the highest increase of all Guildford villages)
- a 25% increase in housing across the borough against official growth projections of 15%
- a lack of supporting infrastructure (schools, Medical facilities, parking spaces etc) to accompany plans for extra housing in the area

GBC’s proposal will be absolutely detrimental to Horsley.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3681  Respondent: 15616545 / Joanne Maslin  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 Guildford Borough Council local plan and in particular the removal of Horsley from the green belt.

The assessment of the Horsley's within the local plan seems flawed and does not reflect the reality of life in this village. The Horsley's are primarily a rural community with low population and housing density which add to the open nature of the green belt area within which it is situated.

There is a lot of talk about increasing commercial centres and leisure facilities within the area but I and my neighbours would argue that the leisure facilities that we enjoy are bought about by the rural nature of the village and the ability to walk, cycle, run within the countryside which immediately adjoins our village. The Horsley's benefit from a parade of shops which are supported by the immediate community and not by a larger and wider community as the report would suggest. If this was indeed the case then I am sure that the number of banks would not have dwindled from three of recent years to a sole existing bank. This commercial centre exists because of the affluence of the local community and their willingness and desire to support their local community. We live in a village and want to support our local companies and not be turned into a district centre with high rates where the retail environment only supports national and international chains.

As a predominately small rural village the Horsley's are served by a number of small country lanes highly unsuited to the increased housing and therefore traffic that the new local plan demands.

The area is regularly effected by both flash flooding and longer term floods during the winter months when the main road that serves the village and which would serve the proposed 1000 plus cars suffers severe flooding.

The large number of proposed building sites are compounded by the major new towns that are proposed within five miles of the village boundary. Schools are full and unable to obtain planning permission to rebuild. Rebuilds that are only able to be financed through private financing initiatives with residential developers for more housing alongside the already oversubscribed school. Train stations whose car parks are already full to capacity with nowhere but greenbelt to expand into.

With developments such as the Wisley airfield no doubt being sold on their proximity to the A3, has anyone involved in the compilation of this report ever tried to travel between Wisley and Guildford on the A3 any time after four pm when a twelve minute journey will take in excess of forty five minutes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3684  Respondent: 15616737 / David Freeman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
As a long term resident of the Horsley area for over twenty years I would be grateful if you could note my objection to the Local Plan that is being considered for Guildford, and in particular, in relation to its likely impact on West and East Horsley.

I appreciate there is a housing crisis, and that new housing must be built somewhere. However, I would argue that the building of any new housing should be undertaken in a way that that is sympathetic to the tone, style and atmosphere of the villages (West and East Horsley) today. I would argue that increasing the housing stock in West Horsley by 35% will result in a significant change in the village and it represents putting the interests of the future occupiers of the new properties ahead of those who already live there. However, I also appreciate there has to be a balance. There will have to be some development – but increasing the housing stock by 35%, a percentage that is not repeated in other villages, is neither fair, not appropriate.

However an even greater concern is the lack of infrastructure planning in the proposed local plan. It is well known that all local services in the Horsleys are under pressure, some at breaking point, and the failure to provide for water, sewage, schools and medical facilities at a level that can provide the required services for an increased population, will increase pressure on the that population, and perhaps, although I hope not, social tensions.

There will be a significant increase in traffic, and the local roads are already under pressure, and the transport infrastructure is failing the current local population.

However my biggest concern is the proposal whereby the Horsleys will, if I understand the draft plan correctly, fall outside the Green Belt, if the plan is adopted. This insetting will create a dangerous precedent – and could lead to the loss of further facilities and change the environment of the area beyond recognition.

At a time when the political process is the subject of such scrutiny, and people are becoming increasingly focused on asserting their concerns through the medium of local democracy, it has to be hoped that the opinions of those who actually live in the Horsleys today, and whose lives will be most affected by the adoption such a plan, will be considered and given due weight.

I am not suggesting that the should be no development – just that an increase in the housing numbers in West Horsley by 35% is excessive and inappropriate, and that my concern is exacerbated by the apparent failure to provide infrastructure for the additional people who will occupy those houses.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3706  Respondent: 15618497 / Sinead Johnson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

>> As a resident of West Horsley I would like to strongly object to the proposed plan to build additional houses on the green belt in and around Horsley

>>

>> The character of the village would be totally changed and the village and residents would be completely affected.

>> There are other possible alternatives and options available.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I write to you to provide my objections to the Local Plan outlined by Guildford Borough Council. I have spent time participating within the GBC organised exhibitions and reading through the documentation provided.

I am a local resident of West Horsley. I live on Mount Pleasant.

I am deeply dismayed at the proposals for development that have been put forward. These are incongruous to this village and the principles of the green belt.

The volume and density of the proposed housing development is unseen in the Horsley villages. I understand the volume increase to be 35% additional housing within five years and the density to be 5 house / hectare whereas the Horsley's is currently 2/3 houses / hectare.

The Local Plan is inappropriate to the character of the Horsley villages. This is a semi-rural green belt village. West Horsley has one shop and a village hall. It does not have a commercial centre. This is a semi-rural village. Children play safely outside their houses and cycle to their friends houses, deer wander in to gardens and I can hear a rooster calling as the sun rises. The volume and density of housing proposed belong within an urban area not within the villages of the green belt.

Further to this should the proposed development go ahead the Local Plan makes no provision whatsoever for additional infrastructure such as schools, doctors, trains, car parks, roads that would be needed to accommodate an additional 550+ houses that represent the 35% additional housing.

Where will the children go to school? The local school is already full.

How will adults travel to work? The trains and station car park is already full.

How will the existing roads cope with the additional cars? Will there be more traffic jams/accidents?

How will sick people access medical help? The doctors surgery is already busy.

The Local Plan does not represent a solution that is sustainable for existing communities or future generations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Repeated attempts made by Ockham Road North residents to extend this zone have been turned down by the local council. Second, access problems are not confined to flooding and are not addressed by the proposal to extend the existing 30mph zone past the site entrance. Firstly, Ockham Road North was closed for several weeks in 2014 because of flooding, and still floods regularly. Over the years, these fields have accumulated and backed up onto existing properties nearby. I can provide photographs proving how badly these fields flood. This is flat, clay land on the downhill side of the Horsleys where floodwater from new development will accumulate and back up onto existing properties nearby. I can provide photographs proving how badly these fields flood. Site A40 is subject to an unacceptable flood risk from a combination of a high groundwater table and the lack of surface drainage. These problems will only get worse with the increase in extreme weather events associated with climate change. The "appropriate mitigation" suggested in Policy A40 exists only as an abstract notion. It should not be used to underwrite the need for Green Belt "exceptional circumstances." Policy A40 underestimates the problems of safe access and climate change. The "appropriate mitigation" suggested in Policy A40 exists only as an abstract notion. It should not be used to underwrite the need for Green Belt "exceptional circumstances." Policy A40 underestimates the problems of safe access and climate change. The "appropriate mitigation" suggested in Policy A40 exists only as an abstract notion. It should not be used to underwrite the need for Green Belt "exceptional circumstances." Policy A40 underestimates the problems of safe access and climate change. The "appropriate mitigation" suggested in Policy A40 exists only as an abstract notion. It should not be used to underwrite the need for Green Belt "exceptional circumstances." Policy A40 underestimates the problems of safe access and climate change.

By surrounding Waterloo Farm campsite with 120 new houses, Policy A40 on land to the North of West Horsley will contribute to creeping urbanisation by attenuating the Green Belt corridors separating the Horsleys from neighbouring settlements. Collectively, these 6 sites militate against NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been a success story in the Horsleys, with the creation of an amenity wood and community garden, the purchase of adjacent fields (on the eastern side of Ockham Road North) by local residents in order to preserve their open aspect, well-maintained pitches for local football and cricket clubs, public tennis courts, open space for a high-quality campsite (at Waterloo Farm) used by many foreign tourists and the approval of plans for a Theatre in the Woods - making West Horsley the only village in Surrey with an opera house. The open nature of West Horsley determined that a long portion of the 2012 Olympic cycle races passed through the village. This route has since been adopted by cyclists as a permanent asset, including the annual Prudential cycle race. These and future examples of "positive planning" depend on protecting the Green Belt to maintain the openness and attractiveness of the local landscape and avoiding the urbanisation and traffic congestion that Sites A36-41 will bring.

Site A40 is subject to an unacceptable flood risk from a combination of a high groundwater table and the lack of surface water run-off. This is flat, clay land on the downhill side of the Horsleys where floodwater from new development will accumulate and back up onto existing properties nearby. I can provide photographs proving how badly these fields flood at present. These problems will only get worse with the increase in extreme weather events associated with climate change. The "appropriate mitigation" suggested in Policy A40 exists only as an abstract notion. It should not be used to underwrite the need for Green Belt "exceptional circumstances." Policy A40 underestimates the problems of safe access and egress. Firstly, Ockham Road North was closed for several weeks in 2014 because of flooding, and still floods regularly. Secondly, access problems are not confined to flooding and are not addressed by the proposal to extend the existing 30mph zone past the site entrance. Repeated attempts made by Ockham Road North residents to extend this zone have been turned down by the local council.
authorities, Highways England and Surrey Police, even though data collected in 2015 show that traffic has doubled over the last 15 years and that the average speed in the 40mph section of this road is 52mph, with maximum recorded speeds of over 80mph. No traffic calming measures have so far been achieved. Additional housing will add to several hazards along this stretch of road, including:

- Its use by pedestrians, especially children (using the Raleigh and Glensk schools and catching school buses to Guildford and Howard of Effingham), pensioners living in the string of bungalows at the northern end of the road, and visitors from the Waterloo campsite who are unfamiliar with the area.
- The existence of a narrow footpath on only one side of the road in any one spot. The layout means that walking half a mile between Green Land and East Lane requires crossing the road twice.
- The road’s increasing use by recreational cyclists (see above).
- Its winding nature, poor sight lines (especially when interrupted by summer vegetation) and dangerous, concealed driveways. Most of these were built in the 1930s. Some have been widened but many are too narrow for modern traffic. Since a deep ditch runs along most of the road, vehicles have to swing out dangerously when entering or leaving.
- The prospect of additional traffic, including 19,000 HGV movements (90 a day over a long period) if Surrey County Council approves the Drift Golf Course’s planning application to re-landscape its site using bulk waste transported from London.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3744  Respondent: 15624769 / Barbara Rose  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We have view the proposed new development plans and after careful consideration we have decided that there are far too many dwellings proposed to be built in such a small area. Also if the Horsleys are taken out of the green belt there could be even more building works than what is already proposed at present.

We moved to a beautiful Surrey village 13 years ago to get away from town life, having had to live in a town due to work commitments. We are concerned that:-

The village doctors, schools and services are already just about coping, we wonder what will happen to our lives if thousands of people decent on the village, they too will want to use these services.

For those that work in London and use the train, the station car park will NOT be able to cope.

The development of the Wisley Air field is absurd with the only entry/exit onto the Ockham roundabout by the A3, there are so many accidents already on that stretch of road occurring with the volume of traffic. The only people interested in pushing this development are investors from overseas, they will get the planning and then sell on to developers for a lovely profit, not caring of the legacy they will leave behind.

If and when these areas are developed and the countryside and villages are ruined, are we not responsible for keeping our lovely “green and pleasant land” for future generations?

If London used brown sites, gaps and properties that are not currently lived in, it could cope for expansion for the next 10 years. A much better idea than ruining our green spaces.

Please, please give our plea careful consideration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the disproportionate allocation of housing in this particular part of the borough. Indeed, over 23% of the Plan’s new housing is proposed in the immediate localities of the Horsleys, Ockham, Ripley and Send.

I object to the proposals relating to number, density and sustainability of new housing in West Horsley. The 385 homes on the four proposed sites are at much higher densities than currently exist within the village and will be totally out of character with the existing mix of different housing styles and layout of the village. For West Horsley this would represent a 35% increase in the number of houses within 3-5 years of a plan being adopted. The home building proposals are unsustainable in terms of schooling, drainage, roads capacity, shops, parking and public transport.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I strongly object to the proposed removal of West and East Horsley from the green belt. The villages are well into the green Belt, are not adjacent to any non green belt urban areas and it would be incongruous to have Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) within or adjacent to urban areas.

I strongly object to the proposal to add 385 new homes within the parish of West Horsley and further I object to the proposal to build 100 homes in East Horsley close to the railway near to East Horsley Station, but adjacent to parts of West Horsley.

I object to the proposals on the grounds that the villages do not have the infrastructure to service the homes proposed; that is insufficient water, electricity, gas and sewerage. In addition there is no provision for extra school places, at all levels the schools are over subscribed, nor plans to expand medical provision. The current road network is based on roads which remain country lanes, founded in the days of horse and cart, are narrow, without safe pedestrian footpaths and because of the increasing heavy use are even now breaking up.

If Guildford Borough Planning department was of a mind to develop and plan the development of the borough and region in a meaningful and positive way it would start with planning improvements and expansion of the infra structure. If the planning department was a business it would fail as it has not thought through or planned for the development it is proposing. The way it is going about the plan will lead to the Borough trying to develop without sufficient income to service the plans. The proposals do not demand that developers contribute meaningful sums to the infrastructure development.

I object to the plan as the housing density proposed is much higher than anywhere in the parishes and while the parishes do not need more large 4-5 bed houses, but smaller 2-3 , particularly 2 bed maisonettes, and terraced houses so that younger people can live in the area, with green space between the blocks to maintain the garden feel of the parishes. In some locations, perhaps near railway embankments 4-5 floored blocks of flats of interesting design could be built.

It is time that Guildford Borough acknowledged that a good part of the housing need could be met by the development of high rise buildings in the centre of Guildford, such as the railway redevelopment proposals. Other areas are also suitable. As towns develop into cities their centres go up. Centres of the Guildford suburbs could also rise higher to perhaps 5/6 storeys.

I object to the plan as Guildford Borough Council has not demonstrated joined up policies for car parking, access to shopping areas, development of local shopping opportunities rather than their reduction. There has to be access to shops and parking and parking availability to increase footfall. This is necessary while transport locally is geared to the motor car. Busses are like trains they cannot go everywhere so many people will not use them and then they are uneconomic.

I object to the proposed plan for its impact on the green belt and in particular on the Surrey Hills ANOB, which abuts and is part of the parishes of East and West Horsley.

I also object to the plan as there is no or little indication of where the new residents will likely find employment to enable them to live in the new houses planned. The Railways are already at capacity as are the local trunk roads and there is no surplus parking space at any of the local railway stations. As we are likely to continue to use the motorcar for personal transport and with buses rather like trains in that they only travel on limited routes the current plans will increase pollution in the local atmosphere.

These local plan proposals have not been well thought out and must be rejected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3776  Respondent: 15627777 / Monica Simpson  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Horsley is a rural village NOT a District Centre, and everything is at overload at present.

The planned development on WIsley Airfield, Ockham, frightens everyone to death, because although the original drawings are all very ‘Pretty’ with doctors surgeries, schools, shops etc, we all know that these will be the last to be built …..and may not be built at all…..and the pressure on the nearby village of Horsley will be huge.

Small developments of 100 or so houses in available land in West and East Horsley, will build up to be a vast new influx of people, and the village just cannot cope unless assurances are given to improve and enlarge the infrastructure of our very special village.

I have been a resident of Woodland Drive for 44 years and the qualities I cherished back in 1972 are still appropriate today. Plenty of nearby countryside and fields and walks, yet a good train service to London and Guildford.

Please don’t ruin our Area. Future generations have the right to enjoy the beauty and uniqueness of this village in the years to come. IF YOU STOP YOUR PLANS TO ENLARGE DEVELOPMENT TO THE UNACCEPTABLE LEVEL YOU ARE PROPOSING, THEN Horsley will remain largely as it is, and we have, by objecting, secured it’s future.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPA16/3820  Respondent: 15631841 / Max Waple  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. The proposal to build 385 new houses will swamp the small village of West Horsley, which in 2011 had 1,111 homes in the Parish. This is a 35% increase. There is insufficient infrastructure in terms of roads, parking, public transport, medical provision, education and schooling, drainage and sewerage. This is contrary to paragraph 47 of the NPPF, which requires local planning authorities set out their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attended documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3822  Respondent: 15631873 / Claire Spencer  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to express my objection to the proposed plan for Horsley.

I do not believe that exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to remove Horsley from the Green Belt.

No reasons have been given why there would be an extension to the boundaries of the settlement area of the Horsleys.

Our school is already full and doctors is overstretched – roads are too busy with no improvements made which we are already in desperate need of.

Station Parade cannot possibly be classed as a District Centre.

The amount of houses proposed as a percentage for West Horsley is such a vast increase in comparison with other areas.

I think that all brown sites within already urbanised areas should be used first – eg Guildford.

I particularly object to planning site A41 as this cannot be classed as infilling – it is a separate piece of agricultural land that does not adjoin any developed land.

The green belt was put in place for a reason – to keep our country green and help with the pollution – do not destroy this for our children and their children – it is our responsibility to protect the land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attended documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3880  Respondent: 15636577 / Keith Mackman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The inflated numbers of New Houses is totally unrealistic, even further now as a result of Brexit, and a new Govt, who no doubt will review the estimates advise a more realistic forecast of population future numbers and associated housing needs.

Green belt status should be maintained for the Horsleys.

The character of the Horsley villages, shops and housing, along with the associated area of countryside should be maintained, IN the Green Belt. This is fundamental.

The infrastructure is seriously compromised now, traffic including heavy vehicles, use totally inadequate country roads as a major means of cutting through, eg, Clandon, West and East Horsley across to Leatherhead Bookham etc from the A3 /Dorking and return, etc these roads and other facilities, ie Drs, Rail Parking and Village amenities generally are now stretched well beyond their original design criteria.

These changes for the worst over the last 10 yrs is a result of increasing volumes of traffic etc using inadequate village roads, without very careful consideration of these aspects and the increasing expressed concerns of Residents and submissions of for example The Horsley Countryside Preservation Society.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3904  Respondent: 15639329 / Louise Herrington  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Guildford Local Plan 2016, specifically with regard to the Horsleys development sites (A36, A37, A38 A39, A40 and A41) and Wisley Airfield developments.

I am writing to express my views regarding the Guildford Local Plan 2016 as outlined in the various presentations I have attended and the documentation I have read.

I acknowledge that the Borough Council is under pressure from central government when it comes to housing. Whilst many villagers would object outright to this plan, I understand the need for some development.

However, the plan that has been proposed is, far too much, not needed and not well supported with associated infrastructure. What is being proposed - nearly 500 homes and a 35% increase - changes the Horsleys from a village into a small town overnight,

the scale of the proposed developments, and percentage increase in the housing stock, is utterly out of proportion with what is being proposed elsewhere in the Borough.

Firstly, I object to the erosion of the Greenbelt - these proposals do not meet the “exceptional circumstances” requirements, so why would we want to build on Greenbelt land? As you will be very aware the Conservative Party manifesto at the 2015 General Election committed a Conservative Government to “prioritise brownfield development” and to “ensure that local people have more control over planning and protect the Green Belt”. Now, just a year after this promise these proposals dishonour this commitment. Recent events should remind councillors of the strength of feeling that exists within the public and what happens when promises are broken. It should not be assumed that Conservative seats are guaranteed in this area.
Secondly, I specifically object to policies A36, A37, A38, A39, A40 and A41. If all of the proposed developments went ahead it would transform the Horsleys into a sizable town, something for which no case is made, the amount of new housing far exceeds local demand, and the density is excessive when compared with existing development. I am concerned that the Collective impact of these 6 sites on a small part of the borough has not been considered, surely given their proximity they should not be treated as isolated, separate sites. Horsley is already very busy; at rush hour you can easily be in severe traffic queues in a village; parking at a train station is very limited; and the infrastructure supporting the villages is already stretched. Policy A40 is especially unviable because of the high water table and poor drainage, leading to regular winter flooding.

The properties in this area have poor sight lines and the pavements are totally inadequate for school children, parents with prams and the elderly.

I also object to Policy A35 (Wisley Airfield). I don’t believe this should be in the plan for all the same reasons the Planning Committee rejected the identical recent proposal by Wisley Investment Properties. This is not a brownfield site as stated – only 15% of it. Anyone that has been on the A3/M25 Junction recently will know how impossible it is to join the motorway with existing traffic volumes, access is confined to inadequate narrow lanes and there is no existing public transport and no train stations in the locality. I also believe that over 2,000 houses will swamp and destroy the Ockham conservation area, with impact on listed buildings. The Water table and surface water flooding has not been considered either for the site itself or for downstream areas of the River Mole.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
East and West Horsley villages

I fundamentally object to the inclusion of Kingston Meadows, land owned by GBC and previously dedicated as open space for the use and benefit of the community with Community Centre, medical centre and recreational facilities. It is fundamental that there are no exceptional circumstances for East and West Horsley to be taken out of the Green Belt.

I object to the extension of the settlement boundaries by the redrawn insetting boundary. These can only be to try and make more land available for what has been shown to be inappropriate development and included in an enormous document so that they will probably be missed by residents. No change to the settlement boundary has been justified. I object to a Plan which allocates Housing disproportionately to the Green Belt villages and in particular the Ockham, Send, Horsleys area. This is morally and legally wrong and contradicts your Vision. A proper assessment of urban brownfield sites should provide enough sites for housing to be allocated at least proportionately as between the urban area and villages.

I object to the revised Settlement Hierarchy with another meaningless tick box exercise. East Horsley is not a rural district centre within any ordinary meaning of the phrase. People do not come from outlying area to East Horsley for shopping or work, they go to Guildford, Dorking, Leatherhead or other urban areas, including Surbiton, Kingston and London. East Horsley is not suitable for town centre type developments and I object to these policies (E8).

I also draw your attention to the very serious existing problems in the village with inadequate infrastructure - roads, flooding and drainage, sewage, etc - and facilities - schools, doctors, failing businesses, no useful buses, to mention just a few. There is a high dependency on car use. For these reasons a large increase in housing is not feasible. It would also destroy the character of the village. For all the reasons given above, I am against anything other than small scale additions to housing in East and West Horsley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
(iv) Policy A41 - Land to the south of West Horsley (on East Lane) (90 homes / 4.8 hectare / 18.8 per hectare).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3970  Respondent: 15645057 / Julian and Clare Colborne-Baber  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure:

West Horsley does not have any of the infrastructure to support the development proposed. The village is small with few local facilities. There is currently just one shop at the southern end of the village, where local car parking is very limited. Most people in West Horsley already have to travel, largely by car, to East Horsley for their day to day shopping, banking and health needs. The existing car parking facilities in East Horsley are already at capacity and any increase in the local population will add to the already existing problems. Any new development would not “support the continued viability” of the existing village infrastructure, as has been noted by the GBC in the past. Key infrastructure issues include:

- Education that is already under strain;
- The East Horsley Medical Centre is already at capacity and serves both East and West Horsley and some other surrounding villages such as Clandon;
- The utilities infrastructure cannot be further stretched and water pressure is very poor across much of the village already;
- The existing road system is only appropriate for a semi-rural village, many of the roads are little more than lanes and pavements are often only on one side of a carriageway.

Any development will need immediate and considerable investment in infrastructure to support any increase in the village size.

In summary, whilst I accept that some housing development is required across the borough and West Horsley should take its fair share; at present the Local Plan proposes excessive development within West Horsley (in proportion much greater than other locations across the borough) the requirements for which have not been proven in any way. In addition the current proposals do not support sustainable development of the village and the amendment to the Greenbelt runs contrary to National Planning Policy.

As a result I am strongly opposed to the current Local Plan proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3967  Respondent: 15645121 / Kate White  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to express my concerns over the proposed 2016 Draft Local Plan and the impact it will have on East and West Horsley and neighbouring villages. Whilst acknowledging that more housing does need to happen and our village
should be prepared to "do its bit" I I object to the scale of what is being proposed which makes it significantly disproportionate. Three grounds in particular I would like to continue to bring to your attention and specifically object to:

1 **Building on Green Belt Land** should only be permitted in highly exceptional circumstances.

2 The biggest two proposed developments just don't appear to have been thought through in terms of the necessary **infrastructure** (schools, medical facilities and parking)

3 **Flooding**: in recent years it is has been very evident that the drainage system cannot cope so building on land already adversely affected by flooding will only exacerbate the problem

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3974  **Respondent:** 15645441 / Guy Willans  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. The proposed removal of villages from the green belt should only be undertaken in exceptional circumstances and there is no reason why GBC should unilaterally decide which villages should be inset from the green belt and make up their own 'exceptional circumstances'. No exceptional circumstances have occurred to remove West Horsley from the green belt as it has an open character and is historically important with many listed buildings, extensive wildlife and important countryside.

2. The infrastructure of West Horsley is already strained and stretched, including: drainage, schooling, medical facilities, road network, nursery places, sewers, risk of flooding, parking and rail transportation.

3. The extension of the settlement boundaries are simply not well thought thought and appear only to enable GBC to meet the expectations it is itself setting.

4. There are some sensible suggestions to utilise existing sites for new homes (Thatcher's hotel and Bell & Colvill), but this can not be undertaken without investment in infrastructure which is already poor.

5. The suggestion that Station Parade in East Horsley is a 'District Centre' is frankly farcical when the definition is read - it is just a small village street with a handful of shops, estate agents and a bank.

6. The Horsleys and immediate surrounding area seem to have a disproportionate level of proposed housing, with complete disregard for the green belt - this includes the suggested new settlement at Ockham (the former Wisley airfield).

7. Transportation via rail into London is already overcrowded with full station car parks and vehicle congestion at the station.

My wife and I feel very strongly that this whole draft GBC Local plan has been poorly thought through and has not been revised to any real extent since the last proposal.

We both oppose it due to the reasons laid out above. Housing is needed, and should be provided, but needs to be accompanied by significant infrastructure investment and there are many suitable sites across the whole of the Borough, including in the Horsleys that do not mean the removal of the green belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3978  **Respondent:** 15645601 / Peter Drew  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please find below comments with regards to the proposed Guildford Local Plan, particularly with reference to the Horsley area.

**Removal of Horsley and other villages from the Green Belt**

I object in the strongest terms to this proposal.

The Green Belt is designed to prevent urban sprawl and in particular to prevent the spread of London into its surrounding areas.

The proposed removal of this essential protection from the key villages surrounding Guildford, will enable the loss of their unique character and enable them to expand into small towns, which will in turn create the feeling of significantly larger built up areas spreading out from London into its surrounding countryside.

This will significantly change the unique character of both the local villages themselves as well as the broader character of the Surrey area between Guildford and the M25.

The scale of development in this area as proposed in the Local Plan, with around 5,000 new homes highlighted for development in this stretch of Surrey, clearly indicates the desired direction of travel should this unique protection be removed. Once this essential protection is removed, it will also open up the path for further large scale developments in this part of our beautiful country in future years.

The Green Belt policy requires 'exceptional circumstances' to be proven before these areas can be removed from the policy and **these exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated within the plan.**

This part of the plan should therefore be removed.

**Extension to the Settlement boundaries of the Horsleys**

Extending the settlement areas would also have the effect of expanding the size of the villages, contributing to the overall feeing of urban sprawl in Surrey.

**Scale of proposed development in the Horsley Area - impact on character and infrastructure**

I understand the need for further housebuilding in the South East.

However, this needs to be done with respect to the character of our local communities.

**I do object the the scale of the development proposed for the Horsley area** as this will have a significant impact on the character of the villages, the infrastructure - especially the roads, the schools and other amenities.

Our roads are already overloaded - for example access in the morning and evening to the M25 via the A3, the M25 itself, the A3 through Guildford. Access from Ockham Road South to the A246 in East Horsley is at best difficult, at worst dangerous each morning and evening. Traffic density makes it impossible for our children to ride on bicycles safely through the village.

Our schools are full and demand is predicted to increase further. Whilst there may be provision in the plan for further schools, there are no guarantees that these additional places will be created before the additional houses are built.

Other amenities will be put under severe strain by the plan, whilst at the same time local government spending has been tightened as a result of tough fiscal constraints by central government.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
I have seen the recent plans for expansion of housing in East Horsley and surrounding areas, and have serious objections over the proposed plans. I struggle to accept that all the proposed areas in this draft plan would not severely negatively impact our village, its community and facilities.

I moved into this area because I wished my family to move into a village community. I do not wish for it to now become a town. The local amenities are only just enough to support the current village community - I have deep concerns about the lack of amenities being proposed to support such a large increase in housing, being schools, roads, drainage, trains, parking, to name a few. Even if these were to be improved to cater for a larger population, it will change the whole essence of living the village.

The land adjacent to my house (Weston Lea, area 1275) is currently used by our children's primary school, The Raleigh, for sports. Are we to assume the facilities for the local primary school are to be decreased to make way for more housing?! I would have thought it wiser to try to increase the school facilities, not the opposite!

In addition, I believe the land is currently left free to allow itself for being used as a flood plain. If housing is allowed in this area, I would need confirmation that any flood damage would be insured for and compensated for by the council, if it in any way impacted my house.

In summary I object to the following key issues:

1) **Schooling** - the current primary school is already over subscribed - I cannot see sufficient measures to support the increase in number of children that will need schooling in this area. This is also true of secondary schools - the Howard of Effingham School is also at capacity.

2) **Flood risk** - the flooding and surface water levels in this area are already of serious concern, and more housing will obviously seriously exacerbate this problem. I do not see sufficient measures are being proposed to address this.

3) **Medical Facilities** - again, already at capacity for this village - what measures are being taken to increase this facility?

4) **Transport, roads, parking** - the train service from Horsley would need to vastly improve, longer trains, more frequent trains, more parking for commuters. With a possible 6000 additional cars frequenting the local roads, the impact on roads and parking will be tremendous. The parking for the local shops, medial centre, & village hall will be over stretched. The roads are already in such poor condition that the increase in traffic will only make this worse. It looks from the plans in the SCC report that "further thought may be required to managing traffic" - this is an absolute necessity, not an afterthought!

I hope you can consider these objections, and come to the logical conclusion that this Draft Plan is insufficiently prepared, and cannot realistically be condoned, as it will have a huge negative impact on the local area in both short and longer term.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
17. I object to West Horsley (south) [as described within the local plan] being removed from the green belt. This clearly meets the description of a village that should be ‘washed over’ by the green belt in terms of size, appearance and character.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I strongly object to the removal of both the Horsleys and other surrounding villages from the Green Belt. The primary purpose of greenbelt land is to prevent urban sprawl surrounding large urban centres. There are already near continuous buildings stretching from the City of London to Effingham Junction and it seems only reasonable to conclude that with the proposed rate of development and the removal of Green Belt status, this will extend to Guildford and beyond, thus removing the beautiful surrounding countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I support Policy E5 on the rural economy in favour of and strongly objecting to Policies E8 and E9 on new District and Rural Centres. Proposals to make East Horsley Station Parade a District Centre as well as Bishopsmead Parade a Rural Centre are completely inappropriate for the local small village which should not be expanded. I understand the plans are to ensure economic resilience however proposals within Policy E5 for better broadband and mobile phone coverage, agricultural diversification and to support sustainable growth of appropriate scale for all businesses in compliance with green belt policy are far more sustainable options which are place-appropriate. This is provided Horsley, as well as many other villages, stay within the Greenbelt as I strongly object to Policy P2. Policy E8 proposes consideration of sites on the edge of district centres for town centre uses to which I strongly object, as it opens up further expansion possibilities in the future, pathing the way for further housing plans outside in the countryside. Such expansion is creeping urbanization, damaging to the Green Belt as well as to Guildford’s thriving urban hub. Past expansion of suburbs both in London in the mid-20th century as well as American cities demonstrate how suburbanisation and consequent urban flight contributes to urban decay. The council has no business facilitating new supermarkets in the Green Belt as retail capacity should be left to local demand. Meanwhile the policy does not show any support for existing rural shops and services which are fundamental to the village communities which would be put at a disadvantage if these proposals were to go ahead. I object to Policy E9’s proposals for retail development adjacent to rural centres such as Bishopsmead Parade, especially when just down the road is proposed to become a District Centre (Station Parade), as well as neighbouring Effingham and beautiful village Shere. Expansion in Shere would be detrimental to its tourist industry as well as site locations for various tv and filming, chosen for its stunning scenery.
and ‘typically British’ quiet country village community location. Such locations are becoming rare to find in the South East of England and it is a popular location for both Londoners for a day out as well as people from across the world. It would be a great shame to lose this beauty and for the local people who rely on the income generated from tourism in the area.

In addition to my aforementioned objection to site reference A36, I also object to any significant increase in the number of villages of East and West Horsley or in the surrounding neighbourhoods. In particular, I object to the proposal of 2,000 homes at former Wisley Airfield (Ref A35) and the further 2,000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm (Ref A25). These two sites will cause huge further pressures on the Horsley villages and I do not believe the villages are capable of supporting and withstanding such pressures including on the road system, rail network, parking, flooding, drainage infrastructure, facilities such as the medical centre, dentists and chemists which are already very busy, local schools and many more. Therefore, I object to Policy S1 in that it fails to recognise that development in rural areas, with inadequate transport and other infrastructure, cannot cope with the proposed scale of development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I should like to register my objection to the Proposed Submission Local Plan. It is of great concern to me that you are proposing to provide such high density housing developments within the Horsley boundaries.

Since moving into West Horsley in 1989 there have been numerous times when the roads and drainage system have not been able to cope with the rainfall, which on some occasions does not have to be severe to cause flooding problems. The proposal to build many more homes in West Horsley will make this problem much worse.

There is also the problem of traffic causing more disruption as well as lack of parking spaces in the shopping areas.

There is a need to provide the supporting infrastructure first before even considering additional housing developments which are being proposed. The medical centre will not be able to cope without expansion, the number of school places would not be sufficient without another school being built, the provision of a more frequent bus service must be addressed especially to cover Saturdays as well as weekdays, the train station car park is already full during weekdays and the local roads network would need to be carefully considered to avoid severe congestion.

The redevelopment at the Thatchers Hotel site is very shortsighted bearing in mind that a prestigious opera company is setting up home in West Horsley. The need for a hotel is bound to be required and Thatchers Hotel is ideally situated.

I am opposed to the removal of the Horsleys from the Green Belt as the atmosphere of the villages will be lost forever.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4080</th>
<th>Respondent: 15653537 / Barrie Morse</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 am writing to express my strongest possible OBJECTION to the New Local Plan.

The previous Draft Local Plan issued in 2014 for consultation received some 20,000 comments of which the majority expressed fundamental objections. The new local plan has made no changes. The New Local Plan does not respond to the concerns of electors and the 20,000 comments which will not be available to the inspector. I consider These issues amount to CONTEMPT of the electorate by Guildford Borough Council.

I am aware that both East and West Parish Councils made objections to the new Plan specifically to the former Wisley airfield on 4 July 2016. The Parish Councils have articulated this clearly. Guildford Borough Council must give full weight to the concerns they have so professionally expressed.

I have the following specific OBJECTIONS to the New Local Plan:

1. I OBJECT to the proposal to remove East and West Horsley from the Green Belt. The exceptional circumstances needed to justify such a fundamental and adverse change for the Horsleys have not been demonstrated and only Guildford Borough Council's perceived unfulfilled housing needs appear to support the proposal.

2. I OBJECT to the proposal to extend the boundaries of the Settlement areas within East and West Horsley. No sound reasons have been given for the proposed changes which seem to be aimed solely at increasing the land available within the settlements for future additional development.
3. **OBJECT** to the proposal to designate Station Parade as a 'District Centre'. I see no reason to change this view. The proposed reclassification results from a complete misunderstanding of the nature of the facilities in the village centre and would inappropriately target the area for future urban developments.

The proposals made in the New Local Plan result in 593 new houses in the Horsleys within five years of the Plan being adopted without taking account of the 2,000 houses proposed at Wisley, 2,000 houses and mixed use development at Burpham, and 400 houses and commercial development at Burnt Common and Gosden Hill Farm. In West Horsley alone, the proposal is to increase the housing stock by up to 35%! Once again, it is difficult to avoid the impression that this plan is the result of a desktop exercise prepared by individuals who have little knowledge of, or interest in, our villages. Adjustments to population growth projections made by Guildford Borough Council result in a population increase which is almost 70% higher than official national estimates for the Borough. The adverse impact on an overloaded existing infrastructure in terms of local schools, medical facilities, and road and rail transport would be substantial. The impact of the resulting urbanisation of our villages adjoining the Surrey Hills area of Outstanding Natural Beauty would be devastating.

**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>PSLPA16/4075</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15657601 / J. Y. Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</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 am writing with regard to the proposed Draft Local Plan Strategies and sites June 2016.

I have many concerns regarding this new plan the most unacceptable aspect of the proposal is the proposed increase in housing for West Horsley. The proposed 35% increase in 6 years is clearly ludicrous. No plans for local infrastructure have been shown. The roads are already overcrowded and the drainage systems are at bursting point. The village designation as a Rural District centre is also inappropriate. The proposed increase in housing will make the local amenities unuseable due to the fact that I already struggle as disabled drivers to park. I also struggle to receive doctors appointments as the surgery is oversubscribed.

The parish council offered a sensible proposal i.e. a limited need for some 20 affordable homes for local people who want to remain in the village, i.e. for young people and for elderly people who wish downsize to a smaller home. This would enable the current community spirit and ethos to remain and allow the village to thrive as a part of proper rural England. This would then respect the NPPF policy which requires that new residential development must respect the character and density of housing in the area and be limited in quantity by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities.

I note also that the designated green belt land which I have always been assured would remain as such, has now become prime building land. I understood in 2014 that it is possible, under exceptional circumstances to change green belt land to enable development. I now understand that this will be obtained by “Insetting”

Can the council demonstrate that all of the required process has been adhered to and recorded and that these circumstances legally allow such re-designation.

Can the council also confirm that all possible brown-field sites have been prioritised for development prior to the green-field being used?

With regard to the proposed development at Manor Farm. I am extremely concerned about the extra road traffic this proposed development of some 135 homes would produce. New residents needing to use the A3 to Guildford or London...
will chose the shortest route to the main road. This will create traffic down the narrow Long Reach road, which includes a very sharp blind bend towards its North most end. This could easily result in a future accident.

I live in Northcote Crescent and already have problems with our garden flooding during periods of high rainfall. The Manor Farm development lies on land higher than where I am. The large area of impermeable land that will be created by the development will without doubt contribute to this problem.

With regard to the surface water run off from this development at present this runs into a pond at the back of the proposed Waterloo farm proposed development. The area of land around Ockham Road North in this area is already a high risk flood area. These two proposed developments will also add to this problem unless a very major surface water alleviation project is to be undertaken. I look forward to seeing the promised hydraulic modelling which is only the start of design development work. The feasibility of this flood alleviation work, together with a design and budget costs should be investigated prior to consideration for actual residential development. Normal SUDS schemes will not be sufficient to alleviate this problem which needs to be sorted now let alone following extra new development.

In summary our concerns are as follows:

- Inadequate flood prevention planning for Northcote Crescent and Ockham Road North.
- Inadequate road access for long reach to A3 links.
- Inadequate facilities at station parade shops and surgery.
- Inadequate school facilities in area.
- Inadequate consideration for the use of brown field sites.
- Inadequate exceptional circumstances to change green belt land to enable development.
- Inadequate consideration for population growth prediction figures.
- The complete lack of consideration for the National Planning Framework requirements

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4101  Respondent: 15661729 / Jaqueline Tolley  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to lodge my comments on the Guildford Local Plan and how it relates to the Horsley area.

1) There has been no valid reason presented to change the Horsley green belt status.

It appears to be driven by developer's desire to get hold of cheap land. What is the point of identifying areas to be protected with green belt status if it can be removed simply. Residents will surely mount a legal challenge to any such change in status.

2) Road infrastructure inadequate already.

Plans to introduce substantial increases in traffic with new housing to the A246 and Ockham Road (both North and South) are ill conceived. At the junction of the the A246 and Ockham Road South we regularly have traffic jams simply to the volume of traffic. In the morning the queues stretch from the junction back along the A246 towards Leatherhead around the corner past the Thatcher's Hotel. In the evening this is compounded by traffic coming south off the A3. In less than 200 yards on the A246 around that Ockham Road junction there are 8 entrances/roads. Proposals to increase the volume here is crazy without a major change to the layout. Sight lines on the junctions are already too short and the proposed Thatchers hotel development in particular looks questionable as the hotel will still be operational. Similarly the Bell & Coleville roundabout is already overstretched as it takes the Cranmore school load for parents doing u turns.
3) The estimates of population growth are clearly exaggerated as they far exceed national and even other local area expectations. The failure to publish the model simply underlines this concern. Publish or be damned is surely the right view. To base plans on a projection that cannot be critiqued is plain wrong. I used to work in the City and always had to provide sources for any assertions.

We would like to highlight the wonderful care home development currently being completed on Kingston Road, Leatherhead. This site used an old police station so had minimal green space around it, with minimal impact on the surrounding areas and has created numerous residences. My key point there are plenty of sites (brown sitres) that are already developed so would present no impact on green spaces. Building on gardens is a cheap and nasty way - force the developers to redevelop existing sites by limiting the availability of green belt and other similar land.

Guildford council should be more open to the conversion of commercial property to residential.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4104  Respondent: 15661761 / Rob Harris  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Changes to settlement boundaries.

Similarly, the extension of the Settlement boundaries around East and West Horsley has inadequate basis and will just result in further diminution of the Green Belt of the Borough.

The extent of the proposed new housing within the extended boundaries of East and West Horsley, associated with the proposed village to be created on Wisley Airfield, will have the effect of creating a single town out of 3 existing villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4121  Respondent: 15664065 / Jo van Herwegen  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Sustainability

There are limited employment opportunities within the village, and residents will need to commute to a place of work. This will either be via car (see transport above, with impact on local highways), or via train. The environmental burden of these additional journeys has not been considered in the sustainability assessment.

Village character

The proposed high-density housing sites are totally out of character with the current low density settlement, and will have a big impact on village life. This proposal is non-compliant with the national planning framework as the development does not respect the character and density of housing in the area.
Summary
The developments within the local plan do not take account of the availability of infrastructure or local facilities, nor are they in line with the character and density of housing in the area. I therefore strongly oppose these proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/662  Respondent: 15664065 / Jo van Herwegen  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I welcome the removal of sites A36 and A41, however the amendment fails to address the issues stated in my previous letter on the following sites:

Former Wisley Airfield (site A35)
Bell & Colvill (site A37)
Manor Farm Site (site A38)
Ockham Road North (site A39)
Ockham Road North (site A40)
Garlick’s Arch (site A43)

In particular, the amendment does not include sufficient provisions in local infrastructure (road network, sewage, medical facilities, and schools) to accommodate the additional demand driven by these proposed sites. These issues have been clearly outlined in my previous communication with you (17/07/2016) and have not been addressed in the revised plan. I also strongly object to the removal of greenbelt classification within this area, and the exceptional circumstances required to change this status has not been met within the amendment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4141  Respondent: 15665377 / Denise Hinton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Green Belt status of the area mainly to the south of the A246 in East Horsley.

I feel it is important to retain areas of greenbelt to ensure the character of the areas around London is maintained. By reducing greenbelt the London are is being extended and the south east of England becomes one big suburban sprawl. There is no gain to be made by doing this.

In regards to the additional housing planned for the Horsleys and Wisley airfield the increase in housing is disproportionate to the size of the existing population, the roads and drainage would be unable to cope with this increase and there are also insufficient public services. The schools would not be able to handle the influx nor would the surgery or local hospitals.
It does not seem that the plan is suitable to the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4156  Respondent: 15666049 / Amanda O'Brien  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The existing roads, schools and health facilities have no plan for funding set out in the plan to address 500 new houses.

Several of the new sites proposed extend the built area out into the countryside which is clearly damaging to the Green Belt where any new building is regarded as inappropriate in government policy

The council are proposing new village boundaries which extend the built area outwards into the green belt again clearly damaging to the Green Belt where any new building is regarded as inappropriate in government policy

The proposed new development has been focussed on West Horsley with no Special Purpose being defined as required by policy to promote development in the green belt.

The protection of Birds in the special protection area near Wisley requires special consideration within 5 km. All of the sites in West Horsley and the site at Wisley Airfield are within this 5km. Any new development requires the possible effect on the birds to be addressed by the provision of alternative open space to draw residents away from Wisley. Effingham Common has been identified to serve this propose but in order to be usable for this purpose it requires a public car park which it has not got. Common Rights and planning permission issues may well stop this ever coming forward. This puts in doubt the feasibility of the sites in the long term

For all of the above reasons we object to the Local Plan and request that the minister addresses the green belt points and confirms that West Horsley remains a green belt village, recognises the uncertainty relating to the protection of the birds and that as a result removes the pink coloured sites as development sites from the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4195  Respondent: 15672737 / Andrew Mills  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to any reclassification of the village boundaries, enlarging the villages of East and West Horsley will have a significant and damaging effect to the existing village life, village characteristics and property values. Having purchased my property in the last five years specifically within a village green belt setting (for which I paid the various search fee’s etc) I was told that I was safe from any future building proposals due to the green belt protection and restrictions. I will investigate all means of recovering any costs for damage to either the existing building structure or future property value along with a refund of all search costs.
I object to any removal of the existing village boundaries from the green belt. Having purchased my property in the last five years specifically within a village green belt setting (for which I paid the various search fee’s etc) I was told that I was safe from any future building proposals due to the green belt protection and restrictions. I will investigate all means of recovering any costs for damage to either the existing building structure or future property value along with a refund of all search costs. GREEN BELT

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4213  Respondent: 15673185 / Simon Jefferies  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 land at Ockham Road North, WH – allocation A40

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4215  Respondent: 15673185 / Simon Jefferies  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 West Horsley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4259  Respondent: 15685409 / Marie-France Beglan  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites: June 2016.

I have lived in Walton-on-Thames for nearly 45 years and raised my family here. In that time I have seen too many houses being built, beautiful historic houses demolished and ugly blocks of flats built in their place. The roads are very congested, I cannot leave the house during certain peak hours due to traffic. The proposed changes by Guildford Borough Council are on a very large scale and will damage the look and feel of the area forever but also dramatically worsen the already dire traffic situation, e.g. trying to get in and out of Wisley RHS Gardens or shopping in Guildford.
My daughter and her young family live in West Horsley and these proposals will have a very detrimental effect on their village, it’s look and feel. The extra impact on local services (schools, roads and health services) are not adequately addressed in the Local Plan.

My main objections are:

- Erosion of the Green Belt: GBC has not explained clearly what the “exceptional circumstances” are to needing to remove areas from the Green Belt.
- Density and proposed scale of the developments: not in keeping with current density of housing in the area especially in East & West Horsley.
- Lack of provision for increased infrastructure for new number of houses: health, transport, education, sewerage.
- Wisley Airfield New Town: a very large development of 2000 homes which will have catastrophic consequences on the already heavily used A3. The impact on local villages and services will be immense (eg Ripley, Ockham, Horsleys).
- Gosden Hill Farm: Proposed development of 2000 homes like Wisley Airfield will have dramatic consequences on roads and the amenities of local villages.
- “Affordable Housing”: the term is misleading and the demand for these are not high in the villages affected in the Local Plan. Very ill thought through.

For the reasons I have listed above I object to the Local Plan and hope that it will be rejected to protect the area from irreversible damage.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4301  Respondent: 15691489 / Richard Hutt  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have been a resident of West Horsley for some 24 years and write to express profound regret at the proposals which have been introduced which in my opinion lack careful consideration and wish to raise the following observations by way of an objection to these proposals.

I would first add that I am not directly affected by the development proposals but like many others, are aghast at the lack of diligence that is evident in the proposals which have been produced and comment as follows.

Proposals for removal of West Horsley and East Horsley villages from the green belt

At a time when properties within Central London remain substantially vacant in exclusive residential areas then to undertake further residential development outside the core areas of population, (i.e. Central London and within the ring of the M25), will lead to increased travelling time for commuters, lack of consideration for the environment and a lack of “sustainable” development. Far better use could be made of developments in existing “brown field” sites with high rise developments where people will actually choose to live rather than consuming acres of good quality agricultural land or land situated within the established green belt. If an encroachment is made on the green belt, then quite simply – where will this stop? Increased travelling times for those leaving London at weekends to enjoy public open space will inevitably rise and this will lead to further environmental damage. The green belt has served the South of England well for over 50 years and there is no good reason to introduce such a change – especially given that the population projections maybe impacted by recent political development such as the withdrawal from the EU and the projections on population growth prepared by Central Government may now be considered wholly erroneous.

Increase of some 385 homes to West Horsley and some 100 homes to East Horsley
It will be noted that the proposed figures for additional housing are in addition to those which have already been provided for in the proposed Parish development sites. However, no real consideration appears to have been given to the impact upon the infrastructure which is already overloaded in terms of the following:

1. local schools are full and already over-subscribed with more demand than places available;
2. medical facilities are already stretched;
3. drainage is inevitably inadequate;
4. the existing highway system is inadequate to take further population growth of the levels proposed without leading to severe safety concerns and increases in the number of accidents to both pedestrians, cyclists and other road users;
5. car parking within both East and West Horsley is limited and is already at capacity at Horsley Station. Given the expectation that the majority of the proposed housing will be sold to commuters, this will simply exacerbate parking within the existing centre which is already full. What though has been given to this?
6. it is also noticeable that the percentage of new homes proposed within the proposed “Guildford Plan” involves an increase of some 35% more than the existing number of houses in the Parish compared to 16% in Ash and Tongham District Council and just 11% in Guildford Town – the latter location in particular benefitting from substantially superior facilities and more readily capable of taking such growth as an appendage to an established urban area!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4318  Respondent: 15693313 / Nigel Richardson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Being a frequent resident visitor to East Horsley and residing with the below Ralph and Charlotte Harris I wish to add my objection to the current proposal.

It is clearly not in the interests of the local community to adopt the Council proposals and the Inspector should take full notice of what objections are being made with which I fully concur.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4325  Respondent: 15694465 / Ellie Denham  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Village sites - East and West Horsley

I object to the extension of the settlement boundary of my village (East and West Horsley) by the redrawn insetting boundary. I particularly object to the inclusion of Kingston Meadows, land owned by GBC and previously dedicated as open space for the use and benefit of the community. That is a key green space and recreational area where I have used the play parks, bike humps, trim trail and football pitch for decades with friends from the village and outside. It is used
by hundreds of dog walkers and for village celebrations. No change to the settlement boundary has been justified. I object to the inclusion in the Plan of six large housing sites in the Green Belt by the two villages (A36 - 41).

In addition I draw your attention to the very serious existing problems in the village with infrastructure - roads, flooding and drainage, sewage, etc - and facilities - schools, doctors, transport, parking at the station to mention just a few. There is a high dependence on car use. For these reasons a large increase in housing is not feasible. For all the reasons given above, any additions to housing in East and West Horsley should be small scale and preserve the openness of these Green Belt villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Please find below my objections to the Guildford Local Plan.

West Horsley is defined by Guildford Council as a Green Belt Village.

Policies in the Governments National Planning Framework (NPPF) require that new building is regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt.

These Policies also say that only limited infilling with Housing is appropriate.

Neither of these policies support substantial new development in the green belt.

The Councils Proposals total some 500 new dwellings in the green belt, which is clearly contrary to the above policies.

Previous objections to the Local Plan by West Horsley residents have been totally ignored by the council, who have shown no community engagement in producing the current plan with the increase in housing and the expansion of the village contrary to their wishes.

In producing the new Local Plan larger sites are proposed west of Guildford to reduce the pressure on the green belt. No benefit is evident to the residents of West Horsley from this reappraisal and in fact an increased requirement for housing in their green belt is proposed.

The existing roads, schools and health facilities have no plan for funding set out in the plan to address 500 new houses.

Several of the new sites proposed extend the built area out into the countryside, which is clearly damaging to the Green Belt where any new building is regarded as inappropriate in government policy.

The council are proposing new village boundaries which extend the built area outwards into the green belt, again clearly damaging to the Green Belt where any new building is regarded as inappropriate in government policy.

The proposed new development has been focussed on West Horsley with no Special Purpose being defined as required by policy to promote development in the green belt.

The protection of Birds in the special protection area near Wisley requires special consideration within 5 km. All of the sites in West Horsley and the site at Wisley Airfield are within this 5km. Any new development requires the possible effect on the birds to be addressed by the provision of alternative open space to draw residents away from Wisley. Effingham Common has been identified to serve this propose but in order to be usable for this purpose it requires a public
car park which it has not got. Common Rights and planning permission issues may well stop this ever coming forward. This puts in doubt the feasibility of the sites in the long term.

For all of the above reasons I object to the Local Plan and request that the minister addresses the green belt points and confirms that West Horsley remains a green belt village, recognises the uncertainty relating to the protection of the birds and that as a result removes the pink coloured sites as development sites from the plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4357  **Respondent:** 15701473 / Robert Mattock  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to register my strong objection to the proposed submission local plan (strategies and sites) June – July consultation

The first line of your proposed Policy P2 states, “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt against inappropriate development.” It then fails to do so.

I am a resident of West Horsley and am totally opposed to the village's removal from the Green Belt by insetting and extending the 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area boundaries. The village is well into the green belt and should remain so.

Nowhere in your proposal are exceptional circumstances or any other justification made for the new Green Belt boundaries that will result from the proposed insetting of the two parts of the village from the Metropolitan Green Belt

I believe the Green Belt & Countryside Study is flawed

Certainly West Horsley's defined Settlement Area boundaries (ref 2003 Local Plan) DO NOT need to be extended

West Horsley Parish is one of a varied mix of well established low housing density settlements with a considerable number of historic buildings. We are positioned on the north side of the North Downs, partly in the Surrey Hills AONB, and attract a considerable number of recreational visitors (walkers and cyclists) through the seasons each year

the Key Evidence document 'Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2031 makes absolutely no case for locating large numbers of homes in West (an increase on current house numbers of 35%) and East Horsley or neighbouring villages and the proposed new economic development site proposals are on the opposite side of the Borough to West Horsley

**Policies S1 Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development, S2 Borough Wide Strategy, H1 Homes for all, H2 Affordable Homes**

I further object to this proposed policy.

Policy S2 states that provision will be made for 13,800 new homes over the Plan Period 2013 to 2033. The number of homes is too high and unsustainable in Guildford’s villages. The Site Allocations list totals 12,698.

This size of expansion in our village is unsustainable. With only one small shop, no post office, very limited weekdays only bus service through the village, it is clearly not suitable for the proposed high volumes of new housing development

The development of 385 homes on the 4 proposed sites are at much higher densities than currently exist in the village settlement and will be totally out of character with the existing mix of different housing styles and layout of the village.
The homes building proposals are unsustainable in terms of schooling, drainage, roads capacity, shops, parking in East Horsley (shops and station), public transport

The need for so many houses to be built in West Horsley over the first 5 years of the Plan period 2018 to 2033 is totally unproven and nothing in your documentation say’s otherwise. The West Horsley Parish Council and Surrey Community Action Housing Survey: May 2014, identified a limited need for some 20 affordable homes for local people who want to remain in the village, i.e. for young people and for elderly people who wish downsize to a smaller home.

**Policy i3: Sustainable Transport for new developments**

I object to this policy. Developers will be expected to propose and secure travel Plans for their developments and contribute to transport arrangements for the able and disabled.”. This proposed policy is too soft and is unrealistic where development and major housebuilding companies are involved. The roads in the area were founded many years ago when cars did not exist. They can hardly cope with the current volumes, let alone the increase that your plans would deliver.

**GENERAL OBSERVATIONS:**

Have the authors of this proposal ever lived in or even visited a village community of our size. If they had, they, like me, would be objecting as I do to the plan in it’s current form.

The small grocers store at the southern end of the village may close later this year as the shop owner is retiring. There has always been very limited parking outside this store.

People using East Horsley’s shops and its Public Library in 2016 experience more and more difficulty in parking their cars at most times of the day. The proposed large increase in population of West and East Horsley will make parking and movement into and through the village considerably more difficult and time consuming.

There is a continuing lack of state primary school places in the village. The Raleigh school which serves both East and West Horsley is full every year and this has been the situation for many years.

Secondary school places are limited in number at the Howard of Effingham School and other secondary schools involve a much longer journey of time and distance from the village to reach them.

Glenesk and Cranmore private schools are well supported by many families living in Guildford and other villages up to 14 miles away. Each of these private schools during term time, receives high volumes of traffic going to and from each school at each end of the school day, on Ockham Road North and the A246 respectively.

Again I object to this plan.

**Medical facilities –**

Kingston Avenue Medical Centre, serving all of East and West Horsley and areas beyond, is always extremely busy and residents experience difficulty in making appointments. Yet your plans are for expansion after five years. The planned population increase which you are predicting for the Borough will require a major extension of the Royal Surrey Hospital to cope. Therefore, I object to the way your plan does not recognize medical needs.

**Transport**

Horsley station has frequent trains to London and Guildford 7 days a week, the station car park is normally full on weekdays. An increase in village population will increase pressure on station parking and traffic movements to / from Horsley station to drop off/ collect travellers to London and school children going to Guildford and Leatherhead.

Traffic generation from the proposed new housing areas will be considerable. Most households in rural areas as a necessity have 2 cars, many having 3. Journey times on local roads will increase significantly.

Therefore I object to your plan.
Waste water Infrastructure –

There are known sewage overflow problems in the Ockham Road North / Green Lane area.

Thames Water has advised Guildford Borough that the area’s wastewater network is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all the proposed developments. The foul drainage system from West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley, will need to be upgraded to cope. Thames Water advise ‘a 2 to 3 years’ lead-in period’ to install the necessary waste water network and treatment capacity after planning permission for a development is granted.

All in all, this is a badly thought out plan, which does nothing but bring distress to the residents of villages such as West Horsley. It must be withdrawn.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4358  Respondent: 15701857 / Melissa Freeman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We have lived in the Horsley area for nearly 28 years.

I completely understand the need for more housing, especially affordable housing, in and around the Guildford area. However, I would like to object to the proposed local plan, particularly for the Horsley area, for the following reasons:-

1. Transport.

Public transport in Horsley and Effingham is already pushed to its limits. I think it's fair to assume that each new household will have at least one, but probably 2, cars. Having done school runs through Ripley and Horsley and Effingham for over 10 years (no bus service), I know that rush hour is awful on the roads and will not be improved by the introduction to the area of a further 500+ vehicles, if 500+ more homes are built. This does not include all the extra traffic expected to East Horsley station should the Wisley/Ockham and Send/Send Marsh developments go ahead.

1. Resources

Having spoken at length to a local builder, who has lived and worked in the Horsleys for over 50 years, I understand that the water supply in West Horsley could only support another 20 homes in its current state. Provision of water and dealing with waste water is not something that can be done after the event. The local plan seems to be very vague on how this vital infrastructure can be dependently delivered in time, if at all. It also appears that Thames Water themselves don't believe that level of development is suitable or sustainable.

1. Percentage increase

West Horsley is proposed to have a 35% increase in its housing. I strongly object to this percentage, especially when the proposal is that the Horsley villages will be removed from the Green Belt. There will undoubtedly be a huge loss of amenity with this sort of increase in population and buildings. If the development of Wisley/Ockham and Send/Send Marsh goes ahead, this would be exacerbated further. This percentage increase is far greater in the Horsleys than any other area in the local plan and is totally disproportionate.

1. Infrastructure

The local infrastructure is already close to, if not at, full capacity.
The schools (both public and private) are full.

The roads are very congested and it's difficult to park at: the local shops, who we'd like to support, and The station, as we'd prefer to use public transport.

According to local sources, medical facilities are 'stretched'.

As previously mentioned, water provision and waste water systems are already at capacity. Little Cranmore Lane regularly floods because Thames Water will not install a pipe that is big enough to deal with anything other than light rainfall, despite numerous requests to do so. Can they therefore be trusted to provide adequate water and drainage and deal with waste water for another 500+ houses?

I hope that the Planners can come up with a more sustainable and sympathetic way to increase the amount of housing in the Guildford area, without the amount of negative impact that this plan would inflict on the local community and countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4366  Respondent: 15703873 / Neil Taylor  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We strenuously object to the Proposed Submission Local Plan issued June 2016 on the following grounds:

1. Guildford Borough Council proposes to remove East & West Horsley from the Green Belt.

In section 4.3.16 the plan states that “National planning policy requires that Green Belt boundaries are only amended in exceptional circumstances”, GBC has not been clear what exceptional circumstances exist that support a 25% increase in the housing stock of the borough when the Office of National Statistics (“ONS”) are projecting a population increase of 15% for Guildford Borough over this same period.

In section 4.3.24 the plan states that “Development within villages in the Green Belt is limited to small scale infilling”, yet for the Horsley’s this infilling numbers more than 533 new houses which represents a 25% increase.

The proposed plan further states that “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt” which we hole-heartedly applaud. The plan further states that “The AGLV will be retained until such time as there has been a review of the AONB boundary”. Yet GBC goes on to propose that some 65% of developments will be made on land that is currently Green Belt.

East Horsley moving to “inset” from being “washed over”, means that any green spaces within the village potentially be built on in the future. GBC also proposes to move many of the settlement boundaries around East Horsley in particular by redrawing the western boundary removing over 5 hectares of agricultural fields from the Green Belt as well as Kingston Meadows. These open spaces contribute to the openness and character of the village, including providing valuable outdoor space that contributes the social and physical wellbeing of all residents. NPPF rules state that Green Belt boundaries should only be changed in ‘exceptional circumstances’, yet GBC has not provided evidence of exceptional circumstance.

1. No consideration in the proposal is given to current infrastructure and services which are already overloaded:
In section 4.1.13 of the plan Station Parade, East Horsley is listed as a district centre. Yet more closely meets the definition of a local centre. “The borough’s local centres range from the small centres with only five to 10 commercial premises or public facilities such as library or village halls, through medium sized local centres with between 10 and 15 premises, to large local centres, such as Woodbridge Hill in Guildford which has 29 units.” GBC has not indicated it’s reasoning for this listing and also the potential impact of designating it a district centre. The local East Horsley shops whilst sufficient for the current number of residents are insufficient to support an additional 533 households, and there is a lack of available land in the current shopping parade to support development, this means that the local character will be irreversibly impacted by redevelopment.

No consideration is made on the impact to local schools which are already heavily oversubscribed from the additional 533 households in East and West Horsley, nor to the addition of 2000 additional households in the nearby Wisley site which will not have schooling for many years.

No consideration has been made to the impact to local medical facilities, roads and car parks. Parking at Horsley & Effingham junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the medical centre and at the village hall will all be affected.

In both East and West Horsley the principal through roads are narrow and winding, having pinch points that would be unsuitable for HGV traffic. Although it is stated that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution, there is no clear plan as to how the roads will be made to accommodate the increase of traffic or how existing problems such as pot holes, uneven surfaces, lack of pavements and street lighting will be resolved, the latter posing a significant safety risk to residents.

We respectfully ask that you do not adopt this plan and take into consideration the objections from both this recent planning period and the 20,000 objections to the 2014 draft planning consultation. Please protect our green belt and our legacy to the future generations of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4367  Respondent: 15703905 / Ryan Smith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a local West Horsley resident I object to The Guildford Plan removing East and West Horsley villages from the green belt and the proposed significant increase in housing developments.

- there is already insufficient school places both at primary( The Raleigh) and secondary schools ( the Howard of Effingham), a material increase in the number of houses in East and West Horsley will result in many children not being able to attend schools locally but will have to travel to other villages and towns.
- the infrastructure cannot handle the proposed increase of housing in west and east Horsley village, there have bee no clear plans provided by The Guildford Plan on how traffic and environmental issues will be addressed. There are already limited parking facilities in both villages, which cannot support the extra cars and traffic as a result of the increased housing.
- local facilities, such as medical cannot support an increase of housing as proposed by the Guildford Plan.
- removing west and east Horsley from the green belt will completely alter the character of the local area.

the Guildford Plan is unsustainable and not proportionate in the Housing proposals in West and East Horsley, the green belts and characters of our local villages need to be protected, and any development needs to be in line with what local infrastructure and facilities can support. I thus strongly object to the Guildford Plan in regards to West and East Horsley.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4368  Respondent: 15703937 / Graham Vickery  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

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 West Horsley from the 'Green Belt' in contravention of national government policy intended to protect the Green Belt from general development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4379  Respondent: 15705121 / Rachael Anderson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to register my objection to the local plan on the following points:

• proposal to remove Horsleys from the green belt - it is essential that an area such as the Horsleys remains in the green belt and should not be removed for the sake of convenience to assist planning proposals. 'Exceptional circumstances' need to be demonstrated before such a step can be taken and this has not been done.

• extension of the boundaries of the settlement areas of the Horsleys - I cannot identify any sound reasons for such an extension contained in the plan. Therefore, it should be the case that the status quo remains.

• infrastructure - no detailed thought or planning has been given to the infrastructure adaptation that would be required for the number of new dwellings in the local plan. The Horsleys are already stretched in terms of school places. Further roads/drainage would need to be implemented and the inherent structure and feel of the Horsleys would be adversely affected.

• number of houses - an appropriate method to determine how many dwellings the local area could feasibly sustain has not been applied. The plan has been proposed without proper depth of thought as to the impact and practicalities that would need to be involved.

The plan seeks to implement a local plan which is not sustainable and would materially adversely affect the existing residents of the villages. The proposal does not sufficiently support the number of houses contemplated.

I would urge the council to reconsider the local plan given it is ill thought out and unsustainable for the reason specified above.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4383  Respondent: 15705313 / Lisa Sarti  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
1. **I OBJECT to the 2016 local plan in its current format.** I do not believe that it is sound and is not yet fit for implementation.
   1. The council relies on a strategic housing making assessment that is in question. The council have not scrutinised the figure provided and rely purely on the fact that other councils have used the consultant GL Hearn to assess the housing need. The SHMA appears to be exaggerated against ONS data. Two independent reviews have identified similar faults, which suggest that the figure is too high and inaccurate. They also identify that the recent referendum result relating to Europe may have an impact on economic growth and consequently should be reviewed. The SHMA must be reviewed to ensure that it is accurate before the housing figure is agreed.
   2. The council have chosen not to impose any constraints in respect of the OAN.

2. **I OBJECT to altering the green belt boundaries.** Para 83 NPPF states green belt boundaries can only be altered in exceptional circumstances and where there is local support. Meeting the housing need is not exceptional circumstances. This has recently been reiterated by Central Government. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated.

3. **I OBJECT to the use of the ‘Green belt and countryside study 2014’ within the evidence base.** This is a subjective view of the green belt provided by one company, It is not evidence. It does not provide exceptional circumstances to remove land from the green belt.

4. **I OBJECT to the use of the transport study within the evidence base.** The SINTRAM model is designed for major routes and is not suitable for local roads as it takes no account of junctions. The three hour period also skews the data disproportionately downwards. This means that it will not necessarily provide a true reflection of traffic movement within Guildford. A different model should be used and the peak times adjusted to accurately reflect traffic, particularly within rural areas.

5. **I OBJECT to the disproportionate amount of development in this small area of the borough:** The area surrounding East and West Horsley will attract in excess of 5000 new homes, which accounts for over thirty-six percent of development. The area is predominantly rural in structure, nature and environment and does not have the infrastructure to cope.

6. **I OBJECT to the disproportionate increase in housing in West Horsley.** The local plan proposes an increase of thirty-five percent for a rural village, this is totally out of character. The density suggested by the council is not in keeping with the current environment, almost double the levels within the majority of the village.

7. In line with Central Government guidance I **OBJECT to development on areas of high agricultural value.** This includes Wisley airfield. If it is necessary to build on agricultural land it should be of low quality.

8. **I OBJECT to the fact that there is no provision for a larger primary school within East or West Horsley** despite the fact that Para 38 NPPF states that for large developments a primary school should be built within walking distance. Over 500 houses within East and West Horsley is large development when considering the size of the villages. The Surrey infrastructure review does not state that a new school is necessary despite the fact that the school is already oversubscribed causing children to be driven to other villages. (They do state the school may in the future identify a suitable site through infill opportunities). Surrey have suggested that children from the Horsleys can be accommodated either in Ripley or Clandon; both of which would necessitate parents driving, and in the case of Ripley travelling through a traffic blackspot.
9. **I OBJECT to the local plan making East and West Horsley less sustainable.** This is a breach of para 7 and 9 NPPF and policy S1 of the proposed local plan. Failing to provide essential health, education and community facilities forces residents to use private vehicles to reach these when at present the majority can walk. The Infrastructure survey suggests that primary and junior school aged children will have to travel to Ripley and Clandon to attend school. No provision is made for any other facilities including health, dental, community and sport.

10. **I OBJECT to the inclusion of Policy A41 relating to land south of East Lane.** This is in contravention of para 85 NPPF which states that borders must clear and readily recognised. The natural border is the wood to its east. The inclusion of this site is not in keeping with the current settlement and character of the village; houses front East Lane up the woods to the east of this site which borders the road for approximately 400 yards. The land is green belt, no exceptional circumstances are made.

11. **I OBJECT to the inclusion of A35 Wisley airfield in the local plan.** The principle of the local plan is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Housing and Planning Act 2016 grants permission in principle to any development included within the local plan leaving only technical details to be considered by planning authorities. The site at Wisley failed in its planning application on a large number of points including infrastructure and sustainability. It is highly unlikely that these will be met in the future due to its positioning. Part of the site is green belt and no exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated. Aspects of the site also include high quality agricultural land.

12. **I OBJECT to the fact that the Local plan does not effectively demonstrate proposals to improve road networks** to accommodate the additional vehicles likely to travel through East and West Horsley. The majority of through roads are narrow, have pinch points and are subject to closure through flooding on a regular basis.
   1. LRN7 intends to introduce interventions to address potential highway performance issues resulting from the development of Wisley airfield. If these are those put forward by the developers they are likely to have a significant negative impact on East and West Horsley, or any traffic travelling to or through even without additional housing.
   2. LRN22 East and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme is non-specific and the suggested £1m is insufficient to make sufficient improvements to deal with the substantial traffic increase likely if all aspects of the local plan are allowed.

13. **I OBJECT to the council failing to deliver sufficient infrastructure** to cope with the proposed development within this area of the borough. The bus network is almost non-existent and new buses are linked only to the Wisley development. The train station car-parks at Horsley and Effingham junction are always full and there is no space to enlarge them. The roads are not suitable for commuters to cycle any distance due to the narrowness of the roads, speed of traffic and lack of space to build cycle paths.

14. **I OBJECT to the area described as West Horsley (south) being removed from the green belt.** This clearly meets the description of a village that should be ‘washed over’ by the green belt in terms of size, appearance and character.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
the Horsleys plus another 2,000 houses at the Wisely Airfield site will hugely change the character of the area irreversibly destroying the existing village character, the quality of life of its residents and, undoubtedly, property values.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4442  Respondent: 15706689 / Hope Sarti  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the disproportionate increase in housing in West Horsley. The local plan proposes an increase of thirty-five percent for a rural village, this is totally out of character. The density suggested by the council is not in keeping with the current environment, almost double the levels within the majority of the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4447  Respondent: 15706689 / Hope Sarti  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
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 there is no provision for a larger primary school within East or West Horsley despite the fact that Para 38 NPPF states that for large developments a primary school should be built within walking distance. Over 500 houses within East and West Horsley is large development when considering the size of the villages. The Surrey infrastructure review does not state that a new school is necessary despite the fact that the school is already oversubscribed causing children to be driven to other villages. (They do state the school may in the future identify a suitable site through infill opportunities). Surrey have suggested that children from the Horsleys can be accommodated either in Ripley or Clandon; both of which would necessitate parents driving, and in the case of Ripley travelling through a traffic blackspot.

I OBJECT to the local plan making East and West Horsley less sustainable. This is breach of para 7 and 9 NPPF and policy S1 of the proposed local plan. Failing to provide essential health, education and community facilities forces residents to use private vehicles to reach these when at present the majority can walk. The Infrastructure survey suggests that primary and junior school aged children will have to travel to Ripley and Clandon to attend school. No provision is made for any other facilities including health, dental, community and sport.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the area described as West Horsley (south) being removed from the green belt. This clearly meets the description of a village that should be 'washed over' by the green belt in terms of size, appearance and character.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4410  Respondent: 15710017 / Clive Long  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Revised Guildford Borough Draft Local Plan 2016

It appears that very little of substance has changed from the first unacceptable Draft Plan of 2014. I write to register my objections and criticisms of certain key aspects of the above Plan, as follows:

- The blanket withdrawal from the Green Belt of West and East Horsley, as well as all the other villages listed, is overreaching and excessive. If it is necessary to designate some very specific small patches of land for inset from the Green Belt for development, it should only be done with considerable care on a site by site basis, not sweeping wholesale removal of large swathes of whole Parishes and villages
- The policy statements essentially contradictory, claiming to protect the Green Belt but then removing huge areas from its protection
- The number of additional potential dwellings proposed in West Horsley is disproportionate compared to the existing housing stock and will constitute a massive increase of some 35% and in no way can be considered “commensurate to their size, character and function”
- The number of additional potential dwellings in West Horsley is considerably higher and disproportionate to that proposed for the rest of the Borough.
- The population growth projections used in the Plan appear to have a fundamental base calculation flaw to justify these huge housing increases. They are considerably higher than predictions made by the Office for National Statistics. Why? They are therefore an unreliable basis to warrant such considerable development.
- In addition, following the Brexit referendum outcome, housing needed for EU immigrants will be much less
- The number of additional potential dwellings for the Horsleys must not be viewed in isolation but must be considered in the context of the potential other developments in the Borough, particularly the massive expansion of over 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield, a mere couple of miles away. The area will be literally swamped by a massive increase in population which is in no way “commensurate”
- Successive national Governments and Ministers are on record as confirming that the Green Belt should remain protected and only used in “exceptional circumstances” and housing development needs does NOT constitute exceptional circumstances
- The proposed extremely high proportion of affordable housing in these housing developments is totally out-of-line with the current mix of housing. Furthermore it is questionable if there is even demand for such a high proportion
- The local infrastructure of facilities and services such as schools, medical facilities, roads, will be overwhelmed
- The adoption and conversion of most pavements to shared use for both pedestrians and cyclists, with pedestrians having priority where necessary, should be specifically stated in the Draft Plan

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4411  Respondent: 15710081 / MK IP Works LTD (Marilyn Krige)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to note my objection to the proposed plan for development for certain part of the Horsley area.

I am a Horsley resident and home owner. One of the main reason for choosing to live in this area was and still is to take full advantage of quiet village life and to enjoy the green space which is entrenched in the declaration of much of this area as a green belt.

I am disappointed that application has been made by the Guildford Council to 'delink' Horsley from the green belt so that housing and development can be increased in this area. Horsley is an essential part of the green belt and is part of the Surrey Hills and part of this area of outstanding natural beauty. It is also close enough to London to be a great area to easily access by Londoners keen to introduce their families to nature either walking in the various green areas of cycling along country lanes. There appear to be no good or exceptional reasons, as required by the Policy to change the boundaries of the green belt. Any such change would also add significant impact on the enjoyment of the area.

The addition of so many more homes will have a significant impact on the services in the area. Not only would the planned additional Housing change the character of the village but there are no plan for how the additional Services will be provided.

There is no concrete plan for infrastructural development to accompany the proposed increase in housing. The train station parking is already inadequate for present commuters and is often full. No plan exists for the development of new schools although the population increase would require it. The roads around Horsley are country lanes and would not be able to cope with further traffic.

All in all the proposed development is not well considered or thought out and will have a very negative impact on the character of the area without enough consideration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4416  Respondent: 15710561 / Stephen Kirby  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Comments on the proposed submission local plan; stratagem and sites June 2016.

I am a resident of West Horsley and have been for over 10 years. The reason I chose to live in the village was predominantly due to the peaceful, beautiful and unspoilt location. Whilst I am sympathetic to the reason for new housing I cannot understand why anyone would consider removing the green belt land to make way for such development. The areas preposed for development are home to a number of key indicator species of animals which determine the conditions of the local environment. One of these species is the Red kite. There are many other precious spices of bat and reptiles such as the adder which I have seen residing locally. Another privilege of living in the village.

If the land use is change from green belt to allow the local council to sell the land for development, I fear greatly for the habitat destruction of the species mentioned, and these are just some examples. It seems so much effort has been put into making the environment habitable for these animals only to be lost for the short sighted gain of building homes. There are in my opinion many other brownfield sites that would benefit from this sort of development, but here is not one of those places.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4417</th>
<th>Respondent: 15710593 / Lilian Pan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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, Lilian Pan, 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] object to proposals for developments in the east and west Horsley area. The rich wildlife, natural, historic features of the area will be compromised. Due not only to the development work but unsustainable numbers of home / people due to populate an area with limited resources and amenities. The area is known to be a greenbelt area and we, the residents, proud of it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/208</th>
<th>Respondent: 15711393 / Kirk Georgiou</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies A37, 38, 40, 42, 44 &amp; 45 – My Objections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some 295 houses in various smaller developments in West Horsley, 100 in Send and 15 in Ripley. These will generate traffic on the A 247 to access the 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: PSLPA16/4504</th>
<th>Respondent: 15724769 / Joseph Neasmith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 write to object to the Local Plan for East and West Horsley.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the Horsleys should remain as Green Belt. The exceptional circumstances required before taking this action have not been demonstrated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no sound reasons for the boundaries of the settlement areas to be changed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure in Horsley is already overloaded. Local schools are full, drainage is inadequate, roads and car parks are overloaded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Parade should not be designated as a District Centre. The nature facilities in the village centre have been misread.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the development of over 2,000 houses at Ockham. This will have a huge and devastating impact on Horsley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4509  Respondent: 15724865 / Edward Craft  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write as a resident of West Horsley in response to your draft Local Plan. I draw attention to my two previous detailed letters of 17 September 2014 and 28 November 2013 in relation to your previous form of draft Local Plan and the Strategy and Sites document respectively. Much of the comments in those letters do not seem to have been specifically considered in this latest Local Plan. As a general comment, I believe that you have demonstrated both irresponsibility with public funds and poor custodianship by not specifically addressing the points previously raised.

In the continued period of austerity I think that you have unnecessarily wasted significant sums of residents’ money in the manner in which you have pursued the local plan process, more focussed on razzmatazz surrounding it and self-promotion rather than seriously, substantively and constructively engaging with residents and precipitating a point of consensus. I have been particularly disappointed in GBC’s conduct in relation to these proposals given the massive mismanagement that was demonstrated in 2013-214. Lessons do not seem to have been learned.

As an initial comment, I believe that you have wasted a great deal of public funds and energies of residents in this process. You could have considered matters better and allowed for a more focussed, constructive debate that the one you have precipitated.

My principal comment is to object to the proposal for villages being removed from the Green Belt. I do not believe that there is sufficient reason for this and, furthermore, to do so would be unlawful and ultra vires because exceptional circumstances for blanket removal has not been, and cannot be demonstrated. Development in the Green Belt can only be justified when other options have been exhausted: this is demonstrably not the case.

GBC should be working to improve the area and the efficiency of Guildford as a major town, increasing population density within the central urban area in a sustainable manner and thereby reducing private traffic movement.

Development on the Green Belt can only be justified in narrow circumstances. It is accepted that specific fields might be appropriate for release from the Green Belt where specific exceptional circumstances exist, such as where the provision of essential community infrastructure (such as schooling and healthcare facilities) is required, but this is an exception to the general rule. The blanket removal of villages from the Green Belt (as is proposed) is both lazy and irresponsible and will do little to actually support the need for sustainable growth in the area.

Development should be focused on Guildford Town Centre

Guildford is Surrey’s country town and is a leading town centre in Southern England, boasting a major university, many corporate head offices and thriving community assets, such as the Cathedral community. Accordingly, Guildford should be the focus of development within the borough, whether that be commercial or residential. For thousands of years it has been clear that conurbations are the most efficient and effective manner in which to manage human populations and, accordingly, if there is to be population growth in the proportions projected by GBC, our largest town centre is the most appropriate place for this.

Regardless of the other overriding reasons to object to development across the Green Belt, there has been a lack of consideration for social infrastructure and transport connections. These will be best delivered in Guildford town centre, with improved connections to Guildford from the villages. East and West Horsley’s local facilities (including local
shops, parking, schools, medical services and transport infrastructure) are inadequate to cope with the numbers you contemplate for increase in population. Development in East and West Horsley would lead to a great increase in car use, which is contrary to sustainable transport policies. The roads of East and West Horsley are of poor quality, are narrow and cannot sustain further traffic. The Station parade area of East Horsley is regularly overcrowded and the changes of the area were demonstrated by the awful accident at the Station Approach/Kingston Avenue junction during afternoon peak hours. Train services from Guildford are, and will always be, much better than from Horsley.

**No exceptional circumstances which justify development of the Green Belt**

GBC has, to date, failed to make any case that exceptional circumstances exist to justify any attack on the sanctity of the boundary of the Green Belt as it currently stands. Indeed, GBC seems to be adopting a position which is contrary to central government policy. To do so will lead to any decision being changed as ultra vires, thereby exposing GBS (and, effectively, its rate payers) to the unnecessary cost of judicial review.

Those who have made a conscious decision to live in a village within the metropolitan Green Belt appreciate the constraints (and responsibilities) that places on them, restricting what they can do with their land.

In the Winter 2013 copy of About Guildford GBC stated the importance of maintaining a continued sense of community and to recognise the distinct character of each of the villages within the borough. The status of much of the borough as metropolitan Green Belt land is fundamental to this, protecting the area from the encroachment of London from the north east and from Guildford itself as well. Accordingly, the process for the development of the local plan must be delivered with the protection of community and the environment at the forefront. There is insufficient and inadequate evidence that this has been done. No sufficient consideration has been given to the legacy we would create for our children if GBC’s wide-scale development assault on the Green Belt is allowed to proceed.

Accordingly, I strongly advocate for East and West Horsley (and the other villages within the borough) to remain within the Green Belt and should not be removed from it. However, if there is a powerful case for the re-zoning of a particular field or fields for reasons which satisfy the high threshold set, that could be supported on a case-by case basis. GBC is yet to do this on a case-by-case basis but, if any when it does I would be happy to lend my support. Given the current political trend for referenda rather than elected politicians demonstrating leadership, perhaps the solution is to hold a multiple choice local referendum with a series of questions.

The provision of vital community infrastructure is a powerful example of where the sacrifice of a small piece of Green Belt land might become appropriate, provided that there is no other viable alternative. Similarly, such a sacrifice should not be used as the thin end of any wedge to then open the door from property speculation for commercial purposes.

**Loss of Green Belt Land is Irreversible**

As you will have remembered from my previous letters, to change the planning status of the Green Belt land around the metropolis and around Guildford would send a clear (and negative) message that the rural nature of our precious and beautiful county is not something for which we are simply custodians and which therefore requires protection. A continued development linking London to Guildford along the axis of the A3 would be unacceptable and is contrary to the objective of Green Belt designation.

The Green Belt land in the east of the borough protects our most precious natural asset, the North Downs and Surrey Hills, in their true, undeveloped, context. We should be justly proud of being the most wooded county in England (much of it ancient) and do everything to ensure that this precious heritage is passed down to future generations.

We have much to thank former generation for in the protection of our county's countryside in a manner which has delivered a vibrant local economy, whilst protecting our heritage. Today, it is the responsibility of the current councillors and officers of GBC and its residents to ensure that the work of past generations is not for naught and that the special characteristics of our borough are maintained.

If the Green Belt status of vast swathes of the borough were removed, there is a genuine risk that it only the SSSI/AONB areas would be appropriately and sufficiently protected from development for the benefit of biodiversity and for our children and successive generations.
It should be remembered that that Green Belt status assists GBC in its stewardship of the borough so as to protect the precious nature of the area, whilst also permitting sustainable, proportionate and sympathetic development. Green Belt status clearly identifies areas which are “off limits” for most development. By proposing to move the boundaries of the Green Belt you will make your own role harder than it needs to be.

Loss of undeveloped land within the current Green Belt is irreversible and it is our collective social responsibility, and your legal responsibility as public steward, to ensure that this does not happen.

**Planning Policy Guidelines in relation to the Green Belt**

I would like to bring GBC’s attention to page 19 of the DCLG National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) (the "NPPF"). In the NPPF DCLG sets out five purposes served by the Green Belt. These are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Achieved by the current GBC Green Belt?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another</td>
<td>Y (towns and villages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</td>
<td>Y (towns and villages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In applying the NPPF to the borough GBC should only consider changes to Green Belt status once other non-Green Belt areas have been effectively developed and once a continuing unsatisfied demand is demonstrated. At present, this is not the case and GBC is encouraged to assess each borough candidate site within the current metropolitan Green Belt against the above criteria. GBC should therefore make no mention of any piece of land within the current boundaries of the Green Belt within its Local Plan unless and until it has failed to adequately meet housing and other land use need from other sites: this is not yet the case.

GBC should use the full array of powers available to it (including powers of compulsory purchase) to ensure that brownfield and other non-Green Belt sites are appropriately developed before any assault is made on Green Belt status. Any assault on the Green Belt may only be considered appropriate once all sites have been fully developed and a continuing unsatisfied demand demonstrated.

In November 2013, the then leader of GBC said that GBC “will not be building on the Green Belt until we have exhausted all usable brownfield sites first”. Such a statement was very encouraging, but now GBC need to be kept honest to stick to this promise, commitment and aspiration. Such a responsible approach is not reflected into the draft Local Plan which seeks to remove villages from the Green Belt from a sense of apparent laziness before developing the brown field options.
It is recognised that appropriate, proportionate, sympathetic and sustainable development is desirable and necessary. In that regard, the NPPF states that the construction of new buildings within the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate, subject to certain exceptions.

The most relevant exceptions in relation to the future planning policy relevant to East and West Horsley (emphasis added) are limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan and the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

The Local Plan proposals for East and West Horsley go far beyond these limited exceptions (both in nature and extent) and would have a significantly detrimental (and irreversible) impact on the natural characteristics of the area, as well as being unsustainable with regard to the existing local infrastructure. The existing local infrastructure struggles to bear existing demands, in particular board traffic levels of quiet rural roads, village parking and school access.

In the aftermath of the successful High Court challenge to the Solihull Local Plan the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government has made it clear that there is a two-fold test for any intended development on Green Belt land:

1. firstly, whether land should be taken out of the Green Belt at all; and
2. secondly a hurdle as to what should be put on the land which hitherto benefitted from Green Belt categorisation.

There is a high threshold to pass for each. GBC has not demonstrated this in respect of the Green Belt land within the borough. I am keen to ensure that GBC does not waste further monies in pursuing Local Plan proposals which will be struck down through a judicial review of face any other legal challenge. Accordingly, I urgently call upon GBC to produce more reasonable, reasoned and acceptable proposals which are consistent with the NPPF ad the legal regime.

**Improved safety for pedestrians and cyclists needed**

Improved road safety to ameliorate the village environment for cyclists and pedestrians is vital. GBC should work with the highways authority and enforcement agencies to apply a zero tolerance attitude towards antisocial, dangerous and aggressive motorists. Safety for sustainable travel in villages attracts insufficient attention in your Local Plan.

Generally, much more work needs to be done by GBC (in conjunction with Surrey County Council as the highways authority and the Parish Councils) to slow motor vehicles and to protect pedestrians and cyclists in East and West Horsley. The potential proposals in relation to East and West Horsley and Ockham give insufficient consideration to the infrastructure and the inability of the current road network to satisfactorily service the increased demand that would be placed upon it by potential development.

It is also important for GBC to ensure that footpaths and cycle paths remain accessible, are not overgrown and left with plant detritus and the metalled surfaces remain of appropriate quality. Once this is done, better lighting for pedestrians and cyclists should also be considered.

The roads in the villages are inappropriate for existing traffic using them and something must be done to ensure that they are no longer used as a cut through by commercial vehicles seeking to avoid the major trunk road network: this needs to be carefully considered as part of the local plan adoption process.

**Lack of proportionality in development in the area and lack of sustainability**

GBC’s proposals for development in East Horsley and West Horsley are disproportionate to the area. Development should be focussed on Guildford Town Centre and increasing density in urban zones rather than increasing the size of sensitive villages which would:

- lead to a disproportionate impact in comparison with other parts of the borough better placed to deal with large population increases (in particular, Guildford Town Centre);
- cause irreversible harm to the Green Belt and the Surrey Hills AONB;
- place unmanageable pressure on local infrastructure (in particular, the local shops in East Horsley, Horsley Station, the Raleigh School, the Medical Centre and local roads);
• cause irreversible harm to the Green Belt; and
• not be sustainable.

Sustainability goes far beyond deploying low-carbon construction techniques.

Some limited development at Ockham Airfield might become appropriate if it met sustainability needs, focussed only on brownfield land and was accessible only from the A3, so as to not harm the villages. However, to deliver such a plan, it would be necessary to also address traffic congestion issues with Highways England on the A3 and the M25.

**Conclusion**

Once development takes place on land, the change to the nature of an area is irreversible. Many appropriate non-Green Belt sites available within the borough which may be available for development and a number of these candidate sites are in public ownership: in order to comply with the NPPF and to ensure that GBC is able to optimise its cash position other candidate sites (particularly those within GBC or other public sector ownership) should be fully developed before any review of the Green Belt is undertaken.

Whilst it is appreciated that the EU referendum exit decision has been thrust upon the people of Guildford against our will, it is clear that central government policy will be moving against population increase through immigration. Accordingly, GBC needs to re-run your household growth modelling to reflect this new paradigm once central government policy is clarified.

GBC is presented with an opportunity to be innovative in its planning policy, whilst protecting the heritage and value of its precious landscapes. For example, GBC should carefully evaluate the use of high-density development around Guildford station with new communities built above commercial units at ground level (a very attractive prospect for commuters). GBC has, as yet, failed to demonstrate innovative thinking. I implore you to now assume the role of a responsible steward and to develop proposals.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:** 12006901_1_13384(1).docx (41 KB)
Please refer to images (right) taken from bottom of footpath leading up to the back of the houses on Silkmore Lane. You will note the absolute monstrosity of a house which was allowed to be built in place of a small pretty Victorian cottage – more in keeping with Weybridge than a country village. It is a complete eyesore and should never have been allowed to be built. No amount of fencing and trees will ever hide this architectural nightmare. All other houses in the lane are unobtrusive and nestle into the village boundary and landscape. There are 14 listed buildings in this particular area and their setting should be preserved for the benefit of future generations.

I ask you to reconsider extending the village boundary which will only be to the benefit of a property developer who will exploit the land for his own monetary benefit and have long term detrimental effect on the village and affect the enjoyment and pleasure this open countryside offers to village residents and visitors from the towns and cities alike.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  
CDK letter July 2017_Redacted.pdf (541 KB)

And in relation to Sites A36-41:

- The changes to the Local Plan for East and West Horsley are minimal - the revised plan still contains four of these sites, which represent a total of 395 new dwellings. This shows that GBC has chosen to disregard the very high number of serious objections previously submitted to this part of the plan. **We do not want the character of the Horsleys destroyed by insetting from the Green Belt and over-development.**
- Many Horsley residents are suspicious of political bias amongst a Council leadership which represents the opposite (western) end of the borough: the over-development of East and West Horsley seems to be the sacrifice they are willing to make in order to protect their own neighbourhoods.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Therefore, for the following reasons, we still **object strongly to proposals for sites A37-40:**

- The issue of excessive and disproportionate development in East and West Horsley compared with the rest of the borough remains unexplained and unaddressed.
- The Local Plan makes no attempt to set out an integrated vision for this part of the borough, there is no assessment of the cumulative impact on facilities and infrastructure - public transport, traffic, road safety, parking, schools, medical facilities, sewage, flooding/surface drainage and shops - of the four sites now proposed, as well as Site A35 (Three Farms Meadow, aka “Wisley Airfield”), which is only two miles away and proposes more than 2,000 new homes.
- Sites proposed on the periphery of existing residential areas in the Horsleys encroach on surrounding open fields and require the extension of settlement boundaries and the insetting of the villages from the Green Belt. The plan
presents no arguments for this, and contrary to NPPF paragraph 79, will contribute to creeping urbanisation by weakening the Green Belt corridors separating the Horsleys from neighbouring villages.

- Together, the four Horsley sites breach NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value, which has been an outstanding success story in the Horsleys (as detailed in response to the last consultation). Assets include a dense network of public rights of way and permissive access routes, parks, sports fields, a campsite of international standard, Britain’s newest opera house, and the much-used Olympic cycle route. These examples depend on a Local Plan that protects the Green Belt, maintains its openness and beauty and avoids urbanisation and traffic congestion. The proposed developments are clearly in contradiction to this.

- The density of the proposed new housing is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in East and West Horsley at the current time.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/168  Respondent: 17283297 / John Ball  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policies A37, 38, 40, 42, 44 & 45 – My Objections

10) Some 295 houses in various smaller developments in West Horsley, 100 in Send and 15 in Ripley. These will generate traffic on the A 247 to access the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/215  Respondent: 17295265 / Brian McGee  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policies A37, 38, 40, 42, 44 & 45 – My Objections

Some 295 houses in various smaller developments in West Horsley, 100 in Send and 15 in Ripley. These will generate traffic on the A 247 to access the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/219  Respondent: 17296321 / Robyn Cormack  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Policies A37, 38, 40, 42, 44 & 45 – My Objections

Some 295 houses in various smaller developments in West Horsley, 100 in Send and 15 in Ripley. These will generate traffic on the A 247 to access the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/220  Respondent: 17296417 / Simon Wilcockson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policies A37, 38, 40, 42, 44 & 45 – My Objections

Some 295 houses in various smaller developments in West Horsley, 100 in Send and 15 in Ripley. These will generate traffic on the A 247 to access the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1819  Respondent: 17307457 / Eileen Stone  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

OBJECTION TO "THE GUILDFORD PLAN -JUNE 2016"

I have lived in East Surrey since 1967 and over the years have sadly witnessed the gradual erosion of the rural aspects of the area despite living in the "Green Belt" as seems to be the case in most rural areas in Surrey over the years.

Whilst I am sure the majority of people living in Surrey and farther afield readily accept that there is a need for more housing (particularly affordable housing for the younger generation and key workers) any Plan has to be based on sensible and sustainable numbers.

As a very frequent visitor to see my son, daughter-in-law and grandson who live in West Horsley, I am shocked at seeing the proposals for future housing in the West and East Horsley Parishes contained in "The Guildford Plan - 2016". The effect of a 35% increase on the number of current homes in the area will be profound, particularly with as I understand it little or no explanation as to how the existing infrastructure and services generally will cope with such a huge explosion of building.

Based on my comments above I object most strongly to the proposals set out in "The Guildford Plan" and urge Guildford Borough Council to have a serious rethink about the sizes/numbers of developments proposed and table a much more realistic revised Plan in line with the wishes of electorate of Guildford Borough Council.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am writing as a concerned parent of a West Horsley resident regarding the latest changes made to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan June 2017 consultation, having expressed my concerns previously.

It would seem that no change is being proposed to the idea of insetting West and East Horsley from the Green Belt which will risk the outstanding countryside surrounding the two Parishes being overwhelmed by the Metropolitan Sprawl. Although there is a reduction in the number of new homes being proposed for West Horsley there is no evidence of an overall reduction in the number of new homes but clear evidence of an imbalance between the number of new homes being proposed for the Eastern side of the Borough compared with the Western side.

Hopefully the final submission will include realistic infrastructure upgrades in line with the proposed housing developments. Finally, in my view the proposed Wisley Airfield redevelopment would be a disaster for the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
- The council is not choosing to constrain its housing growth in Green Belt areas and the proposed developments still represent a large number of dwellings on Green Belt space, which was established to prevent urban sprawl not facilitate it. The continued submissions of the Local plan squarely fail to meet any of the infrastructure issues and relies on inaccurate information and excessive erosion of Green Belt land.

- I question the Council’s predictions for Guildford’s level of growth which is 25% more than the Office of National Statistics prediction for the area by 2034. Surely it is an error to base a plan on figures that differ so markedly from national forecasts and flawed evidence must not be relied upon to justify the inflated predictions.

- Nothing has been proposed since last years Consultation to improve sustainability of the West Horsley development sites and therefore meet the National policy requirements. The road network is already over used, in poor state, is prone to flooding in poor weather. The train station car parks are already full up at rush hour. The primary and secondary schools in the area have both applied for expansion to meet existing needs and these have been rejected. I therefore do not understand how an infrastructure that is over subscribed already can fit the further demand expected of 400 new homes in the area. The same applies for the Doctors surgery which is at capacity.

- I object to no changes being proposed since the 2016 consultation to insetting West Horsley from the Green Belt and welcome the reduction in the number of new homes being proposed, but the Local Plan does not go far enough to maintain Green Belt land.

- The number of proposed dwellings will fundamentally change the character of the village, yet Guildford town centre and brownfield sites appropriate for dwellings are being overlooked in preference for further retail space when many published studies show online retailing is growing at the expense of the high street.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
I wish to comment on this local plan in respect of West Horsley.

I wrote to you on 21st September 2014 and also on 17th July 2016 but regretfully never received any response from you so I am repeating much of what I wrote then. I find it entirely unsatisfactory that you have not even bothered to contact me to discuss this site which has the benefit of being in the centre of the village yet hidden away. Please note my email address has changed.

As I do not know where precisely where Cranmore Lane turns into Little Cranmore Lane I shall just refer to both as Cranmore Lane in the following.

I should be grateful if you would consider an additional / alternative development site on land to the east of Overbrook and west of Cranmore Lane. I have spoken to the owner of adjacent Barcombe Farm who would be happy to include his fields between Barcombe Farmhouse and Cranmore Lane within a development area. These areas are shown on the attached plan being land parcels Nos 154 and 136 totalling some 6.769 acres. These should have been identified for possible development in your original study.

This site has the benefit of being in the centre of the village (ie West Horsley South) and would round off the village settlement boundary by the recognisable and defensible boundary of Cranmore Lane.

The land involved is very poor quality agricultural land and not being part of a larger holding is uneconomic to farm, and is completely surrounded by other residential housing.

Whilst your study states that this parcel of land has limited access at present a new access to this site would have to be negotiated but there are several possibilities including the demolition of one or two existing houses to make way for such access. An access up the driveway to Barcombe Farm from The Street is also perfectly possible.

This site would NOT be a visual intrusion on the village as it is tucked away behind the Overbrook estate and Fulkes Cottages and bounded by woodland to the East and the South, and cannot be seen from higher ground or other roads.

I am confident that the selection of this site would find more favour within the village than those proposed given that some more development in the village is said to be necessary. Furthermore it could be at a density more appropriate to the village situation rather than the extremely high densities proposed.

Regarding the remainder of the plan I would like to see in it proposals to deal with future medical facilities which are at present overstretched, Increased parking at Horsley Rail Station which is at present full on most weekdays, increased capacity of local schools in order to deal with the proposed increase in population.

I view the plan as being produced at a very high level with less than sufficient consideration to the actualities that exist in a lot of the various locations in the Borough.

I hope I will receive a response from you this time and would be happy to enter into further discussions regarding the inclusion of this suggested site into the final Borough Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/569  **Respondent:** 17445217 / Philip and Charles Mason-De Freitas  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley North

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is **Sound?** ( No ), is **Legally Compliant?** ( )

We are writing to make comment on the above in respect of West Horsley.
We are very disappointed that the 2017 version of the plan should be almost unchanged from the 2016 version and that most of the 32,000 objections received last time seem to have been ignored. I truly hope the inspector rejects the plan and sends it back for radical reworking. In particular, the calculation of the SHMA remains unsupported as it can’t be tested by either the public or the government because the council refuses to reveal it. Despite this the SHMA methodology is still taken by the council to produce an “objective” housing number assessment. The council is contradictory about how development will be phased and infrastructure and other constraints applied making the final housing number so uncertain as to render this part of the plan unworkable as a practical policy tool for officers responsible for day-to-day planning. No-one knows for sure what number the council is heading towards or how this aligns with public opinion or government policy. Policy H1 has deleted constraints on housing density, which ought to be a key part of any planning document. • P1 and E5 have removed the 5 tests for development in the AONB, making it more vulnerable to development, in contradiction to government policy and promises made by the council leadership since the 2016 consultation. • The plan still contains a multi-pronged assault on the Green Belt. Building on the Green Belt in West Horsley would have zero effect on house prices, since it would make no impact on the national supply/demand balance, the local overhang from London or the availability of cheap credit, e.g. to overseas buyers. It would discourage the regeneration of urban areas where many people wish to live and instead wants to promote more shops when the national and international trend is for less town centre shopping and more internet and delivery. There is infrastructure already in place in the town to support housing. This plan seems to see a suburbanised countryside with a decaying town centre in its centre.

The following comments relate to my local area that features in Sites A36-41 (East and West Horsley): The latest version of the plan reduces the number of development sites here by 2, but 4 remain, representing 395 new homes. This is too many in absolute terms, and disproportionate in relation to the rest of the borough. In my view, the plan is unsound in failing to assess the aggregate impact of these sites, along with the 2,000 homes planned for Site A35 only 2 miles away, in effect leaving the Horsleys as vulnerable as piecemeal planning applications as they are without a local plan in place. By not setting any development boundaries, the “plan” fails to plan this important part of the borough’s future size or shape in a useful or meaningful way. The plan fails to mention most of the known sustainability and infrastructure problems affecting the Horsley sites, which were fully explained in the public responses to the 2016 consultation. These include public transport, traffic, road safety, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, flooding/surface drainage and shops. The density of new housing on the four Horsley sites is too high, being greater than anywhere in the locality at present. Sites on the edge of existing development in the Horsleys trespass on the open countryside and require big extensions in settlement boundaries. Taken together, the 4 Horsley sites conflict with NPPF para. 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been an outstanding success story in the Horsleys, as detailed in response to the last consultation. Assets include a dense public footpath network, parish parks, sports fields, a campsite of international standard, Britain’s newest rural opera theatre and the popular Olympic cycle route. In order to survive, these assets require a local plan that protects the Green Belt, maintains its openness and beauty and avoids urbanisation and traffic congestion. Sites A35-41 are integral to this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
medical centre, library and Horsley Station, regardless of how much pressure is applied to adopt cycling and walking as the preferred means of travel. I am in complete agreement with my Parish Council in rejecting the proposed grossly disproportionate 35% growth in our village housing stock on unsustainable sites over the first 5 years of the plan.

The housing numbers proposed in the draft Local Plan remain unsound in that they continue to be derived from a flawed Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The independent review of these assessed housing needs to be found in Appendix 1 to the West Horsley Parish Council response of 18 July 2017 to the present consultation suggests that there are significant errors in the OAN West Surrey SHMA, which, if accepted, would significantly lower the numbers of houses required. As before, there is nothing in the Local Plan which indicates that, if any housing is built in either of the Horsleys in accordance with its proposals, it will be of the kind actually required by the villages.

The recent successful appeal for the creation of a SANG in Long Reach in West Horsley (not in the Local Plan as such) was said to be justified by the needs of Guildford and surrounding area. This is laughable for managed space in the form of what amounts to an urban park does not replace actual countryside that has been built over.

I continue to object to the lack of provision for sustainability, be it in housing, transport or in other aspects of the current draft of the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley South
### Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/457</th>
<th>Respondent: 8573793 / Harry Eve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley South</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 continued inclusion of an identified settlement boundary for the area known as Horsleys – East Horsley (south). This area should retain full Green Belt protection and parts of worthy of inclusion in the AONB.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/598</th>
<th>Respondent: 8938881 / Ann Cook</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley South</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>

Further I strongly object to the new proposals for Horsley South – see map with Amendment 2: Horsleys – East Horsley (South). In the 2016 Local Plan this area was placed within ‘the identified boundary of the village’. Under the 2017 amendments the designation of this area seems to have changed to within the ‘identified settlement boundary’. This change has been VERY POORLY explained and indeed the area within the yellow square seems to go through someone’s house! This area touches the AONB and is very close to a SSI. It also includes Chalk Lane – one of the ancient ‘hollow ways’ of Surrey; this is a single track road within deep chalk banks lined with wonderful old beech trees; just the type of area that 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: pslp173/382</th>
<th>Respondent: 10627457 / Graeme Morrison</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley South</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>

3) Proposed change to the settlement boundary. Under amendment 4 shown on the map attached as Appendix H, the settlement boundary is to be extended further south to encompass all of this area. This land is close to, and in some parts adjacent to, Surrey Hills AONB. It is wrong to propose its inclusion in the settlement boundary.

I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE MOVEMENT OF THE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY PROPOSED UNDER AMENDMENT 4 IN APPENDIX H MAP OF EAST HORSLEY SOUTH

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Thank you for your invitation to take part in the consultation on the Proposed Submission Local Plan. I have considered this carefully and find that there are several aspects that are unacceptable and to which I object.

First and foremost I object to the incursions that are proposed into the Green Belt. Changes to the boundaries of the Settlement Area, development of Green Belt sites outside the Settlement Area and insetting of East Horsley, which is essentially a rural village, all remove land from the Green Belt. This can only be accepted if they are necessitated by exceptional circumstances -which have not been demonstrated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

We have lived here in East Horsley for almost 40 years and the village is growing alarmingly. The basic infrastructure cannot cope with a lot more housing which means many more people using the roads, which are narrow, the shops with inadequate parking, the schools which are not big enough and the medical practice which is stretched already. If more housing is needed on a larger scale then plans must be in place to provide the appropriate services of schools, doctors and shops. Our country lanes cannot cope with the added weight of enormous lorries cutting through from the A3, and M25, they are not in good condition now and will only get worse. Cars are forced off the road by the size of lorries using country lanes to avoid motorways. More housing will bring many more contractors vehicles and consequently roads will suffer with deep rutting and pot holes, already a problem. The Horsleys are old villages which do not have the resources to cope with a dramatic rise in population. They are in the green belt and have many farms and fields with animals. These need to be preserved for future generations to enjoy green open space away from the M25.

We add our agreement to the document drawn up by the Horsley Countryside Preservation Society citing the many reasons that large scale building of houses would be detrimental to the area and hope that local residents' views and reasons will be taken into consideration when this local plan is again discussed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I have been a resident of East Horsley for over 30 years. Please do not destroy our environment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I have commented before on the Council's proposal to take the village of East Horsley out of the Green Belt (what you call insetting) and the very ambiguous statement that the Green Belt is being protected in the proposed Plan. That is clearly not happening, and a more plausible and honest statement of Green Belt policy needs to be stated in your Plan if is still your intention to remove the Green Belt status of this village in the face of many objections. Along with this, you are proposing to increase the area to be "inset" beyond the boundaries of the existing settlement area in order to maximise the area available for building on the fringes of the village. However I wish to comment more specifically on what appears to be a new proposal in your targeted consultation. This is to extend the settlement boundary in East Horsley to the south of the A246. While I am pleased to see this area is not threatened by Green Belt removal, the proposal you are making is difficult to comprehend on the maps - the various Appendix H maps for East Horsley South - and is largely unexplained in the text. It seems to have been "bounced in" to the Plan at the very last minute. One of the main components of this potentially increased settlement area is Chalk Lane and its environs. The Lane is a scenic and archeological feature of the village, being an old drove road probably dating from pre-historic times. The proposal to include this sensitive area within the new settlement area boundary will put at risk the unique character of the area. It is very likely to promote unsympathetic mulling and extensions to properties, and new and larger accesses that destroy the chalk banks and degrade the whole character of this part of the village. I therefore strongly object to the movement of the Settlement Area Boundary south of the A246 which is proposed under the various East Horsley South maps in Appendix H which you are proposing as part of Policy P2.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I wish to comment on this local plan in respect of West Horsley.

I wrote to you on 21st September 2014 but regretfully never received any response from you so I am repeating much of what I wrote then.

As I do not know where precisely where Cranmore Lane turns into Little Cranmore Lane I shall just refer to both as Cranmore Lane in the following.

I should be grateful if you would consider an additional alternative development site on land to the east of Overbrook and west of Cranmore Lane. I have spoken to the owner of adjacent Barcombe Farm who would be happy to include his fields between Barcombe Farmhouse and Cranmore Lane within a development area. These areas are shown on the attached plan being land parcels Nos 154 and 136 totalling some 6.769 acres. These should have been identified for possible development in your original study.

This site has the benefit of being in the centre of the village (ie West Horsley South) and would round off the village settlement boundary by the recognisable and defensible boundary of Cranmore Lane.
The land involved is very poor quality agricultural land and not being part of a larger holding is uneconomic to farm, and is completely surrounded by other residential housing.

Whilst your study states that this parcel of land has limited access at present a new access to this site would have to be negotiated but there are several possibilities including the demolition of one or two existing houses to make way for such access. An access up the driveway to Barcombe Farm from The Street is also perfectly possible.

This site would NOT be a visual intrusion on the village as it is tucked away behind the Overbrook estate and Fulkes Cottages and bounded by woodland to the East and the South, and cannot be seen from higher ground or other roads.

I am confident that the selection of this site would find more favour within the village than those proposed given that some more development in the village is said to be necessary. Furthermore it could be at a density more appropriate to the village situation rather than the extremely high densities proposed.

Regarding the remainder of the plan I would like to see in it proposals to deal with future medical facilities which are at present overstretched. Increased parking at Horsley Rail Station which is at present full on most weekdays, increased capacity of local schools in order to deal with the proposed increase in population.

I view the plan as being produced at a very high level with less than sufficient consideration to the actualities that exist in a lot of the various locations in the Borough.

I hope I will receive a response from you this time and would be happy to enter into further discussions regarding the inclusion of this suggested site into the final Borough Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: Pages from Scan 161990002.pdf (577 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2930  
Respondent: 15581889 / Evelyn Piallj  
Agent:  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Re. Guildford Local Plan, as a resident of East Horsley, I wish to comment as follows:

1. The "exceptional circumstances" required to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt which are integral to the fulfilment of this plan do not exist as stated in the plan.

2. The proposal to extend the boundaries of the Settlement areas of the Horsleys appears to be aimed at opening the way for even greater development in the future than that currently proposed.

3. Our local infrastructure is already overloaded. Schools, medical facilities, station car parks and local roads are overstretched, over full, or becoming congested. With regard to local roads, some, like Ockham Road and East Lane, are used more and more as "rat runs" by people who do not live locally. The proposed increase in households by over 2000 in this small area will make for enormous difficulties with regard to all of the above. For example, the very real minimum of 4000 extra vehicles using our local roads is the stuff of nightmares.

1. The proposal to designate Station Parade as a "District Centre" makes it obvious that the long term aim is to completely destroy the villages as such and to create a new urban environment. The wonderful community spirit of the Horsleys as exemplified by organisations such as the West Horsley Wheel of Care, a recent recipient of the Queens Award for Voluntary Service, East Horsley Care, The Good Companions and many others, will be lost amid a rush to build more and more large family homes for London commuters or to be sold to overseas
investors who will never live here. The Horsleys and neighbouring Ockham will become, in effect, an extension of Greater London, very close to Guildford! is that what Guildford Borough Council wants?

5. The housing numbers proposed are preposterously high, calculated to produce a 35% increase in households in West Horsley alone.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/293  Respondent: 17308385 / Anne Nicholls  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley South

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 - Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh I object to Policy A58 - Land at Burnt Common, London Road I object to Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15

My objections to these proposals are based on the ignorance of a local council to ignore hundreds of previous objections made by local people who already live, work and contribute to the community.

The traffic congestion is getting worse and the impact of the above developments on the local main roads and country lanes will lead to grid lock through Send and Ripley; disruption to the A3 and other local A roads.

The inclusion of a requirement for ‘travelling show people plots’ in this location; this sounds like an opportunity to recognise and publicise diversity rather than a proven requirement. Where are these people now and why do they need a new/other site?

Previously the Burnt Common site was deleted from the 2014 plan because of all the objections made - the populace was listened to so why has this been reintroduced as a new allocation - did the council think we would not notice; had changed our minds or don’t care?

Why are new industrial and warehouse developments in the middle of the green belt being proposed when Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units - sounds like poor planning and project management?

Thank you for affording me this opportunity to object and I hope you take the concerns raised seriously.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Total records: 10.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3861  **Respondent:** 8574881 / Melanie McLaren  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**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

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/441  **Respondent:** 8591169 / Michael Bruton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

a1 I object to the proposed housing sites in East Horsley as follows:

1. Ockham Road North – A39
2. Thatchers Hotel – A36 – already rejected following a planning application by GBC earlier in 2016

b1 I object to the insetting of West and East Horsley

c1 I object to the insetting of Ripley, West Clandon and Send

d1 I object to the creation of new Metropolitan Green Belt at Ash and Tongham – the farthest point within the Borough from London

e1 I object to the failure of the Council to consider ‘brownfield first’ as a policy. There are large swathes of brownfield/previously developed land within Guildford Town

which should be considered for housing rather than office/warehouse development. Such land is very sustainable for housing in terms of local transport. Given modern

house building technology any flood risk can be managed successfully. I object too, to the lack of affordable housing included in the Plan.

f1 I object to the Borough’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan which lacks detail, is reliant on central government funding which is not confirmed and is merely an expensive wish

list

g1 I object to the Green Belt and Countryside Study. It is lengthy and inconsistent. for example regarding site allocation and the 5km zone for the Thames Basin Heath SPA

I support objections to the Local Plan made by West Horsley, East Horsley, Send and Ripley Parish Councils and by the Wisley Action Group. I support objections made by
West Horsley resident, Mr David Roberts

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/493  Respondent: 8592001 / Mr Michael Trower  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to formally object to the Guildford Draft Local Plan 2017 as far as it affects West Horsley.

While the reduction in the number of new homes is an improvement it does not go far enough in reducing the very large number of proposed houses proposed on Green Belt land. No development should be permitted in Green Belt land.

The plans make it a disproportionate number of homes which are intended to be placed in the eastern side of the borough and in Green Belt land.

Guildford BC is not choosing to constrain its overall housing growth, which is out of line with what other councils are proposing, and the proposed growth is nearly 25%, which is far in excess of what the Office for National Statistics are predicting for the growth of Guildford.

There has been nothing new put forward since last years consultation to improve the sustainability of the West Horsley development sites and to thus meet national policy requirements. The intended development will place an inordinate strain on the local road network which is already very badly maintained for the current traffic, let alone any proposed increase.

GBC are still using flawed evidence to justify the overexpansion of West Horsley, and all the neighbouring areas.

There is a requirement in Guildford for more apartment style properties, not retail shopping space.

I object to the fact that no changes are being proposed since the 2016 consultation to the insetting of West and East Horsley from the Green Belt.

I also support the arguments put forward by the Wisley Action Group against the development of the proposed new town on the old Wisley airfield sties, for all the reason that they have put forward.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/508  Respondent: 8606625 / Mr Tim Bennett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am very disappointed that most of the views of myself and a very large number of others from the Horsley and other rural areas surrounding Guildford made during the consultation period following the ‘2014 Draft Plan’ and updated June 2016 Local Plan still have not been addressed. My overlying concern is that the Green Belt area of the villages
surrounding the urban areas of the Guildford borough is one of its greatest assets and the current plan will destroy the nature of these villages.

In addition to the comments I laid out in my letter of 5th July 2016 I strongly object to the changes in the current plan for the following main reasons:–

**Scale of development** – This revision the plan now includes an increase of over **295 new dwellings** for West Horsley which currently has just over **1,100 dwellings**. This represents an **increase of 27%** which is totally disproportionate to the size of the village, and at a density that is significantly above the village at present. This would result in a significant detrimental change in the nature and character of the village. This increase is vastly above the increases in most other areas of the borough. The increase in the urban area of the borough is only planned to around **11%**. The consequent pressures on the village infrastructure would be completely unmanageable. The increases in housing proposed in the plan would dramatically increase pressure on schools, medical facilities, roads, railways, drainage, parking etc. In particular the state primary school is already at capacity, with no room for expansion, and the station car park is virtually full during weekdays. Car parking around the shopping areas is already very restricted, and often full, with little scope for expansion.

There is no evidence in the plan that any required changes to the infrastructure would be in place before any increase in housing/development. This must be addressed in detail.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/515  **Respondent:** 8643393 / Sue Baker  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

In this latest version of the Plan, Guildford Borough Council has totally ignored the views of tens of thousands of their constituents (including my own) who wrote with objections last year in the hope that they might have some influence over the process.

Specifically, it is with regret and anger that I note that no changes are being proposed since the 2016 consultation in terms of removing (in planning double speak I believe this is called “insetting”) parts of West and East Horsley from the Green Belt. This means that several sites that are currently protected by their Green Belt status will be available for housing developments and these are in addition to those sites already earmarked in the Plan as suitable for development.

I further believe that the proposed housing target is flawed and the process has not been transparent with the Council refusing to publish details of evidence, data and assumptions used in reaching the target figure.

This flawed “evidence” is being used to justify over-expansion, particularly in the Horsleys, where local services and infrastructure are insufficient for the proposed numbers of new homes. The Plan has failed to include measures to improve the sustainability of development these sites.

Deletion of the constraints on housing density in Policy H1 is a retrograde step and will give developers a free hand to use land inefficiently (but at maximum profit for them) and the policy relating to AONBs serves only to weaken the current protection against inappropriate development.

The Council in my view has failed to prioritise the use of brownfield sites in urban settings for housing and is instead intent on compromising the Green Belt against the wishes of a large majority of borough residents.
Instead, these brownfield sites, especially in Guildford, are being allocated for retail and commercial development. I don’t believe we need more shops; we need more affordable housing in suitable locations, with good transport links and local services.

The Council’s website encourages residents to “help shape the borough’s future” by commenting on the Local Plan. However, the latest version of the Plan shows very little if any evidence that the Council is listening to the views of local people.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I would like to object to some of the plans for East Horsley on the following grounds.

1. Including The Warren and Park Horsley inside the village boundary. If Infilling was allowed, it would mean increased traffic onto the A246 from building lorries and new residents, onto what is an extremely dangerous part of the road, and where accidents occur with monotonous regularity. The Highways dept has, in the past, recommended refusal to new properties on those grounds. They are also in the Green Belt.
2. Developing Thatchers site. Thatchers is also on a very dangerous bend. Plus, we need an hotel in the village. Plus it gives employment.
3. Other sites planned for development are on flood ares, and would mean increased flooding on the roundabout onto the A3, which also occurs regularly.
4. Infrastructure in already under great strain, and the council recently stated that development would not happen unless infrastructure could cope. Already the Station car park is full, with people missing trains due to nowhere to park. The car park behind the shops is also frequently full, ditto the Village Hall and Doctor's. The schools are full and so are the doctors.
5. 3 of your proposed sights, Thatchers, Carlians and Bell and Colville, are local employers. Your stated desire to increase local employment, 4.4.1 shows that you should be encouraging local economy, not removing it for the sake of a few houses.
6. Removal of areas from the Green Belt. The Prime Minister, no less, promised that no housing would be built on Green Belt. It should be sacrosanct, previous generations fought hard for us to have it.
7. Guildford has enough brownfield sites for building, and already builds more houses than suggested by government. We really cannot cope with much more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I have the following objections to the proposed local plan:-

1. Including The Warren and Park Horsley inside the village boundary. If Infilling was allowed, it would mean increased traffic onto the A246 from building lorries and new residents, onto what is an extremely dangerous part of the road, and where accidents occur with monotonous regularity. The Highways dept has, in the past, recommended refusal to new properties on those grounds. They are also in the Green Belt.
2. Developing Thatchers site. Thatchers is also on a very dangerous bend. Plus, we need an hotel in the village. Plus it gives employment.
3. Other sites planned for development are on flood ares, and would mean increased flooding on the roundabout onto the A3, which also occurs regularly.
4. Infrastructure in already under great strain, and the council recently stated that development would not happen unless infrastructure could cope. Already the Station car park is full, with people missing trains due to nowhere to park. The car park behind the shops is also frequently full, ditto the Village Hall and Doctor's. The schools are full and so are the doctors.
5. 3 of your proposed sights, Thatchers, Carlians and Bell and Colville, are local employers. Your stated desire to increase local employment, 4.4.1 shows that you should be encouraging local economy, not removing it for the sake of a few houses.
6. Removal of areas from the Green Belt. The Prime Minister, no less, promised that no housing would be built on Green Belt. It should be sacrosanct, previous generations fought hard for us to have it.
7. Guildford has enough brownfield sites for building, and already builds more houses than suggested by government. We really cannot cope with much more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the proposal to remove East Horsley from the Green Belt.
2. I object to the proposed changes to the settlement boundaries in East Horsley.
3. I object to the proposed development of some 100 homes near Horsley station.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/348</th>
<th>Respondent: 8742689 / Keith Michel</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</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>

As a consequence of the above we consider that the Site allocations proposed for East Horsley, including Policy A36 and A39, are inappropriate. We also adopt and endorse the submission made by the East Horsley Parish Council in their letter dated 13th June.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/271</th>
<th>Respondent: 8772097 / Duncan Wilkinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</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 am writing to make clear my objections to the six main development sites in East and West Horsley.

To build this many new buildings in our area will completely ruin our village atmosphere and put unacceptable pressure on the roads and amenities.

In my mind Green Belt means the land is protected against unwanted building and this is why we chose to live in this lovely area, and paid a premium to do so.

NO to 533 new homes in the Horsleys !

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/256</th>
<th>Respondent: 8772289 / Sheila Mellstrom</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</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>
Despite there having been 30,000 objections to the plans to build new homes on 6 sites in the Horsleys, the amended plans have only removed 2 of those proposed sites!!

Anyone who drives out on the local roads at rush hour will agree that there are already far too many cars for the size, width and capacity of our village roads. We simply cannot cope with any additional traffic.

Our local schools, trains and station car park, surgery and infrastructure cannot cope with the additional amount of people such a scheme will produce

Whilst acceptive there are bound to be some limited amount of new houses, such as “fill-ins” and on brownfield sites, we nevertheless reject the demands to make us into a “New Town” instead of a village and above all to remove any of the Green Belt.

It seems iniquitous that after receiving 30,000 protests against these proposals, our Guildford Borough Council, does not support us, and can go on bombarding us with amendments. Do we have no right to a rural village life, protected by the Green Belt which we chose when we came to live in the Horsleys?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2027  **Respondent:** 8798465 / Linda Ross  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I have recently looked at the new Local Plan put forward by Guildford Borough Council and wish to object to the proposals on the following grounds:

Whilst accepting that new houses will have to be built in both East and West Horsley, I feel that the total number proposed is simply too many as we do not have the infrastructure to deal with the increased population development on this scale would bring.

Many of the roads, for example the one in which live, are in dreadful condition and we understand the County has insufficient resources to carry out all the necessary repairs.

Flooding is common in many parts of the two Parishes making road travel difficult when heavy or prolonged rain occurs.

Our local schools and medical facilities are already under pressure and would not be able to cope with additional large numbers.

Car parking for shops, village halls, Doctors' Surgery and railway station is very limited indeed and there is no available space in which to extend these facilities.

In addition, I am totally opposed to these two Parishes being taken out of the Green Belt. The villages will cease to be individual entities and simply become part of the apparent plan to concrete over every available green space.

Proposed development that is strictly "in-fill" might be acceptable in smaller numbers but some of the proposals will totally alter the look and nature of the villages and cannot be acceptable to residents. I feel that proposals to alter the village boundaries in order to give more scope for "in-filling" are also unacceptable.
I realise that planning practice seems to put forward plans that do not include additional schools, shops, medical facilities, etc. as these would be included at a later date. Presumably these would require yet more green spaces being built on, and to ask people to accept plans that do not show these additional works suggests the council is being less than open with residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1056  Respondent: 8804897 / Alan Goodfellow  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the land to the north of Fangate Manor being taken out of the Green Belt and taking it into the settlement boundary. There are no exceptional circumstances for doing this and there would be a loss of agricultural land currently supporting deer, badgers, foxes, pheasants and a multitude of other birds and animals. In the LAA relating to this site, the plan shows access to Manor Close. I would point out that Manor Close is a private road and access would not be allowed from any development of this site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/26  Respondent: 8825409 / Alan Gilbertson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I fully support the response of the East Horsley Parish Council.

In addition, I OBJECT to the expansion of the East Horsley Settlement Boundary because the changes are being made in an undemocratic manner because no relevant information has been provided, as far as I can see.

*No information has been provided* as to how the parcels of land now proposed for inclusion were selected.

In terms of possible planning reasons the implications for local roads, flooding and utilities should have been considered; *no information has been provided*.

In terms of public probity and mindful of the financial gains handed to the owners of the parcels of land involved, I believe that we should be told who owns them and what political and personal connections the owners and their agents have; *no information has been provided*.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I would like to object to many issues within the Draft Guildford Local Plan.

We would like to object in the strongest of terms to the suggestion that The Horsleys should be removed from the Green Belt. Removing this protection will lead to much development and leave us open to any plans from landowners on additional sites.

We are dismayed to learn that we could lose our designation of Green Belt and yet a patch, further away from London, in Ash South and Tongham will form a new area of Green Belt. It makes no sense because our Green Belt is the Metropolitan Green Belt and it would therefore make more sense to retain this area for the good of the Londoners. The original purpose of the Green Belt was to prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas and to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. Dividing the Green Belt up for development will destroy the original purpose.

The Plan, which designates Station Parade, East Horsley, as a rural district centre, will lead to developments totally out of character with the area. We believe this designation was allowed because Budgens was assumed to be a “large supermarket”. Budgens is a small convenience store under the terms of the Sunday Trading Act 1994. It has under 280 sq.metres of floor space and therefore is able to trade all day on Sundays, unlike a “large supermarket”.

According to the Plan, we are bewildered to learn that “jobs in retail are focussed in Guildford Town Centre ……… and particularly East Horsley”. Why should this be since it is a very small shopping parade.

The proposed increase in housing stock for East Horsley, West Horsley and Wisley Airfield totals 2704 new homes. This increases homes in Ockham and the Horsleys by more than 77%. Absolutely absurd. Our villages will be completely swamped by cars, commuters, patients, parking, children looking for school places, etc.

The current infrastructure cannot sustain such a development. Stations, roads and schools, not to mention doctors’ surgeries, etc. will be overwhelmed.

Since it would appear that the projected population statistics, which were used to draw up the Plan, were out of date, it would seem prudent for the Council to re-visit the numbers before agreeing to any major building plan based upon the wrong figures.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
This still proposes to inset East Horsley from the Greenbelt. Development of 100 homes is proposed near Horsley station and over 2000 on the Wisley Airfield. The village of East Horsley (& surrounding villages such as West Horsley, Effingham & Ripley) do not have the infrastructure in terms of transport (roads, parking or rail), schools or medical facilities to meet this increased demand.

57% of new housing proposed is on land that is currently categorised as Greenbelt and this is, quite frankly, shameful as this land was supposed to be protected for future generations.

Since Brexit, forecasts of increasing population numbers have been reduced. The ONS forecast is now only forecasting 10.4% for Guildford, which still intends to increase its housing stock by 22%. This doesn't seem to make sense?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1766  **Respondent:** 8836449 / Y J Hancox  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is **Sound?** ( ), is **Legally Compliant?** ( )

My main objection to the new plans that Guildford Borough Council are building 533 new houses in the Horsley area are green belt and infrastructure. If you continue to build on green belt we shall lose the surrey hills beauty area as our village encroaches onto it. The roads are already over crowded and schools and health centre very full. More pollution more people, we will not be a village any more. Any more houses will have to be built in an imaginative design to fit in with the village. I cannot see this will happen.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2429  **Respondent:** 8839137 / Eamonn Duffy  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is **Sound?** ( ), is **Legally Compliant?** ( )

- removal of Green Belt
- the lack of analysis on extension of boundaries of the settlement area of the Horsley's
- the existing infrastructure is already overloaded
- the classification of station parade as a District Centre
- the impacts of proposed developments at Wisley Airfield and Gosden Hill Farm
- no published analysis to support the Strategic Housing Market Assessment

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Comment ID: PSLPA16/1759  Respondent: 8845953 / Frederick and Elizabeth Onslow  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) 

I fully endorse all of the comments made by the East Horsley Parish Council in their letter to you dated 13th of June 2016.

I would further add that the Green Belt, which was created some 70 years ago, has performed a vital function acting as a lung for London. This should be added to not diminish.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/680  Respondent: 8850881 / N Reardon Smith  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) 

Having read through Guildford Borough Council’s (“GBC”) Proposed Submission Local Plan:

strategy and sites (2017) (“Local Plan”), I continue to be appalled at what is being suggested and how it is being managed and wish to OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Local Plan. I am incredibly disappointed that the 2017 version of the Local Plan appears to be an almost unchanged version from the 2016 Local Plan and it would seem that the majority of the 32,000 objections registered last year have largely been ignored.

My main objections are as follows:

1. Green Belt:

the Local Plan suggests that both West and East Horsley are inset – or removed – from the Green Belt. The Green Belt was set up very specifically (i) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas, (ii) to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another, (iii) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, (iv) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and (v) to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these reasons (set out in paragraph 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF’)) are as relevant today as they were when initially put together. By removing villages from the Green Belt, these safeguards will be threatened and the urban sprawl, merging of towns etc will start to happen. Once gone, Green Belt land, which is so very precious, will be lost forever and cannot be replaced.

Paragraphs 83 to 87

of the NPPF explicitly states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. GBC has yet to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist which might mean that the Green Belt boundaries could be changed. To say that the supposed housing need is an exceptional circumstance continues to be wrong. Unless GBC puts forward an acceptable case that exceptional circumstances really do exist, then Green Belt boundaries should not be changed.

2. Infrastructure:
The existing infrastructure is already overloaded and struggling to cope with the current number of residents and the planned development on Green Belt land is unsustainable. Specifically: the roads are generally already in a poor state of repair and struggle to cope with the existing levels of daily traffic. There is absolutely no scope for widening any of the roads due to existing housing or building additional roads, meaning that the already poor current situation will only be exacerbated. Also of significance is (i) drainage; (ii) lack of public transport; (iii) a lack of parking spaces at Horsley and Effingham railway stations; (iv) overloaded medical facilities; and (v) already over-subscribed local schools.

3. Employment:

There are few local jobs available so where are all the inhabitants of these new homes going to work? It would seem that most will need to travel by car to and from work, thus creating further congestion, noise and pollution.

4. Brownfield

sites: There is brownfield land available in Guildford Town Centre which is being targeted for commercial development rather than for housing. This is wrong and urban brownfield and/or derelict land must be used for housing. Brownfield sites MUST be developed ahead of Green Belt sites. The general global trend is away from town-centre shopping yet GBC does not appear to be taking this into account.

In principle, I am not against development and new housing, including “affordable” housing, and I understand that there is a major country-wide problem with this. However, development must take place in a sustained and balanced way and it would seem that GBC is taking the easy option of identifying Green Belt areas for development rather than, for example, properly using existing brownfield sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3234  Respondent: 8850945 / Richard Bayes  Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. b) Paragraph 4.3.16 and Proposals Map: Settlement Boundary changes in East Horsley

I concur with East Horsley Parish Council on this issue.

I therefore object to this proposed boundary change.

1. ii) There is also a proposal to move the East Horsley settlement boundary westwards from behind the houses on the west side of Kingston Avenue up to a tree line running along the Parish Boundary at the western edge of Kingston Meadows. The result is to take all of Kingston Meadows out of the Green Belt.

Under NPPF rules Green Belt boundaries should only be changed in ‘exceptional circumstances’. I do not believe that this can be considered as an exceptional circumstance. As such I do not believe this is a valid proposal.

I therefore object to this proposed boundary change.
The NPPF is clear that every movement in settlement boundaries must be justified by ‘exceptional circumstances’. GBC have offered only a generic justification in their Topic Paper of meeting unfulfilled housing need, but a case by case justification has not been provided. As such, I believe the settlement boundaries are invalid without such detailed justification.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/373  Respondent: 8852289 / John F. Wood  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object strongly to the amended borough plan and fully endorse the comments made by the East Horsley Parish Council, with particular regard to taking land out of the Green Belt. This is not in the remit of the borough Council.

The total number of houses to be built has been slightly lowered from the original plan but by nothing like enough. The density of the proposed house building in East and West Horsley and other villages is totally unrealistic and unacceptable.

I also object to the inclusion of the Three Farms Meadows proposal being included in the plan, for all the reasons I gave in my last letter. The changes that the developers have since proposed do not alter the case against the development in any way.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/348  Respondent: 8855425 / Mary Teague  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I remain concerned to note that apart from the removal of Thatcher's Hotel as a development site, no real effort has been made to take into account the objections of Residents of the Horsleys to the removal of the Horsleys from the Green Belt nor to the encouragement of in-filling in the area south of the A246 by specifying deliberately vague and ambiguous criteria that are not capable of defending the current low density, and green belt status, of this area. As before no attempt has been made genuinely to provide evidence exceptional circumstances apply to justify the serious encroachment into the Green Belt.

I object in particular to the failure of the revised plan materially to reduce the overall number of houses proposed for the borough in general, and the Horsleys in particular. The 2017 addendum is opaque, and as I understand it has been challenged by other experts, including the NMSS. The unexplained discrepancy of some 2600 housing units between the figure stated in revised policy S2 and the supporting table is clear evidence that the plan is unsound.

I object to the continuing failure of the 2017 Plan adequately to specify an appropriate brownfield first development policy. The space allocated to retail in Guildford town centre would more appropriately be allocated to housing. The
recent development of Waitrose in the town centre is a good example of a lost opportunity to combine retail with new residential, as opposed to allowing simply a 1 ha+ ground level open car park.

I object to the inclusion of policy A35, which has increased the Three Farms Meadow development site. Local road and rail infrastructure is already overburdened, and proposed mitigations to address increased traffic such as new bus services take no account of the adverse effect on safety and amenity of residents of the the Horsleys, given the narrowness of the local roads, and the fact cycling and walking are being encouraged at the same time on the same network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1084  **Respondent:** 8856097 / Pelham Reilly  **Agent:** Kiely Planning Limited (Colin Kiely)

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Submission Local Plan Strategy and Sites June 2016**

We are instructed by Mr Pelham Reilly to submit the enclosed response to the Proposed Submission Local Plan. This representation relates specifically to the proposed settlement boundary to East Horsley with particular reference to the boundary in the vicinity of Norrels Drive (see plan extract below). For the reasons set out below we strongly believe that the land outlined on the enclosed plan (**Document 1**) and shown below in the context of the settlement) should be included within the defined boundary and thus removed from the Green Belt.

![Image 1](image1.png)

The land amounts to approximately 0.3 hectares and could accommodate a small residential development thus contributing, albeit in a small way, to meeting the Borough’s and in particular East Horsley’s housing needs.

The land is contiguous with the settlement and forms a gap in an otherwise continuous frontage along the eastern side of Norrels Drive. Indeed when considering a planning application for the erection of a single detached house on the land (14/P/01816) officer’s commented:

“It is noted that the application is between two existing residential dwellings (albeit at some distance away) and could be argued as an ‘infill’. However, the application site is not within the identified settlement boundary of East Horsley, where small infill developments may be appropriate and as such, this does not overcome the in principle objection as set out above”

(3rd Paragraph, Page 3, officers report **Document 2**)

The principle reason for refusing the application (on Green Belt Grounds) was on the basis of the site falling outside of the ‘defined’ settlement boundary. No actual harm to the Green Belt was cited by the Council in the context of the 5 main purposes of including land within the Green Belt. A copy of the proposed plans, officers report and decision notice are attached at **Document 2**. It will be noted that the decision pre-dated the findings of the Court of Appeal which concluded whether a site lies within a settlement boundary is not determinative in the context of Paragraph 89 of the NPPF regarding ‘infilling within villages”. Notwithstanding this it is proper to assess whether or not the site needs to be included within the Green Belt in the context of Government Advice.

Advice regarding the definition of Green Belt boundaries is set out at Paragraph 85 of the NPPF that states:

*When defining boundaries, local planning authorities should:*
• ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development;
• not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open;
• where necessary, identify in their plans areas of ‘safeguarded land’ between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period;
• make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development;
• satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period; and
• define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.

In relation to the above, the Local Planning Authority has confirmed that the settlement of East Horsley is sustainable and can accommodate additional housing in a manner consistent with the NPPF. In addition we see no reason why the land, the subject of this representation, is necessary to keep permanently open (for the reasons set out below). Finally, the proposed alteration of the Green Belt boundary sought would retain a clear, defensible boundary being a continuation of the boundary along the rear gardens of adjacent residential development along this side of the Road. This can be seen from the plan on Page 1 of this correspondence.

Indeed it is somewhat curious that the land has been excluded from the boundary given that a larger and more open parcel of land at the southern end of the road has been included within the settlement area (see plan above). In a similar manner (and as accepted by the Council through the inclusion of the larger parcel of land referenced above), the purposes of the Green Belt would not be undermined as its inclusion:

• Would not lead to the eastward sprawl of East Horsley
• Would maintain the separation of East Horsley and Effingham
• Would not conflict with the need to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. In this regard the remaining part of Norrels Meadow would continue to form part of the Green Belt where future development (in a manner that conflicts with the purposes of the Green Belt) would be prevented.
• Would not harm the setting of East Horsley.

Finally, whilst we note there is a Group TPO protecting trees on the site, this would not be affected through the inclusion of the site within the settlement boundary. The Council have policies in place to ensure that any future development is satisfactory in relation other matters of planning importance including impact on Trees. These considerations would need to be considered in relation to any future planning application.

We trust you will take the above comments into consideration and should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact us.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  Pages from Norrels Meadow GBLP Reps 2016.pdf (5.2 MB)
IMAGE_1.png (223 KB)

Comment ID: psp173/258  Respondent: 8864577 / NM Howe  Agent:  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have lived in Horsley for 22 years and I write to strongly object to the revisions to the new local plan and in particular to the extension of the settlement boundaries of the Horsleys into the Green Belt and the removal of the extended villages of last and West Horsley from the Green Belt.
The changes and my continued concerns of the amended 2017 plan are that four of the original housing developments sites remain. This is completely unacceptable to everyone that lives in East and West Horsley, we treasure our village environment and it is completely inacceptable to seek to increase our village, by nearly 400 proposed residential units against all supply of circa 1,000 residential units. Flawed evidence is exaggerating the need for expansion as shown clearly by the GRA report on housing.

I have not met anyone in these villages who are in agreement with amending the Green Belt and it is simply unacceptable that this is even being considered. Exceptional circumstances must be demonstrated in order to develop in the Green Belt and by definition this is not an exception. It will have a devastating effect on homes and our lives. Any consultations on these plans and the objection of local people should not be ignored.

You will be quite aware that the Horsley villages do not have the infrastructure or facilities for its population to be doubled. The one school is oversubscribed and it is already impossible to get an appointment at the medical centre. The identification of the various sites has been undertaken in an incredibly unprofessional way with little thought to access/egress, topography or risk of flooding. It is irresponsible to squander these Green Belt sites in a single plan, robbing future generations. It is also unacceptable that unlike other places, Guildford is choosing not to constrain its overall housing growth. I also object to the proposal for approximately 2000 houses plus sheltered/care homes, Gypsy/Traveller pitches, employment/retail spaces and two schools on the former Wisley Airfield and fields, which is clearly at odds with the revised policy ID3. It is impossible to offer a sustainable transport policy for a site which is located in the middle of nowhere with no amenities, narrow country roads and no public transport facilities.

I therefore strongly object to your proposals. I would also stress the following:-
• Brownfield opportunities in Guildford Borough are being ignored;
• Exceptional circumstances are required for any changes to Green Belt boundaries;
• Unmet housing need is not such a circumstance;
• Green Belt and AONB are reasons for not meeting objectively assessed housing need;
• The plan is not ready for an inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2142   Respondent: 8875841 / J James   Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write again following my letters to the Guildford Borough Council in November 2013 and September 2014.

I do not see any radical new proposals in your latest planning submission, so my objections raised previously still stand. I will summarise below.

Objection 1:ONS figures (May 2014) do not support GBC’s estimate in the Draft Plan. So the basis for this major building plan are flawed.

Objection 2: Green Belt policy is to protect land around larger urban centers from urban sprawl, and maintain the designated area for forestry and agriculture as well as to provide habitat to wildlife. I strongly object to the proposed removal of Green Belt status (in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) from the Horsleys and the other 14 local villages.

Objection 3: We already suffer major development (largely infill) which attracts large lorries during the building stages, and then the increased traffic (on inadequate roads with dangerous pavements) from 2 houses where previously one small bungalow used to stand. So even more traffic generated by the new housing proposals will not be ideal on the B2039
through the Horsleys. It is bad enough when the M25 blocks and traffic totally unsuited (too heavy, too fast) decides to re-route through our village.

Objection 4: I continue to object to the piecemeal jigsaw of 'land opportunities' contained within your document; I am not convinced, despite the document's length, that the infrastructure implications have been fully considered. In my area, schools (already full), medical facilities (no short-term appointments), roads (narrow and pot-holed with collapsing drains and increasing amounts of other traffic, and of course numerous bicycles), drainage (rainwater ditches unknowingly filled in on new developments), and train services (already full at peak times) all struggle with the current capacity today; so a proposed housing increase of over 70% in the Horsleys? Have any surveys been undertaken by GBC?

I appreciate there may well be a need for extra housing in the Southeast - but why ruin the rural areas? Have all possibilities in the more urban areas been looked at?

So yet again we suffer a further attack on the rural villages of England, with the usual consequences: reduced quality of life, loss of many leisure opportunities - or too sites destroyed along with our national heritage, and increased vehicle numbers bringing increased pollution.

Clearly a lot of work has gone into this Plan, for which I am paying. I find myself in total disagreement with it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/461  Respondent: 8886913 / Rosamund Bovill  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. East Horsley (and other villages) are developing a local Neighbourhood Plan which should be respected. They have constructive ideas about the future of the village based on residents’ views. It is a balanced report and I urge councillors and planners to respect it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3329  Respondent: 8887265 / Harvey Weller  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also OBJECT to the proposal to remove Wisley Airfield from the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/274  Respondent: 8888065 / Karen Stapleton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

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 writing to OBJECT to the 2016 draft version of the Local Plan produced by Guildford Borough Council.

The process of compiling the local plan has caused outrage amongst the electorate. 20,000 letters were submitted in during the Sites and Strategies Options Consultation. 95% objected to using Greenbelt land. These views have been ignored and appear to go against the councillors own election promises.

The A3 / M25 is at capacity at peak times and the Highways England Agency are not planning to improve the A3 before 2020. The planned developments will only increase congestion in and around the surrounding villages. It is proposed that 65000 houses (40%of the housing proposed) is built between the M25 & Burpham and I shall concentrate on that area during this letter.

I would like to OBJECT to West Horsley and East Horsley being removed from the greenbelt in the way that the council proposes in order to allow development on the sites proposed. As things stand currently at the Medical Centre in East Horsley it is already difficult to make an appointment. The one local state primary school shared by East and West Horsley is oversubscribed and there is no state secondary school in the villages. The car parking spaces in East Horsley around the shops, healthcentre and at the station can prove challenging at the best of times. West Horsley itself currently has one food convenience store, two Public Houses and a newsagent. There has been no Post Office since August 2013 so I fail to see how you can classify it as a medium sized village. I feel that local social, shopping, educational, healthcare and policing services will be overwhelmed by the proposed plans for development. There is no infrastructure plan whatsoever in the local plan in order to accommodate the increase in housing which I find scandalous.

I OBJECT to the draft local plan as it will destroy the ruralness of the area. In the villages of West & East Horsley the density of houses to be built on the proposed sites is totally out of keeping with the existing houses in the villages. This will mean that the proposed sites will have an urban estate density which is out of character with the low density rural character elsewhere in the villages. In West Horsley alone it has 41 listed buildings in it which gives the village appeal. Our heritage needs to be considered. This proposed plan would have a huge effect both visually and environmentally on the ruralness of this area. Tourism brings advantages to the area such as boosting the local economy. One of the reasons that tourists visit is because the countryside is rural and attractive and appreciated by walkers as well as cyclists. If the roads were developed to accommodate the proposed increase in development I believe tourism would lessen and the risk of injury to cyclists and pedestrians would increase.

I OBJECT to the draft plan due to the dangers that it may lead to. The pavements in parts of East and West Horsley i.e on The Street leading up to the two local stores, and on Ockham Road South are very narrow and unsuitable for wheelchairs and prams etc. The main routes through the villages are narrow with poor road surfaces and the increase in traffic that development would bring would bring inherent dangers to car users and pedestrians alike.

I OBJECT to the draft local plan as I feel there are unsuitable public transport facilities to meet the increase in population. It is naive to think that most people would walk or cycle to work or to the train station in East Horsley from the village and neighbouring West Horsley due to the distances needed to travel and the safety issues to take into consideration. Again this would put huge demands on the road network, increase the carbon footprint and decrease the air quality. Existing public transport in the villages is very limited which makes it difficult to get around without a car.

I OBJECT to the draft local plan as I feel that the roads in East & West Horsley tend to flood annually making the roads impassable often even in a 4x4. Development would only increase this risk as surface water would not be able to drain away so readily.

The Horsleys appear to have a larger number of Potential Development Areas than most other villages within the borough which appears unfair. In addition to the planned development sites in the Horsley’s there are plans for 2000 houses at Gosden Hill on the A3, 400 houses at Garlicks Arch, a site of ancient woodland, and a new town at the old site of Wisley Airfield. All these sites are on green belt and will mean that there is urban sprawl along the A3 corridor and appears to be an unbalanced allocation of development in one area of the borough. West and East Horsley will grow by over 40% by 2031 according to the draft Local Plan. Most of this will occur in the first 5 years of the Guildford Plan period. This is much much greater than other areas of the borough and will totally destroy the villages as we know them.
I OBJECT to the Horsley’s defined settlement boundaries being changed and the villages being “inset” therefore allowing development on current greenbelt land and conservation areas. There are no exceptional circumstances apparent to build on the green belt. Housing need alone should not constitute as exceptional circumstances.

I OBJECT to the local draft plan as it stands. There is unsubstantiated evidence as to how the housing figures have been ascertained. Indeed the councillors have rejected several proposals such as the new development planned at Wisley Airfield and yet they remain in this 2016 draft local plan.

I OBJECT to greenbelt land being destroyed for housing needs. 70% of the proposed development across the borough is on existing greenbelt or countryside. I believe that the council needs to consult the residents in order to produce a document which recommends a more suitable level of development which will protect our villages and surrounding countryside for generations to come. Once the greenbelt is lost it is gone forever. The NPPF 79 said that greenbelt land should be open and permanent. Sustainable development means that it ensures better lives for ourselves and not making worse lives for future generations.

I feel that as the plan stands in its current format future generations lives will be made worse for the reasons stated in this letter and for those reasons I OBJECT to the plan. The scale and position of future development sites needs to be much more sensible in order for the Local Plan to be more practical and realistic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/105  Respondent: 8891809 / Sarah O'Neill  Agent:

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 proposals to build 533 new houses in the Horsley’s. The current infrastructure within the villages will not support this increase in people living in this community. The local schools are over-subscribed, as is the local medical centre, where it is not uncommon to wait several days for an appointment. It is often impossible to park at the local shops in East Horsley. The roads, which are already busy, will not be able to cope with the increased volume of traffic, and especially in East Lane with the proposal for 90 new houses in an area which is already heavy with school traffic. All that aside, if all these new houses are to be built what will happen to the overall look of the villages, with many of the beautiful green fields all gone, and increased volume of traffic on the little lanes?

I can only assume that those responsible do not reside in the neighbourhood since they would surely have more concerns for the area if they lived here.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/989  Respondent: 8894241 / J.P Vessey  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the reliance upon calculations for the number of new houses required which are based upon an undisclosed mathematical model which has then been further increased by GBC to result in a population increase set at 70% above the
official national estimates for the Borough. Justification has been provided for this. Moreover, the DLP takes no account of the different social or affordable housing needs across the Borough; the proposals as they stand will require affordable housing to be included in developments whether or not such properties are needed to house those locally employed or are otherwise appropriate to those in need of social and affordable housing.

I object to the proposals to change the status of the land currently within the Metropolitan Green Belt. About 65% of all the housing development proposals within the DLP relate to land currently within the Metropolitan Green Belt. Our Green Belt is precious. It is for us to conserve and protect such land for future generations; removing land from Green Belt status is a once-for-all decision. Not to be taken lightly; indeed the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires any change of Green Belt boundaries to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Unmet housing need is not an exceptional circumstance in law. The very existence of the Green Belt/AONB is a reason for not meeting objectively assessed housing need (ie such protected land is a legal constraint against any such development). No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated, including as to the removal of Wisley Airfield from the Green Belt.

I object to the proposal to inset East Horsley from the Green Belt instead of maintaining its current "washed over" status. This proposal would change the nature of this area of countryside forever. Contrary to the suggestion in the DLP, East Horsley is set in a rural location and has the character of a rural village. Over a third of the land within the village boundary is woodland, and additionally the gardens attaching to the majority of the houses are relatively large, making an additional contribution to the openness of the area. The developments proposed would destroy this character and eventually merge historic and separate villages. Furthermore, the current open spaces provide important habitat for local wildlife that would be lost under the development as proposed.

I object to the proposed designation of station Parade as a 'District Centre'. The proposal demonstrates a total misunderstanding of the facilities within the village centre and the nature of the shops and businesses that currently operate here; it is inappropriate for the area and would adversely affect existing businesses.

I object to the proposals set out in relation to infrastructure for the area. Our existing infrastructure in the form of drains, water supply, medical facilities, schools and roads, cannot cope with the proposed number of new homes; the OLP proposals do not adequately respond to the existing difficulties in relation to infrastructure, let alone meet the additional burden that will be exacted by the developments proposed.

Aside from the A246, roads to and through East and West Horsley are narrow and winding; they are lanes, not major roads, and the proposed developments will add to existing congestion; for example, the proposed development opposite Horsley Station on Ockham Road North. Land proposed for development in both East and West Horsley is subject to flood risk; the Environment Agency has acknowledged the importance of retaining greenfield sites in managing flood risk generally.

Users of our Medical Centre regularly have trouble obtaining a prompt appointment due to the number of patients registered, and parking in order to visit the doctor is a problem. Our local primary and secondary schools are already full to capacity and with waiting lists; if children are required to travel further afield for their schools their transport adds yet further congestion to already busy roads that were never designed for the weight of traffic they now carry, and the spreading of children into schools across a wide geographical area impacts negatively on their community involvement. These issues will only get worse with an increase in housing numbers locally.

The DLP fails to properly address and deal with these issues. I ask the Council to note these objections, and act upon them by rejecting the Draft Local Plan as currently formulated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2566</th>
<th>Respondent: 8895841 / W J Blackmur</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 APPROVE the removal of sites A36 and A41 (the Horsleys) but these do not go far enough. I continue to OBJECT, in particular, to the proposed development of site A39. Any access from this site will compromise traffic and pedestrian safety, releasing traffic from the development on to a minor (but extremely busy) road, with poor sight lines (close proximity to the railway bridge) and narrow footpaths for pedestrians, including young children on their way to and from local schools who are obliged to walk no more than one/two feet from passing traffic. The site is also subject to flooding and abuts ancient woodland which has an SNCI classification. The nature of the woods, the flora and fauna, will be irreparably harmed by the inevitable incursions by inhabitants of any development on 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: PSLPA16/1139</th>
<th>Respondent: 8901249 / Michael Gibbs</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

Once again we are called upon to give our views on a local plan for the area in which we live.

Once again we are required to say NO to large developments that will totally alter the character of this area changing this village forever. I will restate that I have decided to live in this area because it is in the Green Belt and I wish it to remain so.

I oppose this local plan for numerous reasons of lack of infrastructure and overcrowding of roads and services. Please LEAVE the green fields around the Horsleys and Ockham alone.

They are part of the reason that people have chosen to live here. I do not oppose development of brown filled sites but I do not want the ruination of the villages of East And West Horsley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1869</th>
<th>Respondent: 8902593 / Edward Kurk</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

f) The re designation of land south of the A246 is another sneaky way to slip in a new regulation to weaken the case for preservation of the status quo.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1) The removal of East Horsley and West Horsley from the Green Belt
   a) The loss of Green Belt status would severely damage the very special character and nature of both these villages. Both areas were granted Green Belt status in order to prevent urbanisation by ensuring that the designated Green Belt land is undeveloped and that these open spaces are retained. The removal of this essential protection would lead to widespread development, permanently destroying the amenity afforded by both villages. I also strongly object to the removal of Ripley’s Green Belt protection for the same reasons.

   b) Furthermore, the “exceptional circumstances” that are required before these villages can be inset from the Green Belt have not been demonstrated

   What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

   Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/276  Respondent: 8903745 / Peter Davis  Agent:

The Local Plan still proposes to “inset” East Horsley from the Green Belt.

The changes to the settlement boundary will result in the East Horsley settlement area increasing by over 35%. Whilst some increase over time is possibly justified this huge increase will totally alter the current character of the village.

The proposed development of 100 homes in the centre of the village, close to Horsley railway station is excessive and damaging to the community. It will put over 200 cars onto the local roads already excessively busy during the working day especially during school term time. There is a school close by and the road through the village is, in places, too narrow to permit a centre line to segregate traffic adequately.

I note that the development of the former Wisley Airfield is still on the plan. 2000+ houses is not a development it is a New Town which will destroy the whole character of the area and put 4000+ additional cars on the local roads, currently too small for other developments, resulting in increased risk of accidents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/523  Respondent: 8904161 / Geoffrey & Lesley Tregaskes  Agent:

I object to the proposal to inset East Horsley from the Green Belt, instead of it being 'washed over' as it currently is.
I object to the alteration of the settlement boundaries of East Horsley to bring within them areas of agricultural Green Belt Land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I refer to the above plan and to the proposed sites in West and East Horsley, I believe, referred to as A37, A38, A39, A40 and A41.

I wish to strongly object to the proposals put forward in the Plan to build vast numbers of houses on these sites for the following reasons:-

My objections stem from the historic Government Policy of protection of the Green Belt. Your plans are set to remove West Horsley and East Horsley villages from the Green Belt it seems by a procedure known as insetting. For your edification I list below the purposes of the Government's Policies which you seem to ignore:-

1. To check the unprotected sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. To prevent neighbouring towns or villages merging into one another.
3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and villages and
5. To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Your plans directly ignore the above to the extent you plan to remove these historic villages from Green Belt status. This can only be done in exceptional circumstances and this has not been demonstrated.
Your plan to extend the boundaries in order to build a huge number of homes would dramatically change the appearance and characteristics of the villages.

I am not aware of any assessment by you of future housing needs and I am not aware of whether you have established a Policy to use brown-filled sites or whether you have identified them or whether you have sought to ascertain existing houses that are empty and have been for some time.

I would also strongly object on the basis that the existing infrastructure is already struggling. Our roads, or rather lanes, are worn out and likeable to third world. Our existing sewers, drains, ditches and culverts are already having difficulty coping, as has been evidenced by the flooding in the area during recent winters. There is very little street lighting even on our main roads. Our schools, whether State run or Private, both primary and secondary are already overcrowded, our Doctor's surgeries struggle to cope with the current population and our shops already suffer from limited parking.

Your plan for such huge development proposals for West and East Horsley would ruin these villages for ever. We would be absolutely swamped with extra cars, after all most families have at least 2 cars these days, and with people using the same facilities. It is vital that any new development must reflect the character and current housing density in these villages and be limited in size by the current infrastructure and facilities.

I would finally point out that apart from the huge number of objections you have or will receive from residents in "The Horsleys," our MP objects, our Parish Council objects, The Horsley Countryside Preservation objects and I am not aware you have a mandate for this from the people. You must tear up these plans.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Proposed Submission Local Plan

I have already sent my views on the 2016 version of the Local plan so herewith my objections to the revisions made in the 2017 Local Plan in particular as they would affect East and West Horsley.

I object to the proposal that over 50% of new housing development in the borough is proposed on land currently in the Green Belt

I object to the insetting of East Horsley village from the Green Belt

The Green Belt was set up to stop urban spread, reduce flooding and to give lungs to both the countryside and towns. We need these open areas for survival of all species – plant and animal, humans included. Removing villages in Surrey from the Green Belt could be far-reaching and ultimately result in the loss of lovely individual historic Surrey villages. Along with historic villages this part of Surrey contains many areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Sites of Special Scientific Interest which are protected by the Green Belt and should not become islands in urban areas. We already have suburbia reaching as far as the M25 and your plans seem likely to open the doors to eventually extending it all over the rural areas of this part of Surrey and the Surrey Hills.

Because East Horsley is a rural village it contributes to the important Green Belt barrier outside the M25 corridor.

I object to the movement of the settlement boundary proposed further to the south of the A246

Along with the other changes proposed this would increase the total settlement area significantly and will have a considerable adverse impact on the character and form of the village of East Horsley.

The changes suggested for the settlement boundaries for East and West Horsley are not acceptable. The Horsleys do not have the infrastructure to cope with the increased numbers of houses that are proposed.

East Horsley is a rural village with low density housing. The roads are narrow and more like lanes and already very congested at certain times of the day with many problems when heavy vehicles travel through the village.

Moving the settlement boundaries would appear to threaten Kingston Meadows which is the only public recreational space in East Horsley. It has sports facilities, play facilities for children and playing fields for sport and village activities.

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 object to the new local plan 2017 which has made some changes but in particular the changes to Policies A36 to A41 (East and West Horsley). The number of development sites has been reduced but the total number of new homes still represents a total of 395 new dwellings, on green belt sites. Marginal changes such as these would still leave 70% of all new development in the borough built on Green Belt sites. No “exceptional circumstances” or any other justification is advanced for this strange imbalance.

The deletion of two Horsley sites fails to correct the issue of relative overdevelopment in East and West Horsley, which is both excessive in absolute terms and disproportionate in relation to the rest of the borough. No attempt is made to assess the cumulative impact on the Horsleys – either of the four sites now proposed, or of Site A35 (Three Farms Meadow, alias “Wisley Airfield”), with over 2,000 new homes only 2 miles away. This piecemeal approach leaves the future of the Horsleys at the mercy of ad hoc planning applications, which is the opposite of what a Local Plan should intend.

The cumulative effect of the massive increase in the number of dwelling in this area demonstrates undue care in impact assessment on the strain on local infrastructure. The local roads will not be able to cope with the increase in traffic, and the changes to the access to the A3 will not sufficiently alleviate the increase on the local roads and through the local villages of Ockham, Ripley or East and West Horsley. The increase in traffic to stations in the area will not be able to be met by the limited number of car parks without further spending by the local government to meet these needs.

Local amenities will have to be increased dramatically to cope with the total number of new dwellings in the area, and will require substantial further investment from the local council, which are not addressed by the changes.

The over use of the greenbelt in the Horsleys and Ockham will mean that there will be an increase in the environmental impact - one which will be further added to by the increase in pollution from the new access roads that will be added to the A3.

It would be helpful to understand why the villages to the north-east of Guildford have been singled out for such massive expansion whereas other areas of Guildford have been protected. I object to the skewing of development in this local area. Better development potential lies within the Guildford town centre. The under use of derelict areas within the city centre (i.e. the areas around the cinema) would have a better environmental impact than building on greenbelt.

Thank you for taking my points into consideration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am very disturbed to hear of your proposals to extend the village boundary on Silkmore Lane in order to grant development rights.

I believe it is essential to keep this village in the green belt and to maintain its rural character. It is too beautiful to spoil. I also think that in the future we will need the fields for growing food and there is also the wildlife to consider. There are many deer, rabbits and other creatures who will lose their habitat because of your plans and this would be a great shame. This is their home too after all.

The amount of houses you have plans to build is also a cause for strong objection and concern. The character of the Horsleys would be changed and ruined forever which would be a tragedy. People from London and surrounding suburbia also need the countryside to visit and relax in. I hope you will take my objections seriously.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

It is the same in principle as those issued in draft over the last few years and doesn't change focus as lots of residents, objectors and commenters have requested, to be that of a plan based on Brown Field Sites. There are sufficient car parks and railways etc to build rafted developments over, as well as real brown field sites, for Surrey and its rural villages not to be spoiled in the way as still incorporated in this updated plan. Where is the Brown Field Sites Tsar in GBC?.

The inherent details and focus within the plan of extending the Horsleys boundaries into the green belt, the removal of villages from the green belt and the planned 6 large development sites in the Horsleys is totally unacceptable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Policy P2 proposes that East Horsley should be inset from the Green Belt, instead of being ‘washed over’ as it is today. East Horsley is set in a rural location and the village has the look and feel of a rural village. Its Green Belt status has been a key factor in preserving that character. Moreover, being ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt has not been a serious constraint on development within the village. GBC attributes the need to inset East Horsley to NPPF requirements, arguing that the test for remaining ‘washed over’ is that the village should make an important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt. No less than 36% of East Horsley is composed of woodlands, whilst inside the settlement...
area there is an average housing density of just 8.1 dwellings per hectare ‘dph’). Woodlands and large residential gardens make a vital contribution towards bio-diversity, provide wildlife corridors, and furnish those open spaces which are vital to the character of the greenbelt. There is no compelling case for change so why change it?

Further Paragraph 4.3.16 and Proposals Map: Settlement Boundary changes in East Horsley.

I object to two specific boundary changes, which have been proposed, as follows:

1. a) There is a proposal to move the East Horsley settlement boundary westwards from behind the houses on the west side of Ockham Road North up to the eastern boundary of Lollesworth Wood. This proposal removes over 5 hectares of agricultural fields from the Green Belt, with the justifications seemingly provided in the Green Belt & Countryside Study prepared by the consultants, Pegasus. The present boundary line is clearly defined by a deep and well-maintained drainage ditch which is classified by the Environment Agency as a ‘main river line’ and therefore represents a highly defensible Green Belt boundary. Moving this boundary west to the edge of woodland in no way improves its defensibility. Under NPPF rules Green Belt boundaries should only be changed in ‘exceptional circumstances’. I do not believe this proposal can be considered as an exceptional circumstance. Clearly the only justification for this change is to bring a large agricultural field within the settlement area in order to provide more housing land. However, under NPPF rules this is not a sufficient justification for changing a Green Belt boundary. As such, I believe it is an invalid proposal and I OBJECT to this proposed boundary change.

b) There is also a proposal to move the East Horsley settlement boundary westwards from behind the houses on the west side of Kingston Avenue up to a tree line running along the Parish Boundary at the western edge of Kingston Meadows. The result is to take all of Kingston Meadows out of the Green Belt. Kingston Meadows is the main public recreational space of East Horsley, comprising various sports facilities and playing fields. The present settlement boundary is clearly defined by a deep and well-maintained drainage ditch running along its eastern side. It therefore again represents a very defensible Green Belt boundary. Moving this boundary westwards to the edge of woodland in no way improves its defensibility. Under NPPF rules Green Belt boundaries should only be changed in ‘exceptional circumstances’. I do not believe that this can be considered as an exceptional circumstance. As such I believe this is an invalid proposal and OBJECT.

INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES

This section of the Proposed Submission Local Plan sets out details covering a range of infrastructure policies.

POLICIES I1, I2 & I3 I OBJECT to these Policies

These three policies cover Infrastructure & Delivery, Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’ and Sustainable Transport. Whilst I support the general policy statements as presented in each case, the detailed infrastructure proposals give me significant cause for concern. I believe there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will make this worse. Roads, schooling and health care are given scant firm proposals and the knock on consequences of all these additional houses and home is in effect simply flagged as something that will have to be dealt with.

Assuming that every new house has at least 2 cars, this means potentially 6,000 more cars within a three mile radius of the villages. The impact on local roads will be tremendous. Parking at Horsley & Effingham junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the medical centre and at the village hall will all be affected. Local schools are already at capacity – where will newcomers go to school? No extra places are planned in the Horsleys.

In respect of the proposals for development at Wisley Airfield and for an upgrade the current A3 junction at Burntcommon to a full 4-way junction, SCC traffic modelling anticipates increased use of Guileshall Lane, Hungry Hill Lane and Tithembarns Lane for traffic accessing the A3 at Burntcommon in order to travel to Guildford and beyond. The SCC report states that “consequently, it indicates that further thought may have to be given to managing traffic in this area as part of a transport assessment should the development be progressed”. It appears that the Plan is proposing a
strategic site at Wisley Airfield without even knowing what improvements to the local road infrastructure will be required.

I therefore **OBJECT** to the infrastructure proposals on these grounds. I further **OBJECT** to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed development.

POLICY A39: **OBJECT** to this Policy.

Land behind Ockham Road North, near Horsley railway station

Policy A39 proposes a housing development of some 100 dwellings on a 5.7 acre green-field Green Belt site behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North. As I said earlier, I believe that the proposed western movement of the settlement boundary needed to bring this site within the settlement area is unjustified and contrary to NPPF rules. If this boundary movement is invalid, as I believe, then this site remains a part of the Metropolitan Green Belt.

As such I **OBJECT** to Policy A39.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/64</th>
<th>Respondent: 8922145 / David Brand</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</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 would like to strongly object to the new plans for East and West Horsley on the following grounds:

1. Enlarging the boundaries for our villages and removing the village areas inside the boundaries from the green belt will significantly worsen the character of the villages.
2. Building the proposed new houses will significantly increase the demand on already stretched services, such as the Medical Centre and schools. For instance will we ever be able to make a doctor's appointment, already difficult?
3. Traffic has already increased significantly through the roads of East and West Horsley. Building significantly more houses will make the situation worse and indeed dangerous for both pedestrians and motorists. Parking at the two parades of shops is currently difficult and will become even more difficult.
4. Pressure on the station and also parking there will increase, particularly if the development at Wisley is part of the plan.
5. Just a comment on Wisley Airfield. I understood this development was refused recently, so cannot understand why it is being submitted again.

Finally a general comment, I understand the vast majority of residents are against the new development plan, as I am sure you will see from comments you receive and so, as elected representatives, you should reflect the views of your constituents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2306</th>
<th>Respondent: 8925025 / Sally Ingram</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I strongly object to the proposals in the new Guildford Local Plan and in particular for the following reasons:

My main concern with the proposed increased number of housing in East Horsley would be the increased traffic and the inadequacy of the surrounding village roads making it extremely dangerous for pedestrians. As a resident of East Horsley I drive along Ockham Road South many times each day. Ockham Road South is an extremely narrow road with either no pavement at all or sections with a very narrow pavement. This road is already extremely dangerous even with the existing volume of traffic let alone an increased number if the proposed developments in East and West Horsley go ahead. I am aware of a recent accident involving a pedestrian walking along the pavement on Ockham Road South who was struck on the back of the head by a lorry wing mirror which was driving past. This lady had to be taken to hospital and sustained serious head injuries. This accident was as a result of the village road not being wide enough and the pavement also not being wide enough. Forest Road East Horsley is also a very narrow village road particularly the first 400 metres from Ockham road south.

Another example of the inadequacy of the village road Ockham Road South is when two buses or two lorries meet travelling towards each other as I have witnessed on many occasion. All traffic behind these vehicles come to a standstill as the two large vehicles have to drive onto the pavement and then drive along the pavement until they have cleared each other. This practice is totally unacceptable and extremely dangerous to the welfare of the pedestrians walking along the pavements. Many pedestrians in the village fall into the vulnerable category being either children, many of whom are walking to or standing at their school bus stop, and elderly people who maybe both hard of hearing and or sight and slow on their feet, unable to detect the presence of large vehicles driving on the pavements and certainly unable to get out of dangers way.

A width restriction could be introduced but then how would existing school children and the inevitable increased number of school children as a result of the proposed developments, be taken to and from school if their school bus was not allowed along this road? It would also be necessary for the council to put on more buses as the demand for public transport increases with the increased numbers of people living in the village but again how could buses run along this road with a width restriction. To leave the village roads as they are, that is dangerously narrow, is surely not an option if the village population is to increase in numbers as is proposed.

In addition Forest Road in East Horsley is without any pavement at all between Woodland Drive and Glendene Avenue. On many occasions I have driven along Forest Road only to suddenly come across pedestrians walking in the road and had to break suddenly to avoid an accident. Many times it is children who have no option but to walk along this dangerous stretch to get to their school bus stop or train station. With increased numbers of housing proposed in the village and therefore people this problem will only get worse.

Not only will the local roads be inadequate to cope with increased numbers of cars, buses and pedestrians but rail provision will also be inadequate. The local plan contradicts itself with regards to the train station at Effingham Junction and Office Development at Wisley Airfield Ockham as you will see from the following 2 extracts from the Local Plan:

1. When developed, the two new rail stations, Guildford East (Merrow) and Guildford West (Park Barn), will be treated as a transport interchanges.
2. For the purposes of the sequential assessment the train stations at Clandon, Chilworth, Gomshall, Shalford and Effingham Junction, will not be considered to be transport interchanges because of their locations within the Green Belt, AONB or the isolated nature of the station away from the village or centre. We do not consider that it is sequentially preferable or sustainable to direct office development to these locations.

However there is proposed employment floor space of 4,300 sq ft at wisley airfield ockham with the following stated as being provided to get residents and employees from the site to effingham junction station

A significant bus network to serve the site and key destinations including Effingham Junction railway station and/or Horsley railway station, Guildford, Woking and Cobham to be provided and secured in perpetuity to ensure that residents and visitors have a sustainable transport option for access to the site.
I strongly object to the proposed housing in East and West Horsley, due to the inadequacy of the surrounding village roads and the danger posed by increased numbers of traffic. Also West Horsley suffers from severe flooding every year and leaves residents with restricted access to and from the village along its main access roads which are under water.

I strongly object to the proposed site at Ockham Road North. Ockham Road North is a narrow village road. In particular this is highly dangerous due to the location of Glenesk School which even at the moment with current volumes of cars on the road causes chaos at school dropping off and picking up time with traffic driving along Ockham Road North having to overtake stationary cars of parents queuing to enter the school, and drive on the wrong side of the road in order to pass queuing traffic. This is highly dangerous to the welfare of Glenesk school pupils who are extremely young ranging in age from 2 – 7 years old.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I strongly object to the number of houses East Horsley is having imposed upon it.

East Horsley has seen much infill development over the years. Developers are always keen to build in the village because of the huge profits they can make. There are very few infilling spaces left in the village now. Much of the development in recent years has been large individual homes and now many perfectly good smaller homes (which we need in the village for downsizers and the like) are being ripped down and replaced with huge houses. Also in recent times smaller homes and some affordable housing and flats have been built. I am talking in particular about developments behind Bishop'smead, at Frenchlands Hatch, two developments by Horsley Station and two developments in Kingston Avenue – one on the North side and one behind the doctor’s surgery. Also retirement apartments have been built in the village centre in two places. I feel all this development should be taken into account when considering East Horsley’s contribution to housing. The fact is, much of East Horsley has already been infilled.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/305  Respondent: 8930209 / Ray Corstin  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to object to a number of issues in the ‘Proposed Submission Local Plan (2017)’ which have changed since the previous ‘Draft Local Plan 2016’. In addition I would like to state that the original objections to the 2016 plan remain. I still believe that this deeply flawed Local Plan will have a direct and detrimental effect on the amenity currently enjoyed by residents of East Clandon and to the even greater detriment to our neighbouring villages of West Clandon, Ripley, Send, West and East Horsley. The plan erodes the openness of the Green Belt and endangers the beauty and views in and out of the Surrey Hills AONB.

I urge you once again to reconsider the overly aggressive growth plans and housing numbers in this plan, and their detrimental impact on Guildford’s Green Belt, beautiful AONB and AGLV areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3220  Respondent: 8933953 / Stephanie Billington  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I draw your attention to the very serious existing problems in the village with infrastructure - roads, flooding - on roads and in gardens, many of which are still waterlogged in mid-summer, drainage, sewage, etc - and facilities - schools full, doctors, failing businesses (shops only occupied because of the high proportion of charity shops - low rents/rates, low staffing costs and no stock costs!), no useful buses, to mention just a few. There is a high dependence on car use. For these reasons a large increase in the numbers of houses in the villages would not be viable or sustainable in the ordinary meanings of those words. It would also destroy the character of the village. For all the reasons given above, I am against
anything other than small scale additions to housing, which have been taking place steadily over the last 22 years and have contributed, largely appropriately, to increasing the housing stock.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1813  Respondent: 8967617 / Robin Gill  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. We support the proposal to move the village curtailage line to include all the land at Fangate Manor Farm, East Horsley.

2. We note that GBC has included the land at Fangate Manor Farm in the Land Availability Assessment for development, although there are no immediate planning proposals for this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2347  Respondent: 8967617 / Robin Gill  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. We support the proposal to move the village curtailage line to include all the land at Fangate Manor Farm, East Horsley.

2. We note that GBC has included the land at Fangate Manor Farm in the Land Availability Assessment for development, although there are no immediate planning proposals for this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4240  Respondent: 8973537 / D. Connor  Agent: Andy Stallan (WYG)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The settlement boundary in this part of East Horsley remains unchanged from that in the Guildford Local Plan (2003). However, we consider that this is an oversight and ignores the potential that this could make to the provision of additional housing at the margins of what is one of the larger and most sustainable settlements in the Borough. The settlement boundary should therefore be reviewed and altered to include this site. We are asking therefore, that our site should be inset from the Green Belt alongside the rest of East Horsley.
To help support this representation, a plan of the Site is provided which demonstrates how this is well-related to the margins of the existing settlement and how it could successfully accommodate development within clear defensible boundaries as acknowledged in the GBCS. Those clear defensible boundaries should become the new settlement boundary in this location, with the land within this becoming inset from the Green Belt as a result.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4241</th>
<th>Respondent: 8973537 / D. Connor</th>
<th>Agent: WYG (Allison Sanderson)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</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>

**Introduction**

This document forms a written submission, prepared on behalf of Mr David Connor (herein referred to as “the landowner”), in relation to the Draft Local Plan 2016: Strategy and Sites (herein referred to as “the DLP”) which is currently going through its final consultation stage.

It seeks to promote land owned by the landowner for residential development. Representations in this regard were submitted at the Issues and Options consultation stage, however the land in question has not to date been allocated as a development site, which we consider to be an oversight, both in terms of the need to identify a range of sites for development to meet need, and the assessment of this site’s suitability for residential development.

The settlement boundary in this part of East Horsley remains unchanged from that in the Guildford Local Plan (2003). However, we consider that this is an oversight and ignores the potential that this could make to the provision of additional housing at the margins of what is one of the larger and most sustainable settlements in the Borough. The settlement boundary should therefore be reviewed and altered to include this site. We are asking therefore, that our site should be inset from the Green Belt alongside the rest of East Horsley.

The aim of this written representation is to demonstrate that the Site should be included within the new settlement boundary, is suitable for residential development and that it represents a deliverable source of land capable of providing for up to five dwellings in the short term which itself will contribute towards addressing the significant shortfall in dwelling provision in the Borough in recent years.

We will place the need for this site in context by examining the robustness of the evidence base on which the DLP has been produced as well as highlighting the suitability of the site and its deliverability. Finally, comments will be made on some of the wider strategy based policies and the impact that these may have on deliverability and providing for the need identified by the Council.

To help support this representation, a plan of the Site is provided which demonstrates how this is well-related to the margins of the existing settlement and how it could successfully accommodate development within clear defensible boundaries as acknowledged in the GBCS. Those clear defensible boundaries should become the new settlement boundary in this location, with the land within this becoming inset from the Green Belt as a result.

**Site and Surroundings**

The Site is comprised of a maintained paddock to the east of Heathway. This land was formerly part of the gardens of the houses to the north (Tsala and Wild Acres), before this was sold to the landowner. It now represents an undeveloped site approximately 0.3 ha in size. The extent and position of this area (herein referred to as “the Site” is shown in the enclosed plan at Appendix 1.
Access to the site is along Heathway from an existing vehicle entrance towards the north of the site. The northern boundaries of the Site are clearly defined by the rear of the properties ‘Pantiles’ and ‘Wild Acres’ which front onto Orchard Close further to the north. The street at Heathway forms the western boundary, beyond which is an area occupied by large dwellings. Its southern and eastern boundaries are delineated by a woodland area which is owned by the Council and which separates the existing residential area from the wider Effingham Common, an area of common land that lies the east of the Site and which falls entirely within the Green Belt.

The Site is within walking distance of two main line railway stations – Effingham Junction which is approximately 0.7 miles to the north-east and Horsley Station which is approximately 1.3 miles to the south-west. There are also bus services which provide access to both. Local shops are located around the railway station therefore amenities are also within a reasonable walking distance or by public transport. Photographs of the Site from various vantage points are enclosed in Appendix 2.

In general terms we and the Council consider that East Horsley is an appropriate village for expansion and therefore can accommodate further areas of development than currently identified. It is well located to the urban area of Guildford with the A246, which is the primary road linking Guildford with Leatherhead, providing direct access to the village. It is located within close proximity of surrounding villages (Effingham and Great Ockham) both of which are easily accessible by road and public transport, thus expanding the facilities and amenities that are available to local residents. East Horsley therefore is a sustainable location, where appropriate development should be encouraged and viewed positively.

The containment of the Site results in a clear physical separation with the wider Green Belt. As such the site is fully enclosed and contained from the wider Green Belt, and as referred to above the woodland block is a strong defensible barrier, that is controlled by the Council and will ensure that any development is not visible from the wider area.

Full account should also be taken of the detailed representations previously made in a document dated 22 September 2014 (on Alliance Planning heading prior to WYG integration).

2.0 HOUSING AND POLICY CONTEXT

Guildford BC planning context & housing numbers

Guildford BC is currently in the process of producing a new Local Plan which is to cover the period 2013 – 2033 and guide development within the borough and is to be compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This representation is in response to the Regulation 19 consultation phase for the pre-submission version of the draft Local Plan. WYG are pleased to have been given the opportunity to make representations on this concerning the Site and general planning matters within the Borough. WYG are also pleased that Guildford BC has acknowledged the significant challenges that the borough faces in delivering sufficient housing to meet its needs. The previous interim housing figure of 322 dwellings per annum agreed on May 2012 did not take account of up to date assessments of housing need and therefore was not NPPF compliant. The reliance on this figure has meant that Guildford BC has significant under-delivered on their housing requirements over the past five years as shown in the below table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Net Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the housing completions above show, Guildford has not only been under-delivering against the now up-to-date Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) but there has also been consistent under-delivery against the interim housing target.
The most recently produced Annual Monitoring Report (AMR), published in October 2015 for the period 2014/2015 showed that net completions of dwellings in the borough for this period was 242 and that the majority of homes completed in this period are on sites of under 20 homes. As the AMR notes “the number of new homes completed this year (2014/15) is still lower than required to meet our objectively assessed need…contributes to a growing deficit of new homes”. The recommendation within the AMR following this states that “housing provision is currently restricted by the lack of available and deliverable development land in the borough….delivery rate is only likely to increase when larger areas of land are suitable and available for development”. This shows the necessity for suitable and available sites to be considered and this should apply to all sites within the borough that meet this criteria. Our client is the landowner of Lanes End, and the Site is available for development. We have set out below the reasons as to why the site should be excluded from the Green Belt and included within the built up area of East Horsley. It is a suitable and deliverable site which will assist in the supply of land to contribute to meeting the severe housing need in the Borough.

**Objectively Assessed Need**

Guildford Borough has an identified (OAN) of 693 dwellings per annum following the conclusions of the West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) produced in September 2015 by GL Hearn. This assessment was carried out as part of the Housing Market Area (HMA) known as West Surrey which included Waverley and Woking in addition to Guildford.

The most recent population projections produced by Office of National Statistics (ONS) shows that by 2037, the population of Surrey is expected to increase by over 200,000. This increase is anticipated to be greater than shown by the 2012 population figures. The 2012 figures informed the SHMA which in turn has provided the basis around which the housing requirement for the new Local Plan is formed. It can be expected that a large proportion of this increase will be in the West Surrey HMA due to its proximity to London, strong rail connections and reputation as being part of the commuter belt and a desirable place to live. We and the landowner would question the validity of the figures and believe that the OAN to inaccurate and should be revised upwards taking into account the increases based on the 2014 projections as opposed to the 2012 figures. This should, in turn, mean that the housing requirements in the new Local Plan should also be revised upwards, further supporting the proposed allocation sites and insettng villages from the Green Belt.

**Five-year supply of deliverable housing land**

Paragraph 47 of the NPPF states that there is a requirement for Local Planning Authorities (LPA) to

“Identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years’ worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5%...where there has been a record of persistent under-delivery of housing, LPAs should increase the buffer to 20%”.

It has been established that GBC cannot demonstrate a robust five year supply of deliverable housing land and at best the Council can show 2.5 years supply whilst at worst this drops to 1.4 years. It is therefore clear that without significantly more available land, Guildford cannot expect to be able to show a five year supply. The NPPF para 83 states that “Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances” however, as the site is surrounded by development, and is in many respects an area of “washed over” Green Belt, that is naturally part of the village, we conclude that the site should be looked on favourably as a suitable development site within the inset area from the Green Belt.

**Housing requirements within new Local Plan (2013-2033)**

The pre-submission version of the draft Local Plan makes provision for the delivery of 13,860 new homes over the plan period (2013-2033). This equates to 693 dwellings per annum which matches the identified housing need through the SHMA. The draft Local Plan states that:

“The delivery of new homes is expected to increase over the plan period, reflective of timescales associated with delivery of strategic sites”.

The draft Local Plan sets out the housing delivery in different tranches as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Housing Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Annual Housing Targets (as set out in the draft Local Plan – Policy S2)**
The above shows that there is proposed to be an increasing level of delivery over time as the plan progresses through the plan period. On this basis, to ensure the minimum housing requirements are achieved, over the first five years of the plan an average of 693 dwellings per annum are to be delivered. This raises an immediate concern given that GBC cannot demonstrate a five year land supply of any better than 2.5 years. As the net completions table also shows, the first two years of the plan period 2013/14 and 2014/15 have delivered significantly fewer than 693 dwellings per annum. Therefore it is vital that existing allocations in the draft Local Plan are retained and that those which are suitable and deliverable, particularly within the near future, such as the Lanes End Site remain within the Plan and are supported to come forward.

**FURTHER JUSTIFICATION**

**Horsley in Plan Making**

The weight of policy support for the scheme is already strong.

The site was identified within the previous emerging Local Plan which was released in 2014. The site has been promoted throughout the development of the emerging Local Plan process and previous representations for this site were submitted in September 2014 as part of the Local Plan consultation under regulation 18.

The proposed area to be inset from the Green Belt includes Lanes End, East Horsley, to come forward as a development site within the new effective settlement boundary of East Horsley. We are requesting that the settlement boundary in this location should be reviewed.

In reviewing Green Belt boundaries, it is important to consider the merits of development in terms of whether residential development on this site would conflict with the purposes of Green Belt land. The Council’s own assessment (in the form of the GBCS) concludes that this site has clear defensible boundaries.

It is estimated that based on the size of the Site and its proximity to the highway at Heathway that it is capable of accommodating up to five dwellings.

The site is in flood zone 1, at low risk. However, surface water management needs to be managed appropriately and could be achieved by a sustainable urban drainage strategy. This would not be a constraint to development.
The site was garden land in the Green Belt so is officially identified as unclassified land. This would not be a constraint to development.

Access is not considered to be a highway safety constraint to the site being developed as the road is adjacent. There are numerous potential areas where vehicle access can be taken from Heathway. There are no topographical or other physical constraints to the development of the site.

In relation to the ‘five tests’ of whether the land fulfils the purposes of the Green Belt, we consider that it does not. The proposed development and insetting of the site within the East Horsley settlement boundary will not lead to issues of coalescence as it would appear as a natural extension to the village. It will not form linkages with other settlements and will set precedent for further development, due to the physical parameters of the Site. It will not harm the purpose or openness of the wider Green Belt and countryside and the Site is isolated from the wider Green Belt.

In terms of landscape character, this will not be harmed as the Site is within an area that is clearly defined and has defensible boundaries. The boundaries provide a level of containment, which when coupled with extensive vegetation screening makes this site a far less sensitive location for housing, than many others. This should not be a constraint to development.

The development of part of the site will not have an adverse impact on the character of the countryside in which it is located, nor will it be visually detrimental to the character of the existing residential amenities to the north, west and south-west. Furthermore the retained and proposed landscaping will ensure that important landscape characteristics are retained and that an attractive setting is created.

Suitable Sang provision is proposed in the Proposed Submission Local Plan which is supported and would overcome this potential issues.

The Proposed Submission Local Plan confirms that well designed home would be attractive to the market, are deliverable, would help towards meeting housing numbers in the Local Plan and would contribute towards achieving sustainable, inclusive mixed communities.

The fact that the site is available and under the control of one owner, therefore being able to be delivered within five years should carry significant weight, as many other sites and areas are in multiple ownerships.

The site is well contained and is adjacent to existing development.

We estimate that the number of proposed dwellings is 5 and detailed considerations would look at the best way to achieve this number of dwellings on the site. The site can make a meaningful contribution to the housing requirements of East Horsley (and to the 5 year housing land supply in particular) and to the wider spatial and development aspirations for the Borough and its citizens. This fact should also support the proposal in the Submission Local Plan to continue with the existing approach regarding East Horsley, insetting the village and including development sites, and this Lanes End site.

A strong material consideration is Policy P2: Green Belt, which states that “limited infilling may also be appropriate outside the inset or identified settlement boundaries…where it can be demonstrated that the site is as a matter of fact on the ground within the village”. This site was previous garden land to two properties now considered to be within the village of East Horsley and so meets this criteria (Appendix 3).

This representation strongly supports the position put forward in the NPPF, the Submission Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan in respect of insetting the village, the proposed boundary to that insetting and the proposed development of the site for an appropriately designed residential scheme. We support the approach taken in Policies P2 and S2 of the Submission Local Plan with regard to insetting villages from the Green belt and allowing for some element of planned extension of those villages to accommodate existing and future housing need.

**4.0 CONCLUSIONS**
Conclusion
In conclusion, the site should be inset from the Green belt, as shown on the attached Submission Local Plan Map, in the Submission Local Plan for the following main reasons:

- The insetting has been supported through the Green Belt and Countryside Study, the Draft Local Plan 2014, the Draft Vision and Objectives of the East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan and the current Proposed Submission Plan 2016, taking into account the many previous representations made, confirming its credentials as a robust way forward;
- The site would deliver much needed housing both for East Horsley and the wider borough;
- The site is available and deliverable under a single ownership within a 1-5 year period;
- The site is in a very sustainable location close to amenities and local facilities;
- There are no significant constraints beyond the normal development management issues which can be dealt with by consultation and negotiated resolution;
- The acceptability of insetting the site and surrounds has already been demonstrated to be acceptable in Green Belt terms due to its relatively enclosed nature, village location and limited contribution to Green Belt objectives; and
- The scheme will generate section 106 contributions.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
- Heathway Written Reps on GBC Local Plan8.jpg (618 KB)
- Heathway Written Reps on GBC Local Plan2.jpg (354 KB)
- Heathway Written Reps on GBC Local Plan1.jpg (342 KB)
- Heathway Written Reps on GBC Local Plan7.jpg (264 KB)
- Heathway Written Reps on GBC Local Plan.jpg (202 KB)
- Heathway Written Reps on GBC Local Plan5.jpg (256 KB)
- Heathway Written Reps on GBC Local Plan4.jpg (288 KB)
- Heathway Written Reps on GBC Local Plan6.jpg (274 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/108  Respondent: 9050881 / Andy Los  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the excessive number of houses proposed at Wisley due to the already busy A3 and the lack of local infrastructure to accommodate the extra people. Our schools, medical centres and roads are already too busy.

I do not think the Horsleys should be removed from the Green Belt, this is an outrageous suggestion.

Finally I object to the development of the green site on East Lane in West Horsley.

Regards,

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/473  Respondent: 9096129 / Jane Wilkes  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

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 plan in relation to West Horsley specifically.

There are still an excessive number of new homes proposed within West and East Horsley without any plans for increased school places, medical and other community facilities and improvements to the basic infrastructure of the area i.e roads etc.

I object strongly to East and West Horsley being taken out of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4228  Respondent: 9228769 / Cathryn Fleming  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 several points in the proposed Guildford Local Plan

I have lived in East Horsley for 7 years and first moved to this area of Surrey in 1969 as a child. I feel I have a VERY good understanding of the impact and consequences of this proposed development. I do support the need for some development and acknowledge the need for new housing in the area. However, there are several key issues with many of the proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/582  Respondent: 9237953 / Patricia Wood  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 in the strongest terms possible to the amended Local Plan and to endorse fully the comments made by the East Horsley Parish Council, with particular regard to taking any land out of the Green Belt. This is not in the remit of the Borough Council. It is against ministerial guidance and inspectorate decisions and does not meet the “very special circumstances” required.

I strongly OBJECT to the movement of the settlement boundary proposed under Amendment 4 in Appendix H map of East Horsley (South), proposed as part of Policy P2. This land is very close to Surrey Hills ANOB. Chalk Lane is an ancient sunken lane, with high chalk banks, and joins the A246 where there is a very dangerous bend. Any development in this area would have serious repercussions on the area and destroy its character.

I OBJECT to the number of new houses proposed in the Local Plan. The total number to be built has been slightly lowered from the original plan but by nothing like enough. The density of the proposed house building in East and West Horsley and other villages is totally unrealistic and unacceptable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1492</th>
<th>Respondent: 9331457 / E Wiejski</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</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>GBC New Local Plan 2016 The Horsleys Main Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am writing to register my strong objections to GBC new local plan 2016. Having lived in East Horsley for 39 years I take a keen interest in the village because I care about it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of proposed new housing lies within greenbelt. Please take note we will all fight not to lose our green belt or changes to our &quot;identified boundary of the village&quot; I am extremely horrified by the proposal for the two fields near the railway line behind Ockham Road North being developed. If this plan is accepted and these sites developed we will be forced to move causing us much distress, the nature of the village will also be changed beyond recognition. Please take note Of all Horsley's residents views as NONE of us are in agreement with GBC proposed local plan 2016.</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: pslp173/423</th>
<th>Respondent: 9554401 / Mrs Symonds</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</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 still object to the Local Plan in spite of some small changes as it will result in the destruction of the beautiful and historic Lovelace village of East Horsley, and those of West Horsley and Ockham.</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: pslp173/131</th>
<th>Respondent: 10540225 / Peter and Judy Davies</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</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>We have objected to the Plan in previous years on a number of grounds, including -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. the removal of the benefits of green belt status for East Horsley;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. the very adverse effect the Plan will have on our village life, with a much increased population but no corresponding improvement in roads and road use, parking, schools, medical facilities;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. the significant additional effect on this infrastructure of the proposed development of Wisley airfield.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 2017 Plan shows limited changes to the previous plan, and all these concerns remain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is puzzling and angers many of us is that the original idea of consulting the local population was made with much ado. Our voice was to be heard and acted on. The huge response showed an overwhelming wish not to endanger the green belt. Yet the 2017 Plan is largely unchanged, and the same concerns apply.

Is your lengthy and costly consultation only a sham? Is this Plan to go ahead regardless of what most people sincerely feel? Who does the Borough Council represent?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/235  Respondent: 10560417 / Charles Macher  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO over development in the Horsleys. The villages cannot sustain 500+ houses and attendant vehicles. The infrastructure cannot cope with the extra traffic and pressure on local schools and doctors surgeries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/241  Respondent: 10560513 / Jennifer Coyne  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO over development in the Horsleys. The villages cannot sustain 500+ houses and attendant vehicles. The infrastructure cannot cope with the extra traffic and pressure on local schools and doctors surgeries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/137  Respondent: 10776225 / Roger Main  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the revision of settlement boundaries and the removal of East Horsley from the Green Belt. East and West Horsley are currently washed over by the Green Belt and their character adds to the character and ambience of the Green Belt as required under NPPF guidelines. The NPPF states that most development in the Green Belt is inappropriate. Planning guidance issued in March 2014 states that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt enough to constitute “exceptional circumstances”. There is therefore no justification for removing the Horsleys and other villages from the Green Belt and building housing on Green Belt land.
I OBJECT to the proposal to build approximately 100 new homes on land prone to flooding near Horsley Station and to the development proposals to build over 2000 homes on the former Wisley Airfield site. The removal of sites A41 and A36 may reduce the level of housing proposed for East and West Horsley, but it still leaves too much housing of an inappropriate character in an area with inadequate infrastructure to cope with increases in traffic, demands for utilities and for medical services.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1927  Respondent: 10793537 / Mr Michael Pattinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I was astonished to read that East Horsley is regarded as a Rural District Centre. There is a variety of shops in the Village centre but no more than might be expected in a rural, not urban, Village of its size. To state that Station Parade has a large supermarket is simply not true. There is a convenience store, Budgens, but it certainly cannot be described as a large supermarket. Furthermore the car parking arrangements in the Village centre are very limited and in the vicinity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/478  Respondent: 10798145 / Jane and Derick Fulcher  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We have read the objections and comments made by the East Horsley Parish Council and agree with their observations. We however wish to add the following:

• We object to any building on good quality green belt, which was set up in the first place to provide open spaces for recreation and to enhance residential areas.
• Effingham Junction station, which is nearest to our house, is exceptionally busy in "rush hour" indeed the car park is full. Trains are very congested.
• The M25 which would provide access to other areas for work by any new inhabitants, is normally at a standstill in the rush hour period. The A3 north to London in rush hour is very full. The A3 by-pass round Guildford needs enlarging.
• The local school - The Howard of Effingham - may be moving to a new site and we understand doubling in size. Some 3000 pupils we understand. Surely this really is too large as the local roads have enough difficulty delivering the current number of pupils to the school. So new schools and roads will be required. Will the proposed primary school/secondary school at the Wisley proposed development be adequate?
• With house prices being what they are in the local environment will the teachers be able to acquire accommodation?
• Will new build house prices be capped so that new joiners to the housing market can afford them?
• There appears to be no provision for council houses.
• The Royal Surrey is our local hospital - it is working at full stretch. So are Frimley and Epsom. A new hospital is required.
• There is a totally inadequate local bus service.
• The local roads are inadequate for the proposed developments

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Village facilities

The infrastructure of the West Horsley, as well as East Horsley cannot support a potential effective doubling of the households and residents.

The villages are extremely rural in character. East Horsley has one public house, a church, a hotel, very few shops, and not one state school. The two boys only private schools already produce significant traffic problems at each end of the school day on Ockham Road North and the A246.

Secondary school places are limited at the Howard of Effingham School and other secondary schools are a greater travelling distance from the village.

West Horsley alone includes no less than 41 listed buildings, some dating back to the 15th century.

West Horsley has one shop, no post office and one highly over-subscribed school.

The single medical centre shared between East and West Horsley is similarly over-subscribed and residents have difficulty in getting appointments. Such a massive increase in population as proposed would stretch this service to beyond breaking point. The planned population increase for the Borough would also mean a major extension of the Royal Surrey Hospital to allow it to cope.

Parking facilities are extremely limited in the shopping areas of East and West Horsley, as well as Horsley station. The impact of such a large increase in population as proposed would overstretch these facilities. It would make it difficult if not impossible for many of the older and less mobile inhabitants to reach the shops, and most importantly the medical centre and chemist.

Roads

Traffic generation from the proposed development would be considerable, with most households having two cars, many with three.

The Street, which constitutes the only entry to West Horsley from the A246, is very narrow, and it would not be possible to widen it. This road is already often perilous, particularly when large lorries, buses and tractors pass through. To increase such traffic, which would result if the proposed developments were to proceed would be wholly irresponsible.

Transport

- West Horsley’s bus service through the village is extremely limited and only operates two/three times per day Monday to Friday.
- The bus service running from Guildford to Leatherhead travels along the A246 at the southern end of the village and is really only of use to residents living within a maximum of eight to ten minutes walk from the bus stops at the Bell and Colvill roundabout.
• Parking at Horsley station is limited and sometimes full on a weekday. There is no land to create additional parking for the increased need that the proposed expansion would bring.

Drainage/flooding

The road where I live, Green Lane, has an under-capacity of existing drainage, sewers and treatment works to cope with heavy rainfall. When heavy rain does occur, the water in the toilets in our house rises alarmingly and they cannot be used, the drains and sewers flood the road and our garden, requiring several visits from the water company to clean and sanitise the ground. This happened again this week (23rd June). The current infrastructure is unable to deal with the requirement.

The land between Silkmore Lane and Ripley Lane is frequently subjected to such serious flooding that Ripley lane becomes absolutely impassable several times per year. This land slopes significantly towards Ripley Lane, and during periods of sustained rainfall, flooding always occurs. Severe flooding also frequently occurs on The Street, East Lane, and Long Reach, to the extent that these roads, and in particular the hill under the railway line often become impassable.

Impact on Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty

The impact of the proposed housing estates would be to blight the surrounding areas of outstanding natural beauty. Many of the proposed sites are so close to such areas that it would no longer be appropriate to refer to these as such, as they would become reducing areas of green countryside, surrounded by urban sprawl.

Most of the areas proposed for potential developments are contiguous with AONB and it is my understanding that statutory protection is afforded to areas contiguous with AONB.

Impact on Wildlife

The impact on wildlife in the Horsleys would be devastating. In my own garden, I have had grass snakes, hedgehogs, weasels, toads and deer and have observed red kites and woodpeckers. These species would be under threat form loss of habitat, and in some cases, predatory cats, the population of which would increase with the proposed rise in homes.

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: PSLPA16/47  Respondent: 10806849 / Chris Duffy  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Having reviewed the proposed new plan I must reiterate my objection made previously in 2014. This does nothing to alleviate my concerns.

Swamping horsley worth over 500 new houses and continuing to push for a further 2000 homes on nearby Wisley airfield remains wholly inappropriate.

The village does not have sufficient access or amenities or character to cope with this increased demand and it would be irresponsible of Guildford council to approve it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/48  Respondent: 10806849 / Chris Duffy  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the scope of the draft local plan.

The impact on the residents and services of building 593 additional houses planned for the village of East and West Horsley will overwhelm the infrastructure of a small rural community.

We need to build some new houses to help young people get on the housing ladder but an extra 593 in Horsley is too many.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/241  Respondent: 10816545 / Kent Atkinson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of East Horsley I write, YET AGAIN, to OBJECT most strongly to the Proposed Guildford Local Plan 2017.
The 2016 Local Plan had some serious effects on our village:

- The extension of the settlement boundaries of the Horsleys into the Green Belt
- The removal of the extended village areas from the Green Belt
- The proposal to develop SIX (!) large housing sites and several smaller sites in the extended settlement area

The changes in the Guildford Local Plan 2017 are minimal, FOUR of the original development sites remain, including the proposal for 2,000+ houses, plus sheltered/care homes, Gypsy/Traveller pitches (!!!), employment/retail space and two schools on the former Wisley Airfield.

Wow, is that a town or a city?! 

There were, I understand, over 30,000 objections to the 2016 Local Plan which identified a clear desire to limit expansion into the Green Belt. I see no evidence in the Guildford Local Plan 2017 that this plea has been heeded.

Why do we have to, yet again, write to express our objections the proposed developments? This process is clearly designed to wear the local residents down until the plans get implemented. 30,000 objections last year, but yet again, here we are having to comment on a Local Plan that keeps being thrust down our throats.

**Scale of the Proposed Developments:**

The developments will further aggravate the already overstretched infrastructure of both East and West Horsley. The road through East Horsley (Ockham Road North & South) is inadequate even now, and cannot be upgraded. Normal cars have to slow down just to pass each other in certain parts, and climb onto the pavement when a truck passes through.

And you want to add further traffic to the area?!

The development plans for 2,000+ new dwellings plus considerable related infrastructure on the Wisley Airfield, is only two miles from East Horsley. I am of the opinion that the Horsley area will not be able to absorb the increased population, traffic and pollution.

It is not realistic to assume that the new town will restrict itself to the Wisley Airfield area. Their daily routine will spill into the surrounding areas including East Horsley. We do not have sufficient facilities, schools, surgeries and other services. Gas, electricity and telephone services in the area are already operating at full capacity on very old pipes, wires and exchanges. Local roads are too narrow and winding to take the existing traffic, and there is insufficient parking anywhere, even in front of most homes. The local roads were built in the 1930s or before, and are mostly no more than narrow lanes where cars have to slow down to pass each other. The access roads to East Horsley are narrow and winding and are not sufficient to handle even today’s traffic.

The scale of the proposed Wisley Airfield development is way out of proportion and way out of character to the existing infrastructure and the space available in this small, picturesque old village. The new town will completely destroy the special character of our historic village.

**Station Parade a “District Centre”?**

There is a clear misunderstanding of the nature of the facilities in our village centre, it would be completely inappropriate to target the area for future urban development. Please, get out of your offices and come and see the village in action on any normal week day and week end, see how the facilities, roads, drainage etc are already overstretched. As a certain tennis player often said: You cannot be serious with these proposals!

**Green Belt:**

The Green Belt is a policy for controlling urban growth. The idea was developed so as to have a ring of countryside where urbanisation would be resisted, maintaining an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure could be expected to prevail. The fundamental aim of a Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and consequently the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness.
The Metropolitan Green Belt around London was first proposed by the Greater London Regional Planning Committee in 1935. The Town and Country Planning Act 1947 then allowed local authorities to include Green Belt proposals in their development plans. In 1955, the then Minister of Housing Duncan Sandys encouraged local authorities around the country to consider protecting land around their towns and cities by the formal designation of clearly defined Green Belts, to prevent urban sprawl.

The 2012 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued by the Government clearly sets out the following purposes (amongst others) for including land with the Green Belt:

• To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

How do you reconcile the Wisley Airfield proposal, and the removal of the Horsleys from the Green Belt, with the NPPF’s guidelines above?

It appears that you now want to ignore the very reason for having designated Green Belts around urban areas, and specifically around my village of East Horsley. I strongly **OBJECT** to your proposals.

**Objection:**

I know that I am not the only person writing, yet again, to **OBJECT** to the Guildford Local Plan 2017. I hope that the GBC, as our elected representatives charged with representing our interests, will **LISTEN TO THE COMMUNITY**.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3201  **Respondent:** 10816897 / P G Williams  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

My first objection concerns road traffic. The Ockham Road is already used as a rat run between the A246 and the A3/ M25.

Additional construction traffic will initially exacerbate the poor road surface conditions. Even a conservative estimate of 1 car per new house in the 533 new houses will worsen traffic at peak times (school and station runs,) Already in the last few months a lorry has damaged the railway bridge at Horsley station and the have been two serious accidents on Ockham Road South in the past 7 days. Repeated requests for height, weight and speed restrictions have been ignored.Parts of this road are not wide enough for two cars, let alone HGVs or fast moving emergency vehicles.

Furthermore, traffic control measures will be needed at Thatchers Hotel site. The bend on the A246 is sharp and semi-blind. and traffic joining this road from Ockham Road South already faces lengthy peak -hour delays. The Thatchers Hotel and Bell and Colvill developments will only make matters worse.

Traffic onto the Ockham Road North and the A3 from the Wisley site will also need control. The Ockham Road South at the Ripley junction is prone to flooding.

The second issue is Infrastructure and services. Medical facilities in East Horsley are already overstretched. Schools are full. Parking is limited, especially at the station.
Finally the removal of green belt restrictions and the development of the Wisley site will change the village environment beyond repair.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/91  Respondent: 10817697 / J E Kettle  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Housing in East Horsley- GBC has proposed new settlement boundaries for East Horsley as well as a new "Identified boundary of the village", and provide no justification for these changes. Furthermore GBC proposes to build 100 houses on Ockham Road North which is in Green Belt, with no justification for this proposal.

I object to the proposed Housing plan for Ockham Road North

The proposed submission by GBC is undemocratic, unjustified, and lacks any credibility as a Plan for the future of the Borough.

I object most strongly to the GBC local Plan Submission

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/165  Respondent: 10819297 / Phil Haymes  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to formally object to this plan as my previous objection has been ignored

FOUR of the original housing development sites remain (2000 houses).

The 2016 Local Plan was assessed as having massive and disproportionate effect on the Horsley's:

Extension of the settlement boundaries of the Horsley's into the Green Belt.

Removal of the extended villages from the green belt.

Six large housing development sites and several smaller ones in the extended development.

It seems that whatever the objections there remains a determination by the planners to drive the planning process until the authorities get their desired outcome despite the impact on local residents. I fear that by 2034 The Horsley's will become another Surbiton and all the village charm lost in pursuit of development based on flawed demographic data.
I would ask the Planning Department to take a much more holistic and balanced view and seriously challenge the data that is driving unnecessary development that encroaches on the green belt, will stress existing infrastructure to breaking point and negatively impact the quality of life of every resident in the Horsley's.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4099  Respondent: 10824705 / TK Williams  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We strongly object and oppose the proposal to remove Fangate Manor from the Green Belt. In discussion with East Horsley Parish Council, Sir Robin Gill (owner of Fangate Manor) says he has no plans for any development on his land despite the fact that he (Sir Robin Gill) has made previous applications for development on Fangate Manor during the last 30 years. If this is the case, we are at a loss to understand why Sir Robin Gill is seeking to remove his property and land from the Green Belt.

We have been residents of Manor Close for 30 years and our boundary backs on to his land at Fangate Manor. Any development at this property would precipitate a loss of amenity, wildlife and general ambience to all residents at Manor Close.

We and all other property owners in Manor Close do not intend to allow any access nor exit from the field at Fangate Manor onto the south spur road of Manor Close. This strictly a private road. The road and its verges are owned by Manor Close Residents Association.

We at Manorfield, have never witnessed any access nor exit from the field at Fangate Manor onto the south spur road in Manor Close during our 30 years.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/555  Respondent: 10829921 / Patricia Kettle  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write to voice my strong objections to the above plan.

Firstly I would point out that East Horsley is a rural village of character with narrow roads and green spaces; we are not and do not wish to become a District Centre. You must be aware that we already have vacant shop premises and have no available land space for more shops, warehousing, businesses, etc. I reiterate, we are a rural village and wish to remain so.

Thatchers and Ockham Road North, the two sites proposed for development in East Horsley are both on Green Belt land; I understand that Green Belt land can only be built on in exceptional circumstances - what are these circumstances? In addition I gather that GBC has pinpointed 3 further sites identified as LAA sites for future development, all on Green Belt land. I find this a deceitful move as these sites are not in the Local Plan and therefore information not widely known by the general public.
No mention in the Local Plan of infrastructure. The roads are congested, drains blocked, parking in the village is already a problem and Medical practice overloaded. Parking at both Horsley and Effingham Stations is full by 9.0 am.

I would like to know how GBC decided on a 25% increase in growth when the Office of National Statistics forecast a 15% growth rate. I understand new houses are needed but not on the scale you are proposing.

I object most strongly to the enormous growth in building on Green Belt land in the rural village of East Horsley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/414  Respondent: 10830017 / Vicky Thornton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of East Horsley I write, to object most strongly to the Proposed Guildford Local Plan 2017.

The 2016 Local Plan had some serious effects on our village:

• The extension of the settlement boundaries of the Horsleys into the Green Belt
• The removal of the extended village areas from the Green Belt
• The proposal to develop six large housing sites and several smaller sites in the extended settlement area

The changes in the Guildford Local Plan 2017 are minimal, four of the original development sites remain, including the proposal for 2,000+ houses, plus sheltered/care homes, Gypsy/Traveller pitches employment/retail space and two schools on the former Wisley Airfield.

There were, I understand, over 30,000 objections to the 2016 Local Plan which identified a clear desire to limit expansion into the Green Belt. I see no evidence in the Guildford Local Plan 2017 that this plea has been heeded.

Scale of the Proposed Developments:

The developments will further aggravate the already overstretched infrastructure of both East and West Horsley. The road through East Horsley (Ockham Road North & South) is inadequate even now, and cannot be upgraded. Normal cars have to slow down just to pass each other in certain parts, and climb onto the pavement when a truck passes through.

The development plans for 2,000+ new dwellings plus considerable related infrastructure on the Wisley Airfield, is only two miles from East Horsley. I am of the opinion that the Horsley area will not be able to absorb the increased population, traffic and pollution.

It is not realistic to assume that the new town will restrict itself to the Wisley Airfield area. Their daily routine will spill into the surrounding areas including East Horsley. We do not have sufficient facilities, schools, surgeries and other services. Gas, electricity and telephone services in the area are already operating at full capacity on very old pipes, wires and exchanges. Local roads are too narrow and winding to take the existing traffic, and there is insufficient parking anywhere, even in front of most homes. The local roads were built in the 1930s or before, and are mostly no more than narrow lanes where cars have to slow down to pass each other. The access roads to East Horsley are narrow and winding and are not sufficient to handle even today’s traffic.
Has anyone filmed the traffic on Ockham Rd at different times of the day? If you did you would see that there is so much traffic on this road and so many heavy vehicles it is a miracle that there haven’t been any more collisions. This road is too narrow for current traffic let alone the huge increase we would suffer if development of Wisley Airfield and the Guildford Plan went ahead.

The scale of the proposed Wisley Airfield development is way out of proportion and way out of character to the existing infrastructure and the space available in this small, picturesque old village. The new town will completely destroy the special character of our historic village.

Station Parade a “District Centre”? 

There is a clear misunderstanding of the nature of the facilities in our village centre, it would be completely inappropriate to target the area for future urban development. Please, get out of your offices and come and see the village in action on any normal week day and week end, see how the facilities, roads, drainage etc are already overstretched. As a certain tennis player often said: You cannot be serious with these proposals!

Green Belt:

The Green Belt is a policy for controlling urban growth. The idea was developed so as to have a ring of countryside where urbanisation would be resisted, maintaining an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure could be expected to prevail. The fundamental aim of a Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and consequently the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness.

The Metropolitan Green Belt around London was first proposed by the Greater London Regional Planning Committee in 1935. The Town and Country Planning Act 1947 then allowed local authorities to include Green Belt proposals in their development plans. In 1955, the then Minister of Housing Duncan Sandys encouraged local authorities around the country to consider protecting land around their towns and cities by the formal designation of clearly defined Green Belts, to prevent urban sprawl.

The Guildford Local Community Plan 2017 does not prevent Urban Sprawl.

Eventually when all the unoccupied flats and residences in the city of London are occupied we will find that the expansion of the green belt was not required. Don’t build on it, it won’t be needed, we have enough housing in the London area we just don’t have the right laws to make sure it’s used correctly.

In short I object to the Guildford Local community Plan 2017

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3300</th>
<th>Respondent: 10832321 / Robert Deatker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 P2: Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.3.13: Proposal to inset East Horsley from the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy P2 proposes that East Horsley should be inset from the Green Belt, instead of being ‘washed over’ as it is today. Currently development is permitted within the settlement boundary, although this area is still considered to be Green Belt with a particular planning regime being applicable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
East Horsley is set in a rural location and the village has the look and feel of a rural village. Its Green Belt status has been a key factor in preserving that character. Moreover, being ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt has not been a serious constraint on development within the village. For example, GBC’s planning records indicate that no less than 149 net new homes were added to the village housing stock through in-filling and brownfield developments between 2000 and 2015.

GBC attributes the need to inset East Horsley to NPPF requirements, arguing that the test for remaining ‘washed over’ is that the village should make an important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt. This East Horsley clearly does. No less than 36% of East Horsley is composed of woodlands, whilst inside the settlement area there is an average housing density of just 8.1 dwellings per hectare (‘dph’). Woodlands and large residential gardens make a vital contribution towards biodiversity, provide wildlife corridors, and furnish those open spaces which are vital to the character of the greenbelt. It is one thing for a planner to study a map and see a settlement area filled with housing, but it is quite another actually to come to a rural village like East Horsley and see how the Green Belt has preserved the rural character and openness of this village.

Today East Horsley is a picturesque and flourishing rural community, which has and continues to experience steady incremental growth as a result of being ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt. Therefore there is no need to change its status.

I therefore OBJECT to the proposal to inset East Horsley from the Green Belt and requests that this proposal be dropped from the Local Plan.

Paragraph 4.3.16 and Proposals Map: Settlement Boundary changes in East Horsley

GBC are proposing to make a number of changes to the settlement boundaries of East Horsley and so expand the settlement area, as set out in the Proposals Map, with the justifications seemingly provided in the Green Belt & Countryside Study prepared by the consultants, Pegasus.

I object to two specific boundary changes, which have been proposed, as follows:

1. i) There is a proposal to move the East Horsley settlement boundary westwards from behind the houses on the west side of Ockham Road North up to the eastern boundary of Lollesworth Wood. This proposal removes over 5 hectares of agricultural fields from the Green Belt. The present boundary line is clearly defined by a deep and well-maintained drainage ditch which is classified by the Environment Agency as a ‘main river line’ and therefore represents a highly defensible Green Belt boundary. Moving this boundary west to the edge of woodland in no way improves its defensibility. Under NPPF rules Green Belt boundaries should only be changed in ‘exceptional circumstances’. I do not believe this proposal can be considered as an exceptional circumstance. Clearly the only justification for this change is to bring a large agricultural field within the settlement area in order to provide more housing land. However, under NPPF rules this is not a sufficient justification for changing a Green Belt boundary. As such, I believe it is an invalid proposal. I, accordingly, OBJECT to this proposed boundary change.

1. ii) There is also a proposal to move the East Horsley settlement boundary westwards from behind the houses on the west side of Kingston Avenue up to a tree line running along the Parish Boundary at the western edge of Kingston Meadows. The result is to take all of Kingston Meadows out of the Green Belt. Kingston Meadows is the main public recreational space of East Horsley, comprising various sports facilities and playing fields. The present settlement boundary is clearly defined by a deep and well-maintained drainage ditch running along its eastern side. It therefore represents a very defensible Green Belt boundary. Moving this boundary westwards to the edge of woodland in no way improves its defensibility. Under NPPF rules Green Belt boundaries should only be changed in ‘exceptional circumstances’. I do not believe that this can be considered as an exceptional circumstance. As such I believe this is an invalid proposal. I accordingly OBJECT to this proposed boundary change.

In the Green Belt & Countryside Study and its accompanying Topic Paper, GBC justifies the need to make changes in settlement boundaries in order to meet unfulfilled housing need in the Borough. However, Green Belt rules make it
clear that unfulfilled housing need is not normally considered to be ‘an exceptional circumstance’. If it were the entire Green Belt would already be covered in tarmac.

The NPPF is clear that every movement in settlement boundaries must be justified by ‘exceptional circumstances’. GBC have offered only a generic justification in their Topic Paper of meeting unfulfilled housing need, but a case by case justification has not been provided. As such, I believe Local Plan Response 13.06.16 the settlement boundary changes referred to above (and many others) are invalid without such detailed justification.

Paragraph 4.3.17: Proposal to remove Wisley Airfield from the Green Belt I OBJECT to the proposal to remove Wisley Airfield from the Green Belt. The only justification for this proposed change is unfulfilled housing need which is not considered an exceptional circumstance. The proposed Wisley development is discussed further below in the Site Allocation section.

INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES This section of the Proposed Submission Local Plan sets out details covering a range of infrastructure policies.

POLICIES I1, I2 & I3 These three policies cover Infrastructure & Delivery, Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’ and Sustainable Transport. Whilst I support the general policy statements as presented in each case, it is the detailed infrastructure proposals for Guildford Borough which give us cause for concern. I believe there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will exacerbate this problem. I would make the following comments specifically about infrastructure in East Horsley today:

• Roads across the parish are in poor condition with many potholes. Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic;

• The principal through roads traversing East Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. As a senior SCC councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: “East Horsley has lanes, not roads.” East Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV’s now using them;

• Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains. Any substantial development as indicated within the Local Plan will increase hard surfaces in the area and therefore the rainfall runoff will increase into local watercourses and exacerbate localised flooding.

• The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs;

• There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Dorking or Woking; and

• The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients.

Train services to and from Horsley to London on the ‘Guildford via Cobham’ line are already at full capacity at peak times. The current service has to be substantially improved BEFORE allowing further development. Such improvements should include additional train services and additional stations to support new communities.

It is recognised that, as stated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the maintenance of adequate infrastructure and its expansion to meet growing needs is the responsibility of the relevant infrastructure provider. This is often not GBC itself but rather, for example, Surrey County Council, South West Trains or utility companies. Surely GBC must see the infrastructure improved first before approving any new developments.

In respect of East Horsley, there are only two specific proposals in Appendix C:

LRN 25 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme.

It is not clear what is proposed here, and its timing and funding have to be considered uncertain. It is stated that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution. However, it Local Plan Response 13.06.16 is not at all clear what
development is likely to give rise to such a contribution, but it certainly implies that funding could only come if there were a development; and

HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5 – 15 of the plan. There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example roads, pavements, drainage, and schools. Furthermore, it is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this. Although an expansion of the Medical centre is proposed in the Infrastructure Schedule, this is not until years 5 – 15 of the Plan. Given that it is already at capacity, I believe that this needs to be implemented earlier.

Local primary schooling is also a very pertinent issue. There are 11 housing development sites identified in the LAA for East and West Horsley, which taken together would result in the building of 593 new houses in the two parishes that are today served by a single primary school - The Raleigh, in West Horsley.

Planning guidance suggest that this number of new homes will require the provision of around 150 additional primary school places to accommodate such an increase in population. Today there is no spare capacity at The Raleigh, yet no proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in the Horsley’s. I believe that the failure to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure to meet the needs of what is there already is a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

I therefore OBJECT to the infrastructure proposals on these grounds. I also OBJECT to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

There is a legacy of approving development without the appropriate infrastructure, and the infrastructure lags to the point it cannot cope, whether this schools, trains, roads or utilities. GBC in their local plan set out a vision of development, however the details of the infrastructure upgrades needed to today are not firm legal commitments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4326  Respondent: 10832321 / Robert Deatker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to two specific boundary changes, which have been proposed, as follows:

There is a proposal to move the East Horsley settlement boundary westwards from behind the houses on the west side of Ockham Road North up to the eastern boundary of Lolllesworth Wood. This proposal removes over 5 hectares of agricultural fields from the Green Belt. The present boundary line is clearly defined by a deep and well-maintained drainage ditch which is classified by the Environment Agency as a ‘main river line’ and therefore represents a highly defensible Green Belt boundary. Moving this boundary west to the edge of woodland in no way improves its defensibility.

Under NPPF rules Green Belt boundaries should only be changed in ‘exceptional circumstances’. I do not believe this proposal can be considered as an exceptional circumstance. Clearly the only justification for this change is to bring a large agricultural field within the settlement area in order to provide more housing land. However, under NPPF rules this is not a sufficient justification for changing a Green Belt boundary. As such, I believe it is an invalid proposal. I, accordingly, OBJECT to this proposed boundary change.

There is also a proposal to move the East Horsley settlement boundary westwards from behind the houses on the west side of Kingston Avenue up to a tree line running along the Parish Boundary at the western edge of Kingston Meadows.
The result is to take all of Kingston Meadows out of the Green Belt. Kingston Meadows is the main public recreational space of East Horsley, comprising various sports facilities and playing fields. The present settlement boundary is clearly defined by a deep and well-maintained drainage ditch running along its eastern side. It therefore represents a very defensible Green Belt boundary. Moving this boundary westwards to the edge of woodland in no way improves its defensibility. Under NPPF rules Green Belt boundaries should only be changed in ‘exceptional circumstances’. I do not believe that this can be considered as an exceptional circumstance. As such I believe this is an invalid proposal. I accordingly OBJECT to this proposed boundary change.

In respect of East Horsley, there are only two specific proposals in Appendix C:

LRN 25 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme.

It is not clear what is proposed here, and its timing and funding have to be considered uncertain. It is stated that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution. However, it Local Plan Response 13.06.16 is not at all clear what development is likely to give rise to such a contribution, but it certainly implies that funding could only come if there were a development; and

HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5 – 15 of the plan. There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example roads, pavements, drainage, and schools. Furthermore, it is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this. Although an expansion of the Medical centre is proposed in the Infrastructure Schedule, this is not until years 5 – 15 of the Plan. Given that it is already at capacity, I believe that this needs to be implemented earlier.

Local primary schooling is also a very pertinent issue. There are 11 housing development sites identified in the LAA for East and West Horsley, which taken together would result in the building of 593 new houses in the two parishes that are today served by a single primary school - The Raleigh, in West Horsley. Planning guidance suggest that this number of new homes will require the provision of around 150 additional primary school places to accommodate such an increase in population. Today there is no spare capacity at The Raleigh, yet no proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in the Horsley’s. I believe that the failure to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure to meet the needs of what is there already is a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

I therefore OBJECT to the infrastructure proposals on these grounds. I also OBJECT to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

There is a legacy of approving development without the appropriate infrastructure, and the infrastructure lags to the point it cannot cope, whether this schools, trains, roads or utilities. GBC in their local plan set out a vision of development, however the details of the infrastructure upgrades needed to today are not firm legal commitments.

Summary

Surrey is a beautiful county enjoyed by the people from London and further afield, the beauty comes from the structure of open land, green fields and villages, which has been preserved through planning constraints and the Green Belt. The GBC Local Plan sets out to erode the green spaces of Surrey, put strain onto the infrastructure already under strain, and allow housing developments on a scale that is not justified.

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? ( )

As a resident of Ockham Road South, I must object most strongly to the new local plan;

Why have our villages been removed from the Green Belt, when the objectives of the green belt are to preserve our green and beautiful land from intrusive development?

Has anyone given a thought to the infrastructure of Horsley? The B2039 Ockham Road South was never built for the volume of traffic it is currently sustaining. At certain times of the day I cannot exit my drive without someone stopping to let me out. We regularly pick up wing mirrors (2 to 3 per week) from outside the house. I have been in the hedge twice to avoid vehicles mounting the pavement rather than slow down, and my husband has had the number plate torn off his car whilst in the drive waiting to turn left, by a speeding lorry which had mounted the pavement to avoid slowing down. There are many elderly people and mums with buggies walking up and down - will it take an accident to determine that the roads are currently very dangerous?

Places at local schools are at a premium, the doctors surgery is full, the roads flood regularly.

533 houses equals at least a thousand more people, a thousand more cars and a thousand times more load on our already fragile infrastructure.

Since our local supermarket Budgeons has Sunday opening hours, it cannot therefore be categorised as a large supermarket.

This is a village, first and foremost. It's identity is being superseded by planners who see a gap and attempt to force multiple houses on small areas of land, therefore eroding the very nature of the village.

Whilst we are all aware of the need for more housing - this plan is ill thought out, and intrusive. The scale of these proposals is totally disproportionate to the area and must be reviewed.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/289  **Respondent:** 10840161 / Janet Attfield  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have been a resident of East Horsley for sixteen years. It is a fantastic place to live and bring up children. There are good schools, social clubs for young and old. There are tennis, badminton, football, art, cricket, scouting clubs. There are facilities for children with special needs. There are 200 members of the University of the Third age running clubs for retired residents. There is the Wheel of Care, where locals volunteer to help those less fortunate. There is a great community spirit. There is a library, a train link to Guildford and London. There are leisure centres in Guildford and Leatherhead. Horsley is surrounded by countryside which is protected by the green belt, which people use everyday. Everyone appreciates the biodiversity of plants and wild life of the area.

In short The Horsleys and surrounding villages are wonderful places to live.

The only downside is that over recent years there has been a great deal of building, usually 'infilling', leading to greater congestion. In turn, the roads have suffered and not been repaired. Surrey is a rich successful borough and yet it has roads that are worse than many other counties such as Kent, Essex, Devon and Hertfordshire. Indeed they are worse than some of the third world countries we see on TV. Also it is becoming increasingly difficult to find parking spaces, when shopping or visiting hospitals.
I have looked at the proposed building plan for Guildford and Horsley and find the plan totally unacceptable. The proposed building expansion of the area will completely change the character of the area. By allowing any of the green belt to be destroyed, more urbanisation will increase congestion and pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I believe the current Guildford Borough Council (GBC) Proposed Submission Local Plan is deficient, not justified and if implemented will have serious adverse consequences for my village East Horsley and our neighbouring parishes. Both East Horsley and West Horsley are distinct parishes as referenced in the Domesday Book of 1086 and as current Surrey Villages, being south of the M25 motorway, must continue to be protected as such. The Proposed Submission Local Plan should address improving the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area however it is not fit for purpose, based on obsolete population data as the basis and fails to provide simple advice to future planners who will face development proposal decisions.

Proposal to remove East Horsley from the Green Belt: The fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. This Local Plan will expose East Horsley to the threat of urban developments wholly inappropriate that would not be permitted under the existing Green Belt classification - I find this unacceptable. There are no exceptional circumstances why this classification should be changed and East Horsley should therefore remain as a Village, like West Horsley, and continue to be included within the existing Green Belt protection. Only appropriate development and re-development opportunities should be supported in line with East Horsley’s own Neighbourhood Plan. East Horsley’s Neighbourhood Plan needs to be a means of providing a measure of local control to the planning process, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 17: “planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings, with succinct local and neighbourhood plans’.

The existing East Horsley Infrastructure is not acceptable for the current population needs: I am very concerned with recent flooding from Pennymead Drive in East Horsley, down Ockham Road South and Ockham Road North and all the way to the A3 roundabout. I also now find out this area is in a Zone 3 Flood-zone and Functional Floodplain. Any further housing development will obviously severely impact further flooding in this whole area. Local residents who pass our house in a very narrow section of Ockham Road South going to Horsley station or to the local school get very wet every time it rains, because traffic splashes water from the flooded road on to the very narrow pavement. Insufficient work has been carried out on planning for and executing the infrastructure for the existing developments in East Horsley, let alone for any future new developments. Ockham Road South and Ockham Road North have not been constructed to take the existing traffic growth, let alone further expansion from any proposed new developments - a cycle lane along the road is also currently impossible to provide. Opposite our home, the start of Forest Road does not even have a pavement provided from Ockham Road South to Glendene. In addition the East Horsley medical facility is stretched and the local school is full so there is no planning for any future population expansion in the 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? ( )

Thatchers Hotel and Horsley Towers:

I am disappointed to see this development proposal. There are very limited places to walk for Drinks and Casual Meals and this will remove a necessary scenic retreat leaving only one Pub.

Heavy Rain last year demonstrated drainage and flooding problems along roads slanting down into the Village. Further remedial action is needed before exacerbating the problem with this elevated site development.

I see no reference to Travellers Pitches in the Village so understand that this original proposal has been withdrawn as not in character with the Village (previous reference to former BT site).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3848  Respondent: 10860993 / Peter and Fiona Armitage  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed number of houses suggested for East Horsley. It seems that you are trying to turn a small rural village into a town. There appears to be no consideration for the infrastructure required. Horsley is already at saturation point with regard to its local school, medical centre and roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3371  Respondent: 10866881 / Mike Pinder  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I'm contacting you to state my opposition to the Draft Local Plan.

I live in East Horsley and have done so for 8 years. My address 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]

The revised plan appears to have made little consideration to the views I and others expressed against the earlier iteration.

I am particularly concerned about plans for East and West Horsley. To wholesale remove from the greenbelt is utter nonsense. To allow organic growth through individual applications, use of brown-field sites and an application by application based consideration of individual applications on greenbelt would allow the villages and sense of community to remain.

Allowing them to be removed from the greenbelt and thus allowing excessive building will be detrimental to the villages, community and Guildford as a whole. Adequate consideration has to be made of the environment, impact on
infrastructure (trains and roads) for these areas and Guildford as a whole in any plans made. That is why it is essential to consider plans on an organic basis, rather than wholesale removal from greenbelt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/651  Respondent: 10866881 / Mike Pinder  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am an East Horsley resident. I would like to register my objection to the latest version (summer 2017 consultation) of the Local Plan. There has been very little change from the previous version, which I also opposed, with very little being done to address the thousands of sensible concerns made by residents regarding the contents of the previous version. This is not a plan that residents can adopt and support – it is a plan that seems set on building as many homes as possible in places that cannot support the level of development planned.

There has been a reduction in the number of houses for the Horsleys, but I continue to object to the local plan on the grounds of the number of houses being proposed not only in the Horsleys but in other rural villages in the Guildford Borough which don’t have the infrastructure or capacity to absorb so many more houses.

I also object to the plan on the basis that despite requests being made to GBC to reveal the methodology behind the housing calculations, this has been kept secret from residents who are now being asked to blindly approve a plan whose foundations they cannot validate. Two independent studies of the housing numbers suggest that the housing numbers used by Guildford Borough Council in their local plan are significantly higher than they should be.

There has been no explanation as to why GBC has not applied the constraints that they are entitled to do. Residents have asked for a reduction in the housing numbers however GBC continue to push ahead with this flawed plan that does not take the wishes and views of its residents into account. I have to question why the Conservative led Council, whose election manifesto was to protect the Green Belt, is so determined to build so many more houses than they have to and so many more houses than its residents want. Is there a financial benefit to the Council in doing so?

I fully understand that there is a need for more houses in this area and I support building more houses. However, it is important that the following happens before thousands of houses are built unnecessarily on the green belt:

- The housing need calculation needs to be made available and shown to be accurate and appropriate for the area. If it is correct, why are GBC keeping this hidden from their residents? If it is found to be incorrect, the housing numbers need to be revised downwards as appropriate in a transparent manner.
- The housing constraints that GBC are allowed to apply need to be applied, so that GBC can properly demonstrate their commitment to residents to protect the Green Belt, made in the election but now so conveniently forgotten.
- Existing options for housing such as student accommodation & empty properties need to be fully explored before new houses are built on Green Belt land
- Consideration needs to be given to the types of housing being proposed and built. There is a need for affordable housing the Horsley area; this does not mean 4 bedroom houses costing upwards of £500k.
- There is a need for proper plans to be made in relation to infrastructure. Currently Surrey County Council are cutting back on funding on roads, street cleaning, vegetation cutting, recycling etc. There needs to be assurance that where many houses are being proposed where there is no infrastructure to support this, that this is provided for in advance of the houses being ready, so that the local plan does not have a hugely detrimental effect on the lives of those already living in these communities. Currently there is pressure on facilities such as the local medical centre, local schools such as The Raleigh and local roads without the local plan.

I ask you to take into account the opposition views of so many local residents to this plan and reject this plan outright.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/296  Respondent: 10869633 / John & Jacque Sharman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

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 local plan:

I object to the six development sites in East Horsley and West Horsley; I object to taking East and West Horsley out of the green belt; and I object to the planned development of Wisley airfield.

All of the above will result in increased pollution, strain on local infrastructure and fundamentally change the nature of this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/783  Respondent: 10878465 / George Kalorkoti  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

At its Annual General Meeting on 21 June 2016 Manor Close East Horsley Residents Association (MCRA) gave careful consideration to the Proposed Submission Local Plan that Guildford Borough Council (GBC) has now published for public consultation, including in particular the proposal to remove Fangate Manor from the Green Belt and include it within the Settlement Boundary. Individual residents will, if they feel it appropriate, submit their comments to GBC on the draft local plan. I am writing on behalf of MCRA to address specifically the proposals relating to Green Belt and to Fangate Manor:

1. We **OBJECT** to the proposal to inset East Horsley from the Green Belt. The proposal to inset East Horsley from the Green Belt will be detrimental to the rural character of the village and should be dropped. The specific changes proposed are not justified under the National Planning Policy Framework rules.

2. We strongly oppose and **OBJECT** to the proposal to remove Fangate Manor from the Green Belt and include it within the Settlement Boundary. There are no exceptional Planning circumstances to justify removing Fangate Manor from the Green Belt, and changing the Settlement Boundary does not in any way enhance the defensible nature of the Settlement Boundary. It merely involves moving the boundary from one hedgerow to another, but leads to the loss of Green Belt and agricultural land.

3. There is an **ERROR** in the Land Availability Assessment dated February 2016, and we ask that GBC corrects this. There is a plan on page 299 that appears to show access to Fangate Manor from Manor Close. Manor Close is a private road, and access will not be granted. MCRA will oppose any change to the character of this very quiet road. The road and the verges are narrow and are not suited to any growth in traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp173/183  Respondent: 10878881 / Bruce D Edwards  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

+ The Plan continues to propose " insetting " East Horsley " from the Green Belt.

+ Changes in settlement boundaries mean the East Horsley settlement area will increase by 37% and include most roads south of the A246.

+ Development of 100 homes is still proposed near Horsley station.

+ Development of some 2000 homes is still proposed on the former Wesley airfield.

+ Around 57% of all new housing in the Local Plan is on land which is currently Green Belt.

+ While the ONS forecasts population growth for Guildford at 10.4% over the period of the Plan, GBC proposes to increase housing stock by 22%.

+ Consequently, I strongly object to the excessively high housing targets being set, the failure to recognise the various constraints to this development and the large-scale destruction of the Green Belt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/100  Respondent: 10883841 / Gillian Millership  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

East Horsley to be inset from the Metropolitan Green Belt - I OBJECT

East Horsley settlement boundaries to be redrawn - I OBJECT

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4381  Respondent: 10910785 / Clare Curtis  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

People using East Horsley’s shops and its Public Library in 2016 experience more and more difficulty in parking their cars at most times of the day. The proposed large increase in population of West and East Horsley will make parking and movement into and through the village considerably more difficult and time consuming.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Traffic and Parking. The impact on local roads will be tremendous. Parking at Horsley and Effingham stations (which is already full),
at the shops, at the medical centre and village hall will all be affected. Local Road Network. It appears that the Plan is proposing a strategic site at Wisley Airfield without knowing what improvements to the local infrastructure will be required. This is also true for the proposed developments in the Horsleys.

Pollution. Increased traffic will mean more nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment. Already a cause for concern in the area.

Flooding. The site behind Ockham Road North in East Horsley is partially a level 3 flood risk area and local residents are well aware of how much standing water there is in their gardens after rain.

Schools. Local schools are already at capacity - where will the newcomers go to school?

Medical Facilities. The same as schools.

Loss of Green Belt land. Creeping development has led to almost continuous housing from Central London to Effingham. Is this to carry on to Guildford and beyond?

Transport. Misery for commuters. Nowhere to park and full trains at commuting times.

For these reasons I am against the developments for the Horsleys which are included in the Draft Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

We strongly object to the proposal to inset the village of East Horsley from the Green Belt. East Horsley is a rural village of very low housing density. Within the current settlement area the average density of housing is just 8 dwellings per hectare. Most houses lying within the current settlement area have large gardens that are filled with trees, shrubs and open lawns. As a result East Horsley makes an important contribution to the Green Belt of this area, providing openness, picturesque green spaces and wildlife corridors which support a rich biodiversity. If East Horsley is inset from the Green Belt, as proposed in the revised Local Plan, then important Green Belt planning protection will be lost over land currently...
within the settlement area. This will inevitably lead to increased development within this area and the loss of openness, destruction of trees and hedgerows, diminished biodiversity and the impairment of picturesque views of this rural village.

We also strongly object to the movement of the settlement boundary, increasing the settlement area by 37%. Our infrastructure is already creaking and will simply not be able to cope with the increase in development. It will destroy the nature and character of our village and seriously impact on our way of life.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2073  Respondent: 10942305 / Catherine Berton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

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 new Guildford Local Plan:-

I do not believe there is good reason to consider East or West Horsley to be outside the Green Belt.

I do not think it is right to build such large numbers of houses in the green belt. The Green Belt is an important asset in the South East for environmental reasons. Once it is gone, it is gone forever.

Local infrastructure cannot support the proposed housing. Nor would I wish there to be extra infrastructure which in itself would spoil rural Green Belt land. New buildings such as schools are just as bad as new houses! Extra car parks are bad for the environment / flooding issues etc.

East Horsley is a village in a semi – rural area. It is not a farm and as such it cannot support the problems the plan would bring.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3367  Respondent: 10946177 / Graeme Verra  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As residents of East Horsley, we object to the Local Plan for the reasons outlined below.
I firstly note our objections to the previous Local Plan in 2014 have not been addressed in any material way and therefore still stand. I look forward to seeing the feedback on this revised plan being used constructively.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4222  Respondent: 10959937 / Tim Parkinson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

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 new Guildford Local Plan:-

I do not believe there is good reason to consider East or West Horsley to be outside the Green Belt.

I do not think it is right to build such large numbers of houses in the green belt. The Green Belt is an important asset in the South East for environmental reasons. Once it is gone, it is gone forever.

Local infrastructure cannot support the proposed housing. Nor would I wish there to be extra infrastructure which in itself would spoil rural Green Belt land. New buildings such as schools are just as bad as new houses! Extra car parks are bad for the environment / flooding issues etc.

East Horsley is a village in a semi – rural area. It is not a farm and as such it cannot support the problems the plan would bring.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
As residents of East Horsley, we are writing to express our objections to the new housing proposals contained within the new local plan. The extension of the boundaries of the village, and the consequent removal of areas from within the Green Belt and erection of over 500 houses, will destroy the village and turn it into little more than a suburb of Guildford. The village simply does not have the infrastructure to cope with a massive increase in its population and we fail to see how the plans address this. The roads are narrow and ill maintained as it is. The village cannot support additional road traffic and parking (including station parking for many more commuters). Persistent rain, which occurs regularly, floods the centre of the village all too easily, as well as the road we live in.

The above comments relating to the village of East Horsley can be applied equally to the development of 2,000 houses on Wisley airfield, also included in the plan. You have only to try to join the queue onto the A3 at Wisley any weekday morning to see how unrealistic such a proposal is.

We do not believe the plan takes adequate account of local needs and the requirement for suitable infrastructure investment before any such development is considered, and the proposals tabled will serve only to destroy the precious atmosphere and life of one of Surrey’s finest villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Plan continues to propose "insetting" East Horsley from the Green Belt.

Changes in settlement boundaries mean the East Horsley settlement area will increase by 37% and include most roads south of the A246.

Development of 100 homes is still proposed near Horsley station.

Development of some 2000 homes is still proposed on the former Wesley airfield.

Around 57% of all new housing in the Local Plan is on land which is currently Green Belt.

While the ONS forecasts population growth for Guildford at 10.4% over the period of the Plan, GBC proposes to increase housing stock by 22%.

Consequently, I strongly object to the excessively high housing targets being set, the failure to recognise the various constraints to this development and the large-scale destruction of the Green Belt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2765  Respondent: 11003297 / Daniel Fuller  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am shocked to hear that there is another push to build more housing in the Horsley's.

If I recall correctly, that idea was rejected. the Horsley area simply does not have the infrastructure to support an enlarged local population. Water, Sewage, Education, Transport would all need to be enlarged to make a plan such as the proposed one work.

so you would have to perform extensive road works and renovations, increase the parking capacity of the train station to cater for the new residents that will work in London or Guildford, build at least 1 new primary and secondary school to ensure that the children of the parents get their right to education.

also, the Horlsey's are beautiful. and building here will take away that beauty.

instead of building horizontally, you build vertically? several blocks of nice flats would probably suffice, if not then build away from the Horsley's. the residents of this area have told you once and I'm fairly certain that we will tell you again

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2239  Respondent: 11004993 / Jane Whitmore  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Objections to Guildford Borough Council Proposed Local Plan (June 2016) and to remove East Horsley and West Horsley from the Green Belt. Specifically, 173 houses planned at the following locations:

- Thatcher’s Hotel, Guildford Road (48)
- Land near Horsley railway station, Ockham Road North (over the railway from the Village Hall) (100),
- Countryside Depot and Telephone Exchange, St Martin’s Close (15)
- Land at Fangate Manor, St Martin’s Close (10).

I object to the draft Local Plan for the following key reasons:

1. I object to a plan which proposes that over 70% of new housing be built within the Green belt across the Borough. There is ample brownfield land in the urban areas which needs to be regenerated, without the need to encroach on protected Green Belt land.
2. I object to the disproportionate local allocation of housing in East Horsley.
3. I object to the threat the Local Plan poses to the historic rural village of East Horsley and the blight on properties there. The plan calls for an additional village of 173 residences in the immediate area, (with narrow lanes, little or no streetlights and many listed houses).
4. I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:
   1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking.
   2. The increased volume of car traffic on the roads.
   3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in East Horsley and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements.
   4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the limitations of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them).
   5. The lack of suitable public transport. The Horsley rail station will struggle to cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.
5. I object to the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to the environmental and ecological value of these sites.
   1. Pollution: The large increase in volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment.
   2. Flooding: The site behind Ockham Road North in East Horsley is partially a level 3 flood risk area, and local residents are well aware of how much standing water there is in their gardens after rain. Building on such land will only exacerbate the problem.
   3. Schools: Local schools are already at capacity – where will newcomers go to school? No extra places are planned in the Horsleys, and any school places proposed as part of Wisley Airfield will not appear until many years into the project.
   4. Medical facilities: Similar situation to the schools.
6. I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the individual East & West Horsley Parish Plans. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in East Horsley are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village’s green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

I trust that these objections will be fully considered and that the proposed plans for an additional 173 residences in East Horsley is removed from the Local Plan with immediate effect.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3537</th>
<th>Respondent: 11014369 / Geraldine Wright</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</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 have a number of concerns about the draft local plan which has been put out for consultation by the Guildford Council and in particular, I object to the number of houses which are planned both in terms of the actual number and the fact that 65% of these are to be built on land which is currently in the Green Belt.

I understand that the Housing and Planning Act states that a site, once identified in the Local Plan, is assumed to have permission to go ahead in principle, thus stopping normal planning restrictions at a later date.

The current proposals include at least 148 houses in East Horsley and 385 in West Horsley. Both villages will be taken out of the Green belt leaving both vulnerable to future development. This is in addition to the proposed 2068 houses on Wisley Airfield, 400 homes at Burnt Common and 2000 houses at Gosden Hill Farm.

These proposals, if accepted, will cause huge pressure on road, parking, trains, education and medical facilities. Royal Surrey Hospital is already and breaking point. Primary and Secondary Schools are over-subscribed. Where will the children from these new houses go to school and on to university? I am a commuter and with the additional two coaches it is now possible to ensure a seat at Horsley – those at Oxshott are not so lucky, but returning in the evening it is often impossible to get on the train at Waterloo at 7:00 pm and I have to wait for another train. This is not to sit down – merely to get on the train without fainting. Our medical centre is one of the best in the area but appointments are not easy to book. The proposed local plan will put an incalculable burden on these facilities. The Royal Surrey Hospital is similarly stretched to its limits. How will these new residents be treated?

If one considers that each home will have at least one car and most will have two or more, there will be approximately 5,000 additional cars in the vicinity of the Horsleys alone. How will the new commuters get to the station and park? The car parks are already full and there is no more parking land available.

The roads in and out of East and West Horsley are not able to cater for increased flow of traffic. The village life we have come to know would be totally removed by the imposition of a one way system which would be the only way to deal with this additional traffic burden.

The Government is already concerned about pollution, yet I do not see how the increase in volume of traffic can do anything other than pollute the environment.

Flooding is an additional problem. The site behind Ockham Road North is already a flood risk area and standing water collects after any heavy rain. Building will only exacerbate this problem.

The overall loss of green belt land is one of my greatest concerns. Once the land is built upon it can never be reclaimed. Our countryside will disappear. The Local Plan must take account of these issues and reject further development of the Horsley’s.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The plan is not the result of an analysis of the needs of the local community but the opportunity for un-named developers to make a substantial amount of money providing increased dormitory accommodation for workers in London.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to POLICIES A36,A37,A38,A39,A40&A41, for reasons below:-

- Proposed amount of new housing far exceeds local need. (e.g. see local survey - Surrey Community Action Housing Survey 2014) The need for so many houses to be built in West Horsley over the first 5 years of the plan period is totally unproven.

- There is no local support for them

- The density for new housing on the 6 Horsley sites is inappropriate as it is greater than anywhere in the present locality

- They would transform the 2 rural villages into a large urban development for which there is no justification.

- The collective impact of all sites on the Horsleys should be studied. It is clear that it would have a devastating effect on infrastructure and services and have an adverse impact on well being in the area e.g. air quality and noise pollution would worsen.

- The West Horsley defined Settlement Area boundaries (ref 2003 Local Plan) DO NOT need to be extended. Too many green fields adjacent to the current housing in the village would be allowed to be developed. Sites allowed on the edge of the settlement boundaries causing extension of the boundaries would cause creeping urbanisation contrary to NPPF 79, where it closes the gaps between Horsleys and neighbouring settlements. Large sites proposed for development such as Wisley Airfield (A35) and A25 (Gosden Hill Farm) would also contribute to this to the detriment of the Green Belt.

- The total amount of new building would be out of scale with the planned development in other parts of the borough, especially more urban areas not protected by the Green Belt.
-Building 533 new houses on these sites is excessive, not in proportion to the rest of the borough and will destroy the rural character of these communities. The proposals are unsustainable in terms of schooling, drainage, roads capacity, shops, parking in East Horsley at station and shops and public transport.

-The key evidence document 'Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2031' makes no case for locating large numbers of new homes in West and East Horsley, or neighbouring villages.

-Site A40 not viable due to high water table and poor drainage leading to winter floods, and there would be many other safety issues that would have to be raised concerning access, traffic, facilities for pedestrians etc.

-Development of these 6 sites in the Horsleys would together harm the access to the amenity of the Green Belt and its recreational value and compliance with NPPF 81. This would be caused by congestion on all surrounding/narrow roads harming safe activity such as cycling. The development would ruin rural settings of nearby woods, open sites, walking and leisure areas.

I OBJECT also to POLICY (Site) A35 (formerly WISLEY Airfield - Three Farms Meadow)

I OBJECT to this being in the plan for the following reasons:-

- It should NOT be included at all for all the reasons given by the Guildford Borough Planning committee which unanimously rejected an identical recent planning application for this development on 14 separate grounds (application ref. 15/P/00012). It is a scandal that this has been allowed to be inserted into this draft plan just a day before the planning decision was delivered, a fact which the planning committee must have known full well as they delivered their decision!!

This is tantamount to bias towards the developers and is totally unjust, making a mockery of residents' serious concerns and worries in relation to this proposal for development.

The Council planning officers have surely acted irregularly if they have allowed Wisley Investment Properties to present this application out of time.

Grounds for rejecting the application included the following:-

-no "exceptional circumstances" have been shown to give reason to build on this predominantly Green Belt site itself surrounded by Green Belt.

- loss of good quality farmland (55% of the site) contrary to national policy.
- too close to Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBSPA)

-the description given that it is brownfield land is a misrepresentation. Less than 15% of the site constitutes brownfield and it is next to the SPA which has an exclusion area of 400m in respect of housing. The remains of the runway is now a rare flora and fauna habitat and no permanent dwellings have been built on it. The entire plot of land including the former airstrip continues to have Green Belt status.

-proximity to A3/ M25 bottleneck junction (junction 10 ).

-completely inappropriate location for over 2000 dwellings within the ancient village of Ockham disproportionate to the 159 homes in this village.

  - increased harm to air quality for the site, noise pollution and reduction of light would be to the detriment of the health and wellbeing of residents on and near the site.

-proposed Surrey County Council waste site is ignored in the proposal

-no proper traffic data

-SANG would cause harm to SPA

-extreme housing density with little space between

-damage to neighbouring communities by proposing to create a settlement of 5000 residents equivalent to numbers in both East and West Horsley combined.

-major impact on neighbouring villages, especially the Horsleys

-lack of information about the impact on the local water table and flooding on the site itself and areas of the local river Mole

-no existing public transport and stations too far away
-ignores the collective impact this site, together with nearby development sites, would have on the area

- unacceptable conflict of interest arising from the Conservative Party links between the developers and the Council, which has a Conservative party majority

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2240  Respondent: 11040737 / Jonathan Whitmore  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objections to Guildford Borough Council Proposed Local Plan (June 2016) and to remove East Horsley and West Horsley from the Green Belt. Specifically, 173 houses planned at the following locations:

- Thatcher’s Hotel, Guildford Road (48)
- Land near Horsley railway station, Ockham Road North (over the railway from the Village Hall) (100),
- Countryside Depot and Telephone Exchange, St Martin’s Close (15)
- Land at Fangate Manor, St Martin’s Close (10).

I object to the draft Local Plan for the following key reasons:

1. I object to a plan which proposes that over 70% of new housing be built within the Green Belt across the Borough. There is ample brownfield land in the urban areas which needs to be regenerated, without the need to encroach on protected Green Belt land.

2. I object to the disproportionate local allocation of housing in East Horsley.

3. I object to the threat the Local Plan poses to the historic rural village of East Horsley and the blight on properties there. The plan calls for an additional village of 173 residences in the immediate area, (with narrow lanes, little or no streetlights and many listed houses).

4. I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:
   1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking.
   2. The increased volume of car traffic on the roads.
   3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in East Horsley and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements.
   4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the limitations of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them).
   5. The lack of suitable public transport. The Horsley rail station will struggle to cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

5. I object to the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to the environmental and ecological value of these sites.
   1. Pollution: The large increase in volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment.
   2. Flooding: The site behind Ockham Road North in East Horsley is partially a level 3 flood risk area, and local residents are well aware of how much standing water there is in their gardens after rain. Building on such land will only exacerbate the problem.
   3. Schools: Local schools are already at capacity – where will newcomers go to school? No extra places are planned in the Horsleys, and any school places proposed as part of Wisley Airfield will not appear until many years into the project.
   4. Medical facilities: Similar situation to the schools.
6. I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the individual East & West Horsley Parish Plans. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in East Horsley are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village’s green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

I trust that these objections will be fully considered and that the proposed plans for an additional 173 residences in East Horsley is removed from the Local Plan with immediate effect.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/649  Respondent: 11041601 / Robert Bayley  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am very upset that the “revised” Local Plan circulated by Guildford Borough Council did not take my comments into consideration. I think it is based upon flawed logic and inaccurate and I would like to lodge my objection accordingly.

I OBJECT to the changes to Policies A36 to A41 (East and West Horsley)

• The number of potential development sites has been reduced by ONLY TWO (A36 and A41, representing a total of 138 dwellings). This leaves four sites (A27-40) which still represent a total of 395 new dwellings.
• Marginal changes such as these would still leave 70% of all new development in the borough built on Green Belt sites. No “exceptional circumstances” or any other justification is advanced for this strange imbalance.
• The deletion of two Horsley sites fails to correct the issue of relative overdevelopment in East and West Horsley, which is both excessive in absolute terms and disproportionate in relation to the rest of the borough.
• The plan fails to mention most of the known sustainability issues and infrastructure constraints affecting the Horsley sites, including public transport, traffic, road safety, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, flooding/surface drainage and shops. These were fully set out in responses to last year’s public consultation.
• The density of new housing on the four Horsley sites is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the locality at present. Collectively, the four Horsley sites breach NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/342  Respondent: 11049633 / Sue Wright  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We are writing to voice our concerns over the Draft Plan, and in particular Site A40, so we’ll begin with that one. How can it possibly be appropriate to build 120 houses on this site, when very recently Nigel Farley was refused permission to build two small, detached bungalows in Green Lane on the grounds of Inappropriate Development in the Green Belt, copy attached.
Access to Green Lane from the site would be difficult with Green Lane being little more than a single-track lane, extremely liable to flooding – we have had numerous occasions of raw sewage running down the lane - and the prospect of some additional 240 cars using it is unthinkable, along with the increased traffic turning in and out of Ockham Road North, particularly at the spot where local children cross to catch the Howard of Effingham bus. It is unlikely that many residents would even walk to the village shops, given that they’re a mile away with pavement on one side of the road only, necessitating crossing Ockham Road North by Waterloo Farm where traffic is often passing well in excess of the 40 mph speed limit and where tradesmen/delivery drivers/visitors seem to consider the footpath a parking zone.

It is interesting to note that the residents of Oakland Farm objected to an application for nearby dog walking on the grounds that their land was used by many native species of wildlife but don’t appear to care so much now that money is involved, letter attached.

If you add A37, 38, 39 and 40 together, this is an additional 395 houses in a small area which would have an extremely detrimental effect on traffic, schooling, medical centre. In addition, should site A38 also go ahead, the traffic on Long Reach would be much increased and given that during the football season, it is almost impossible to drive down this would cause much local disruption. If Wisley Airfield 2000 house development were also to go ahead, the whole area would be a nightmare.

The road surfaces in Ockham/the Horsleys are appalling, The Drift being spectacularly bad and with the ill thought decision to allow the golf club driving range to be allowed, traffic there and on Effingham Common Road will be disrupted and the roads further ruined.

The area is served by 2 train stations, neither of which have sufficient parking and we cannot believe that most commuters would walk or cycle to either given the narrow width of local road, no footpaths on much of the routes and no street lighting.

In general, we see the estimated population has increased by 4,938 since the last plan – where do these figures come from?? Also where are the increased 4,000 extra jobs coming from?

Traffic generally in the Ockham/Horsley/Ripley area is becoming a nightmare. There seems to be no time of day when there’s not a substantial queue to access the A3 London bound at Ripley. What the combined additional housing in Wisley, Ockham, the Horsleys would add to this is easy to imagine. And I have not looked closely at the plans for Ripley and Send but these would also have a huge impact.

[Attachment redacted due to statements 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: 2 Bungalows refused permission.pdf (399 KB)
seems to be no proposal for enhancing local bus services, footpaths and cycle paths in the Horsley area to try to mitigate this.

The removal of A41 from the plan is to be welcomed as its possible future use for a relocated and enlarged primary school would represent a better use of the land than more housing and address my reservations regarding the level of primary school provision in the area. However, I assume the existing school site would then be used for housing, offsetting partially or entirely the housing removed from the plan by deleting this site. The removal of this site from the plan will not therefore result in a reduction in the adverse impact of the plan on the roads, medical facilities, shop and station parking in West and East Horsley. I would like to see the removal of this site accompanied by the removal of one of the other sites in West Horsley (A38 or A40) to achieve a genuine reduction in the amount of extra housing imposed on the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3295  Respondent: 11078337 / Giselle Hampton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We are vehemently opposed to any changes to the current Green Belt and to the proposals identified in this letter which radically alter the character and nature of existing settlements, increase the pressure on already stretched local infrastructure or create entirely new developments in current rural locations effectively "urbanising" existing countryside.

Specifically we reject the whole concept of "inset" villages. If villages are currently "washed over" by the Green Belt, they should remain in the Green Belt and their settlement boundaries should remain unaltered to preserve their current character. We also object very strongly to any suggestion that a wholly new development should be permitted at the former Wisley Airfield site. This development would create massive challenges to surrounding roads and infrastructure and would be completely out of keeping with the rural nature of the surrounding countryside and be a massive encroachment into the openness of the existing Green Belt south of the 43. More generally, the focus on the three new strategic sites to the north of Guildford on either side of the 43 (up to 5,100 dwellings) and the numerous "inset-facilitated" developments in the Horsleys, Send and Ripley (up to 991- dwellings) effectively creates an urbanised corridor which radically alters the character of the Borough and should be rejected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/260  Respondent: 15084897 / Save Send Action Group (Andrew Procter)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

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 changes to Policies A36 to A41 (East and West Horsley)

1.2 The number of potential development sites has been reduced by two (A36 and A41, representing a total of 138 dwellings). This leaves four sites (A27-40) which still represent a total of 395 new dwellings.
1.3 Marginal changes such as these would still leave 70% of all new development in the borough built on Green Belt sites. No “exceptional circumstances” or any other justification is advanced for this strange imbalance.

1.4 The deletion of two Horsley sites fails to correct the issue of relative overdevelopment in East and West Horsley, which is both excessive in absolute terms and disproportionate in relation to the rest of the borough.

1.5 No attempt is made to assess the cumulative impact on the Horsleys – either of the four sites now proposed, or of Site A35 (Three Farms Meadow, alias “Wisley Airfield”), with over 2,000 new homes only 2 miles away. This piecemeal approach leaves the future of the Horsleys at the mercy of ad hoc planning applications, which is the opposite of what a Local Plan should intend.

1.6 The new plan Policies put greater emphasis on the need for adequate facilities and infrastructure to underpin development. But this is not reflected in any new wording on the Horsley sites, thus leaving most local objections unaddressed. Again, this defect curtails the plan’s usefulness as a practical planning tool at a site level and undermines its credibility among residents.

1.7 The plan fails to mention most of the known sustainability issues and infrastructure constraints affecting the Horsley sites, including public transport, traffic, road safety, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, flooding/surface drainage and shops. These were fully set out in responses to last year’s public consultation.

1.8 The density of new housing on the four Horsley sites too is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the locality at present.

1.9 Sites situated on the periphery of existing development in the Horsleys encroach on surrounding open fields and require the extension of settlement boundaries. The plan presents no arguments for this which, contrary to NPPF paragraph 79, will contribute to creeping urbanisation by attenuating the Green Belt corridors separating the Horsleys from neighbouring settlements.

1.10 Collectively, the four Horsley sites breach NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been an outstanding success story in the Horsleys, as detailed in response to the last consultation. Assets include a dense public footpath network, parish parks, sports fields, a campsite of international standard, Britain’s newest rural opera theatre and the popular Olympic cycle route. These examples of positive planning depend on a Local Plan that protects the Green Belt, maintains its openness and beauty and avoids urbanisation and traffic congestion. Sites A35-41 are hostile to this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
the tone of the area hugely. Surely we must be able to continue to find solutions by using a collection of smaller, brownfield and fill-in sites, preferably around the city itself, before we ever start taking whole swathes of practically unspoilt land and converting it to towns. I support the need for housing when intelligently done.

Specifically re the Horsley sites, I am of the view that the sites 36,37,38,39,40,41 represent a reasonable addition to the village, being within the existing green belt and village boundaries.

However, I also don’t want to see the Green Belt boundaries outside these village boundaries changed. We should be totally keeping Green Belt land. We need to protect the village greenbelt boundaries to remain as tight as possible, and continue to find solutions from WITHIN villages, all villages, or at the edge of the towns, or in brownfield /in fill sites within Guildford itself. But please keep the villages small.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/120  Respondent: 15129569 / Alistair Weight  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to hereby voice my objection to the further extensive development of East and West Horsley. We moved to the village specifically because it is quiet and has a lot of easily accessible greenbelt land. To remove greenbelt land would be extremely detrimental. Not only would we lose that greenbelt land, but there would also be an excessive pressure put on local services, roads and schools in particular. We already know of families in the village who have missed out on places in the local school due to being oversubscribed. Where will all of the children in these new houses go to school?

I urge you to please consider the overwhelming negative impact these developments will have on all local residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/127  Respondent: 15133377 / Joyce Vincente  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of East Horsley I write to express my concerns and to register my objection to the proposed submission Local Plan.

General Points

The number of houses planned has risen to 693 houses per year over the next 20 years (compared with 652 per year in the 2014 Draft) and is more than double the 322 houses per year that was approved in the 2003 Local Plan

65% of new houses in the Borough are to be built on land that is currently in the Green Belt.
Section 150 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 states that a site, once identified in a Local Plan, is assumed to have permission to go ahead in principle, which means normal planning restrictions may be difficult to impose later.

Little notice has been taken of the comments received after the last round of consultation.

Of particular concern to me and my family is that a more local level the proposals include:

- At least 148 more houses in East Horsley.
- At least 385 more houses in West Horsley.
- Both villages to be taken out of the Green Belt. The new boundary, (called the in-setting boundary) extends the old settlement boundary and includes some fields and open spaces. This means that if they aren’t already identified in the plan for development that they too, are vulnerable to future development. Eg Kingston Meadows (by East Horsley Village Hall) is included inside the insetting boundary – despite being a valuable green space. Why?
- Similarly Horsley Tennis & cricket club at the end of Pennymead Drive is also inside the insetting boundary. Why?
- 2,068 houses on the former Wisley Airfield (2.1 miles away).
- 400 houses at Burnt Common (3.2 miles away).
- 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill Farm (4.2 miles away).

This amount of development would have a huge negative impact on the local community and amenities – see next section.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I am writing you because of the New Local Plan involving the village I live, East Horsley.

We, my husband, son and I, moved here only recently for work in London City. We chose this area because it was located at the base of the Surrey Hills, an area of outstanding beauty. Only after we moved here we learned about the plans involving the building of new houses and the plan to change the status of the village we live in.

We believe building new houses should involve the improvement of the infrastructure. Only last week, with Green Dene closed and after a night of heavy rainfall, travel times plummeted. However, building and improving infrastructure would have a great impact on nature and the experience of nature. Changing the green belt status to a 'village' status, would shift the focus from persevering nature to urbanization, a shift undesirable.

Does the demand for houses justify the building of new houses? We noticed that there are a lot of houses for sale or to let in the area.

We may be passers by, as my surname may bear witness to, but we thought this of too much importance not to let our voice be heard.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Wisley airfield. This is because it will have a detrimental effect on our villages. It would mean there would be an extra 25000 cars on our already congested roads. It would mean there would be problems for doctors appointments and roads flooding. We do not east to see our countryside destroyed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/128</th>
<th>Respondent: 15157377 / David Harrison</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 have the following comments (objections) to the revised GBC Local Plan.

1. We note that East Horsley has not been restored to the Green Belt area. This in our view is a retrograde step bearing in mind national and local undertakings in the past to preserve the Green Belt. We also find it staggering that over 50% of proposed new housing would be in land that is presently Green Belt.

1. The number of new homes proposed in the revised plan seems excessive in the light of current informed opinion on population increase.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/327</th>
<th>Respondent: 15184545 / Kari Sherman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 relatively young and newer resident to East Horsley, and I am concerned about the local plans for our area. I have tried to go online to view them in greater details, but they are very unclear.

Our population is growing, houses need to be built - I understand that. What I am most concerned about, and do not see clearly online, is the infrastructure plans for these new houses.

I live off the Epsom Road, on Longhurst Road, near the Duke of Wellington. It is SO hard to safely leave my road, particularly during school run times or evening traffic hour. I dread the day my kids learn to drive and need to turn right out of my road - it is so dangerous with a curve on one direction and a blind hill in the other. If there were to be 48 new homes at the Thatcher’s Hotel site, so potentially 100 new cars entering this dangerous part of the Epsom Road, I would be very worried. There should be larger lanes, and perhaps some traffic calming measures for those travelling 60 mph on it.

And the local schools? Will they be expanded and given more funding for the increase in children expected to move in the new homes? The Howard of Effingham is no longer as strong as it used to be - larger class sizes, a reputation (and indeed children of friends) for drugs around, and small roads surrounding it are a concern.

Shopping - we have a horrible Budgens in East Horsley which is not suitable for the area - where are they all going to shop? The road to Cobham is again filled with residents, speed watch concerns and a 2 lane dangerous drive.
Parking at the train station - is almost at capacity with the current number of residents. The new ticket machine on the platform is GREATLY appreciated, but parking will need to be looked at if more residents will be using it.

I don’t mind growing, but I feel that the investment in the roads, schools and resources need to match the number of residents - and it doesn’t at the moment. I would be very concerned for road safety and for the children’s education if there were any more residents. I hope investment in the areas is completed before new homes can be built in the Green Belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/400  **Respondent:** 15198209 / Michael Bunstead  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I wish to register my protest at the proposed new housing development in East Horsley.

I strongly feel that this development will overstretched the local infrastructure leading to further strain on already congested local resources.

The added traffic pressure on schooling and regrading of the rural environment would be severe.

This project is unwise and ill thought out.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/480  **Respondent:** 15226241 / S Bishop  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I am writing just to endorse what other people have said.

So many houses will ruin our village, as it is the medical centre [text unreadable], the schools are at breaking point and we have very little [text unreadable] as it is.

As for taking some of the Green Belt would be terrible [text unreadable] as it was put there to protect villages such as ours.

[text unreadable]

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
### Comment ID: pslp173/585  Respondent: 15227905 / Nigel Alexander  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object strongly to the latest draft of the GBC local plan which has not allayed any of my concerns I raised in my original letter of objection.

The GBC plan still proposes to inset East Horsley from the Greenbelt, land which was designated as protected land for future generations, a decision made rightfully then and those reasons remain today and will do so into the future.

The development of over 2000 homes on the old Wisley Airfield site will change the landscape and environment of the local areas and beyond for ever and one feels will just continue the spread of Greater London into the countryside. The current infrastructure of roads, railways, schools, doctors surgeries, public services and the list goes on will not be able to handle such a large increase in the local population nor in many cases will it be possible to increase and improve those infrastructure requirements to meet the expanded needs. In short the local area will become paralysed and the lives of current residents diminished dramatically. One only needs to look at the already full railway car parks, the congestion at road junctions, the difficulty in securing a local school place and an appointment at the doctors to realise this to be the case. The proposed development of the Wisley site on its own would be a significant change to the quality of life in this part of Surrey without all the additional development proposals such as the additional 100 homes proposed near Horsley station.

What surprises me is that the new draft plan has not taken into account the revised ONS forecast for the increase in population which is less than half of the increase in housing stock being proposed. This daft plan needs to back to the drawing board.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: PSLPA16/500  Respondent: 15228993 / Peter Mazalon  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**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 inappropriate proposals to develop a large number of houses on Wisley Airfield and in the villages of East and West Horsley.

Collectively, you have failed to take into account the widespread resentment of your proposals in the local communities. In particular,

1) the residents within these communities have chosen to live in rural/semi rural surroundings. If they had wanted urbanisation then they would be living in better serviced and valued areas like Guildford or Surbiton. Our area is a magnet to visiting tourists from London and the surrounding areas to enjoy its beauty, unique wildlife and beautiful vistas in harmony with their surroundings. The amount of cyclists using our area is ever increasing and that is just one example of why it is important to protect our environment. This has a social and economic value.

2) The roads in our area are VERY poor. The conduct of the authorities in maintaining them is also poor. They are largely narrow lanes but with the increased traffic it can only make the situation worse for health and safety reasons.

3) The impact on our local services will be highly detrimental. Already, the stress of getting into the local doctors surgery at a suitable time or even just finding a suitable place to park can be very stressful to a large number of older residents in particular. Parking in the village is already poor especially at the weekend where even a minor event such as a wedding...
can make it extremely difficult. How will schooling cope? You are already adding to a county wide crisis of building more new homes with ever decreasing neighbourhood facilities.

4) The roads around East Horsley from 7am onwards are VERY busy. It can take up to 20 minutes on occasions just to cross the Effingham crossroads on the A246. Any additional housing of the scale you are proposing could lead to gridlock and again safety and pollution concerns in a wider area leading to the increased need for additional policing. Has this been included in your planning?

5) Local transport is very poor meaning ever increasing car journeys on ever more dangerous roads. There is virtually no existing infrastructure to accommodate these developments or very low levels of local employment which leads to increased traffic and environmental damage. The junction currently close to the Ockham Bites café onto the A3 is HIGHLY DANGEROUS. The traffic flow here is very fast and dense making it extremely difficult to join the road.

6) Within East and West Horsley once again the scale of these developments and some like on the Thatchers hotel site are on pristine land that I believe has never been sprayed by agri chemicals. Surely something to cherish.

Finally, if you feel the need to do a Milton Keynes style attack on some of our finest landscapes then consider further down the A3 corridor towards Guildford where the current car boot sale is held. This may give easier access onto the A3 by being on a straight stretch away from junctions and the damage to the landscape and environment is arguably more "acceptable" as it is arguably less polluting and gives a speedy access to the shops and facilities of Guildford and Burpham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/606  **Respondent:** 15248417 / Mary Pitkethly  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of East Horsley I strongly object and am amazed that you are even considering destroying n area of Green Belt to build many more houses The local school is full already and the doctors’ surgery only just copes with the present number of Horsley patients

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2527  **Respondent:** 15257281 / Kath Frackiewicz  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

East Horsley - I have no objection in principle to use the Thatcher's Hotel Site for housing provided the density is reduced and that adequate road access provisions are constructed due to the already very busy and dangerous situation that already exists at the junction of the B2039 with the main A246 road with its two dangerous bends at this location.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPA16/692  Respondent: 15265569 / Douglas and Sudha Young  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My wife and I have read the Comments on the 'Proposed Submission Plan' submitted by the East Horsley Parish Council, and are broadly in agreement with the Council.

Being residents in East Horsley, we find that the parking problems in the Village, and at the two railway stations, are worsening all the time, and cannot imagine how it would be if all the proposed new homes are built. The doctors surgery is very busy at the moment, and again, with a great influx of new home owners and their families, it might cause a collapse of the medical facilities, especially in view of the shortage of GPs now-a-days.

We are concerned about the plan to build on Green Belt land as well.

There is the other side of the coin however, in that more houses are needed that are affordable by young families. Also for elderly folk to downsize to.

Horsley is a very pleasant village, with more, perhaps, elderly people than is the norm in small communities. The village serves them extremely well. Most do not want to leave the village when downsizing their properties and so losing touch with all their friends.

So, knowing that you have a very difficult target for new homes to meet, We would suggest that the arguments made in the East Horsley Parish Councils letter of the 13th June 2016 are given very serious consideration in order to reduce the knock-on effects in the future.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3585  Respondent: 15274785 / Jon Hassell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have seen the recent plans for expansion of housing in East Horsley and surrounding areas, and have serious objections over the proposed plans. I struggle to accept that all the proposed areas in this draft plan would not severely negatively impact our village, it's community and facilities.

I moved into this area because I wished to move into a village community. I do not wish for it to now become a town. The local amenities are only just enough to support the current village community - I have deep concerns about the lack of amenities being proposed to support such a large increase in housing, being schools, roads, drainage, trains, parking, to name a few. Even if these were to be improved to cater for a larger population, it will change the whole essence of living the village.

The land adjacent to my house (Weston Lea, area 1275) is currently used by our children's primary school, The Raleigh, for sports. Are we to assume the facilities for the local primary school are to be decreased to make way for more housing?! I would have thought it wiser to try to increase the school facilities, not the opposite!
In addition, I believe the land is currently left free to allow itself for being used as a flood plain. If housing is allowed in this area, I would need confirmation that any flood damage would be insured for and compensated for by the council, if it in any way impacted my house.

In summary I object to the following key issues:

1) **Schooling** - the current primary school is already over subscribed - I cannot see sufficient measures to support the increase in number of children that will need schooling in this area. This is also true of secondary schools - the Howard of Effingham School is also at capacity.

2) **Flood risk** - the flooding and surface water levels in this area are already of serious concern, and more housing will obviously seriously exacerbate this problem. I do not see sufficient measures are being proposed to address this.

3) **Medical Facilities** - again, already at capacity for this village - what measures are being taken to increase this facility?

4) **Transport, roads, parking** - the train service from Horsley would need to vastly improve, longer trains, more frequent trains, more parking for commuters. With a possible 6000 additional cars frequenting the local roads, the impact on roads and parking will be tremendous. The parking for the local shops, medical centre, & village hall will be over stretched. The roads are already in such poor condition that the increase in traffic will only make this worse. It looks from the plans in the SCC report that "further thought may be required to managing traffic" - this is an absolute necessity, not an afterthought!

I hope you can consider these objections, and come to the logical conclusion that this Draft Plan is insufficiently prepared, and cannot realistically be condoned, as it will have a huge negative impact on the local area in both short and longer term.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/364  Respondent: 15314689 / Alice Cole  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It is really disappointing to see that Guildford Borough Council has not sought to constrain its overall housing growth in comparison with other many other councils who have, in order to protect the Green Belt. For years, Green Belt has been wholly protected and should continue to be. It has many proven benefits both for the health and wellbeing of people, and environmental factors. It's not necessary, flawed evidence continues to be used to justify overexpansion.

I therefore object wholeheartedly to no revised GBC changes being proposed since the 2016 consultation to insetting East & West Horsley from the green belt. Greenbelt boundaries should not be moved to cater for this over expansion of development which is not required.

The impact of these far reaching proposals is having a negative impact on many people in the Horsleys, living with this uncertainty over a prolonged period of time. Thousands of people have previously submitted comments on the plans, have the majority of these views being taken note of and implemented? Is there a report which reflects what the majority of views are and whether these have been addressed?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPA16/1001  Respondent: 15328097 / Tim, Barbara, Hugh and Clare Strange  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Guildford Borough Council’s Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites

My wife and I and our two children have lived in East Horsley since 2001 and we object to the proposals in the new Guildford local plan for the following reasons:

-We do not want the Horsleys to be removed from the Green Belt. The Green Belt protects our living environment and there is no justification to remove it;

-We do not want the Horsley settlement boundaries to be extended. We want to retain the existing village atmosphere and lifestyle;

-We do not want the development of over 2000 houses on the former Wisley airfield. The impact on our village would be enormous and make life intolerable; and,

-The local infrastructure is overloaded. It is difficult to get a medical appointment and to find a parking space in the village centre. The local schools are over-subscribed and the roads congested. The Local Plan would considerably worsen matters.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1315  Respondent: 15349761 / John Kettle  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

District Centre - GBC proposes that East Horsley is defined as a District East Horsley is a rural village with character and open spaces in Green Belt and does not have space available for warehousing, offices and industrial sites. There are already a number of empty shop sites which do not attract businesses so there is obviously no demand for a "District Centre".

Conclusion - There has been little or no change from the ill fated 2014 Plan. GBC continues to Plan to encroach on Green Belt land for which there are “no exceptional Circumstances”. No justification has been given for the proposed enormous growth in Housing in the Borough.

I therefore object most strongly to the Proposed Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1097  Respondent: 15350433 / K Telford Shute  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I recognise the need for new homes in the Borough of Guildford.

However I strongly object to the scale of the proposed building programme for East Horsley (where I have lived for more than forty years) for a number of reasons; mainly on the grounds that the proposal does not provide sufficient additional resources in terms of medical, educational and transport facilities to cope with a substantial increase in the number of people residing in the area.

I am even more concerned about the plan to remove East and West Horsley and some nearby villages from the Metropolitan Green Belt. This plan is contrary to the previously stated policy of the Council and if implemented will give the Council licence to build not only many more houses but also commercial and industrial premises, thus destroying all the natural charm of the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I would like to object very strongly to the latest draft of the GBC local plan.

This draft is still proposing to remove East Horsley from the Greenbelt. Development of 100 homes is proposed near Horsley station and over 2000 on the Wisley Airfield. The village of East Horsley (and surrounding villages such as West Horsley, Effingham & Ripley) do not have the infrastructure in terms of transport (roads, parking or rail), schools or medical facilities to meet this increased demand.

The whole point of Greenbelt is to protect our countryside. 57% of the new housing proposed is on Greenbelt land. This is outrageous!

Since Brexit, forecasts of increasing population numbers have been reduced. Why are you trying to increase our housing stock by 22% when the new forecast, since Brexit, has gone down to 10.4%?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1976  Respondent: 15463745 / P S Ives  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My wife and I have studied the Proposed Submission Local Plan that has been published for public consultation and our comments are detailed below. Having responded to the Draft Local Plan in my letter dated 8-9-15, it is disappointing to see that very few, if any, of our concerns and those of the other 20,000 responders at that stage appear to have been taken into account in the new plan, in particular:

- The excessive and unjustifiable housing needs
- Development within the Green Belt, including traveller
- The insetting of villages within the Green
- Proposed changes to the village settlement areas
- Misconceptions about the rural nature of East and West

East Horsley Parish Council has responded to the Plan in their letter dated 13-6-16 and we are pleased to endorse their comments, including the 27 policies which they support or to which they have no objections, amounting to over 70% of the plan. However, our principal concerns regarding the remaining 30% of the plan are as follows:

The objective of adding nearly 14,000 new houses within the borough is excessive and cannot be justified by the calculations submitted, based on population growth that is 67% higher than officially forecast by the We understand that this is a result of a policy decision by Guildford Borough Council to promote aggressive civic and economic expansion that is not supported by a majority of the electorate. Furthermore, the vote to leave the EU, if it results in better controlled immigration, could reduce the housing need significantly.

We object strongly to these targets and this political policy, under S2 and H2 of the plan.

We are singularly unimpressed by the wording of the plan towards protection of the Green Belt, while instituting changes that include the insetting of villages within the Green Belt and extending the boundaries of the East Horsley Settlement

We object strongly to both these policies under P2 Para. 4.3.13 and 4.3.16 respectively

They would destroy the rural nature of East Horsley, with its low density housing, and are contrary to the guidelines of the NPPF, putting much open agricultural and recreational land under risk of intense housing development.
The proposal to remove Wisley Airfield from the Green Belt under 4.3.17 and Policy A35 is outrageous, when approval for planning application 15/P/00012 has recently been refused for very good reasons, as totally unsuitable for the location. Guildford Borough Council's refusal of 15/P/00012 stated that the application was non compliant with existing Local Plan 2003 policies G1, GS, H11, HE4, HE10, NE1, NE4 and RE2, Chapters 4, 6, 12 of the NPPF and other regulations including the South East Plan 2009.

We endorse the comments expressed in East Horsley Parish Council's supplementary letter dated 4-7-16 and object in the strongest possible terms to the inclusion of Wisley Airfield in the list of potential sites and its removal from the Green Belt. Our grounds for objecting include:

1. The fundamental breach of Metropolitan Green Belt rules, regulations and the underlying spirit
2. That unfulfilled housing need does not qualify as a 'very special circumstance'.
3. That it would not meet acceptable levels of sustainability, with deficiencies such as lack of infrastructure, sewage, schools, medical services, shops and local employment, together with the destruction of agricultural land and environmental damage.
4. Severe impact on local traffic due to the lack of adequate public transport and consequently excess motor traffic travelling on inadequate country This is exacerbated by the current problem of large vehicles that are too wide for the lanes being directed here by inappropriate SatNav instructions.
5. Damaging health and safety issues for the proposed new residents arising from NOx emissions due to the close proximity to the M25 and A3.
6. Deleterious effects on local wildlife.
7. Development that would be destructively out of character for the area.

We agree with the paragraph in the Spatial Vision Section 2 that the growth in the plan is predicated on the delivery of the necessary infrastructure. The lack of suitable infrastructure has been one of the reasons for the refusal of planning applications in the past. However, we do not agree that this expression of intent is sufficient justification for many of the developments proposed in the plan and we question whether the proposed infrastructure improvements are actually feasible, economically viable and advantageous to this area.

East Horsley Parish Council's first letter addresses the shortcomings of the East Horsley infrastructure under Policies I1, I2 and I3 and we endorse the need to make improvements to roads, drainage, pavements, schools and medical facilities. These do not all come under the aegis of Guildford Borough Council and the failure to address the deficiencies of the existing infrastructure to meet the needs of the present population is a good reason to doubt the credibility of the intentions in the plan.

Regarding the Site Policies in particular, we have strong reservations about the suitability of Policies A36 ('Thatchers' (Ramada) Hotel, Guildford Road); A37 (Bell & Colville); A38 (East Horsley); A39 (Ockham Road North); A40 (East Horsley) and A41 (East Horsley), representing a total of 533 houses. We object on grounds of both the high density of houses intended to be built and the way that the two villages of East and West Horsley, which have very different characters, would become merged into one semi-urban sprawl - in effect a housing estate. In particular cases such as A36, we have major concerns about highway safety on the A246.

Guildford Borough Council continues to claim, hypocritically, that it is defending the Green Belt, while attempting to impose excessive, unjustified housing numbers. The residents of East Horsley feel very strongly about the potential impact of the changes proposed in the plan and, while not presuming to comment on the many other villages within the borough that would be similarly affected, we do enjoin Guildford Borough council to proceed no further with these proposals without the explicit agreement of all the affected communities 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 write further to the publication of the above document and write to express my objection to elements of its contents.

My principle overarching objection is the proposal to take a number of Surrey villages out of the Green Belt, and East and West Horsley in particular. This proposal in particular will have "urbanisation" implications far beyond those envisaged by the mantra that more houses must be built in the Borough. Whilst I fully accept the need to provide additional housing in the Borough, I do not agree with the drastic actions of removing the Green Belt status in order to be able to provide large scale developments that would otherwise be subject to far greater planning scrutiny.

I object to your proposal to remove a number of classic Surrey villages that currently give the area its charm, beauty, character, history and overall appeal is outrageous.

I object to your proposal to remove the Horlseys from the Green Belt was established for a very defined purpose by statute. It was designed to prevent urban sprawl and to a large extent has succeeded in doing this. It is there for the benefit of not just our generation but those that succeed us. This area not only contains many areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty but also Sites of Special Scientific Interest. The Green Belt enables these areas to be protected in order that the Guildford/Leatherhead/Dorking area does not become a suburban sprawl such as Hersham/Weybridge/Walton on Thames.

Large numbers of people visit the Surrey Hills area because of its stunning beauty, villages and leisure. These visitors in turn support many businesses both large and small whose livelihood depends upon the area retaining its rural charm. You simply have to remember that these people are your citizens, your ratepayers and your electorate and changing the nature of their environment will potentially destroy the uniqueness of their businesses.

I object to the volume of housing, and associated density of construction, which is currently proposed in the Horsleys is completely out of keeping with their village. The proposal to build 180 houses in East Horsley and 411 in West Horsley is completely disproportionate to the housing stock currently in existence. There has not been any detailed study undertaken proving the need for this level of housing in these locations, the size and style of the proposed houses or the impact on the surrounding infrastructure.

I object to the proposals as many of these sites do not reflect the level of infrastructure in place to support such a volume of housing, from schools to medical facilities, shops, bus services, train station parking and We have seen how many villages in the area have been blighted by the bolt on Council Estates of the post war years - dumped on village back land with no regard to the architectural merits of the development, the local amenities on offer or the employment of the proposed residents. Each site should be considered on its own individual merits under the existing planning regime which has been designed to protect the environment of our rural life and given its particular circumstances.

I object to the proposal to build 100 houses on site A39 in East Horsley as it is fundamentally unsound. The plan already recognises that the site is in a flood plain and notes that the flood risk needs to be reduced and that accordingly there is to be no greater flood risk to anywhere else. Surely by interfering with the flood plain in this location can only transfer the flood plain impact somewhere else? That may be downstream of the site or onto adjoining properties. If there is no interference with the flood plain at the site doesn't become viable for 100 houses. The existing proposal by Cateby Land to develop 100 affordable homes here simply does not sit comfortably with any sustainable, accessible or employment rationale. It is building the wrong types of houses in the wrong place.

I also do not believe that the Council has given sufficient regard to where all these new inhabitants are going to be. There is little or no employment in these villages, there is very little bus transport, the railways are currently crammed in rush hour with no room for extra capacity and the station car parks are not big enough to cater for more cars. And yet how are people meant to get to work in Guildford, Woking and London as the primary employment centres? The answer will be by car, whether this be by way of a short journey to the station (where they will end up parking on the streets) or a full journey into Guildford (which is already rammed in rush hour). I cannot see how this can sit comfortably with the Council’s Green agenda. The Council certainly will not be
able to force the bus and train companies to extend their services as these are now privately owned businesses operating for profit.

6. I object to the Council’s failure to unlock the development potential of brownfield sites and the volume of currently unoccupied residential properties in the Borough should be given a greater priority in the search for developable land before ruining the environment, livelihood and well-being of a unique area of

Remember, there will be no opportunity to undo any development resulting from these proposals. You will not be able to wind back time.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2029  Respondent: 15468353 / David Collett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

New Local Plan

I have seen the new local plan and have several objections to lodge with you

I think you are planning to build too many new homes in both West and East Horsley. Our roads will not cope with the additional traffic, all our local services such as schools, the Doctors’ Surgery and our shops have insufficient space for parking now and will not cope with any increase. This, of course. This, of course, also applies to the railway station.

Our local schools and medical services are already running at full capacity and would not be able to service the additional population I think you probably plan on building additional schools and medical centres to deal with this problem but, as no indication is given in your plan. I can only assume this would require you to build on yet more green field sites. This think is quite unacceptable.

Maybe a reduced number of homes behind existing housing would be acceptable but particularly object to plans to build housing estates along the roads through the village. This will alter the look of our village and produce something that simply looks like a suburb of Guildford.

I would like also mention that the local facilities for dealing with sewage are already

Under pressure. Where on earth is all the extra human waste going to be dealt with? Will this require yet more building over open spaces?

Finally but most importantly I object to your proposals to take our two villages of East and West Horsley out of the protection of the "Green Belt". This is a rural area and should remain so.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2160  Respondent: 15480577 / E C Fairweather  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I have the following objections to the proposed plan:

The proposed development of 48 houses at Thatcher's Hotel would severely impact on the already congested A246, particularly at peak times with drivers attempting to turn right out of the site. There is a strong potential for serious accidents to occur with vehicles exiting the petrol station at the same time. In addition, the density is out-of-keeping with the area.

The proposed travellers site on the old-telephone site, next to St. Martin's Close is particularly unsuitable due to the adjacent Care Home and sheltered accommodation. Many elderly people walk to Bishopsmead Parade and could find the site very intimidating.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2477   Respondent: 15500129 / Lauraine Banks   Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing in response to the draft local plan and in particular the proposal to change the Settlement Boundary so that it includes Fangate Manor, thereby removing Fangate Manor from the Green Belt.

1. I OBJECT to the proposal to inset East Horsley from the Green Belt. The proposal to inset East Horsley from the Green Belt will be detrimental to the rural character of the village and should be dropped. The specific changes proposed are not justified under the National Planning Policy Framework rules.
2. I strongly oppose and OBJECT to the proposal to remove Fangate Manor from the Green Belt and include it within the Settlement Boundary. There are no exceptional Planning circumstances to justify removing Fangate Manor from the Green Belt, and changing the Settlement Boundary does not in any way enhance the defensible nature of the Settlement Boundary. It merely involves moving the boundary from one hedgerow to another, but leads to the loss of Green Belt and agricultural land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2480   Respondent: 15500449 / John Banks   Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing in response to the draft local plan and in particular the proposal to change the Settlement Boundary so that it includes Fangate Manor, thereby removing Fangate Manor from the Green Belt.

1. I OBJECT to the proposal to inset East Horsley from the Green Belt. The proposal to inset East Horsley from the Green Belt will be detrimental to the rural character of the village and should be dropped. The specific changes proposed are not justified under the National Planning Policy Framework rules.
2. I strongly oppose and OBJECT to the proposal to remove Fangate Manor from the Green Belt and include it within the Settlement Boundary. There are no exceptional Planning circumstances to justify removing Fangate Manor from the Green Belt, and changing the Settlement Boundary does not in any way enhance the defensible
nature of the Settlement Boundary. It merely involves moving the boundary from one hedgerow to another, but leads to the loss of Green Belt and agricultural land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3923</th>
<th>Respondent: 15503969 / Katy Denham</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 continued inclusion of a site (the former Wisley Airfield, - now known as Three Farm Meadows) - where the planning application has already been unanimously rejected by GBC’s Planning Committee. After 14 months of consideration (and various extensions and amendments), Wisley Property Investments Ltd’s (WPIL) planning application was unanimously rejected by GBC on 8th April 2016 on the recommendation of GBC Planning Officers, who cited the same grave concerns highlighted in this letter. Serious concerns about this site have also been raised by a broad number of authoritative sources across the UK, including Highways England, Thames Water, NATS and the Environment Agency. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2569</th>
<th>Respondent: 15504737 / Alison Davies</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once again we are asked to give our views on a local plan for this area in which we live. Once again we are required to say NO to large developments that will totally change the character of this area no longer making it a village but part of an urban sprawl. I moved from a city because my family and I wanted to live in a village and all that entails. Large green spaces for children to enjoy and their children. Not vast housing estates taking away the character of village life. All the problems of urban living overcrowding of roads/ country lanes. Over stretched local services, schools and health services. We have to protect our Green Belt not only for future generations but also for the animal population. I do not understand how by the stroke of a pen and the lure of developers money that Green Belt status can be rescinded. It makes make me question if certain people in authority in the council and above have vested interest in the proposed development. If we can not protect the green belt future generations will never have any understanding of what green fields and space is like they will just be used to vast urban areas. It is out duty to fight for the right to protect our Green Belt. I understand the need for housing there are plenty of brown filled sites around Guildford that are better placed for road access and ammenities. We will not give up and will campaign and fight the council at every opportunity. Say NO to the local plan. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/233</th>
<th>Respondent: 15505633 / John Hume</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I am writing to register my strong objection to the latest draft of the Guildford Borough Council local plan.

I am very disappointed to see that it still proposes to inset East Horsley from the Greenbelt in order to facilitate the development of 100 homes proposed near to Horsley Station and over 2000 homes on Wisley Airfield. Why, when the ONS forecast predicts only a 10.4% increase in population size for Guildford does GBC seek to increase housing stock by 22%?

At present the local infrastructure is not sufficient to support the demand put on it in terms of schooling, medical facilities and transport. How does GBC propose that a huge increase in demand will be slotted into the local infrastructure?

When you consider all the proposed changes to East Horsley, the equation proposed by GBC simply does not add up. Again, please note my strong objection to this latest draft of the Guildford Borough Council local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. The site will have a severe impact on local traffic and infrastructure:

The roads around East Horsley are to say the least poor with many being little more than winding lanes without pavements and the main through roads Forest Road and Ockham Road South and North pass through residential areas that are in many places narrow and unlit. Any increase in the local population will only put added pressure to the volume of traffic going through the village centre and in and around Horsley Station and Effingham Junction Station which will add to the congestion at peak hours. The likely further traffic congestion at the A3 I M25 intersection will only exacerbate the existing problems.

Other facilities in the Horsleys such as schools and the East Horsley Medical centre will not be able to cope with the additional population planned as a result of the Wisley Airfield and proposals for housing in the Horsleys.

2. The development is totally out of keeping with the local character, context and distinctiveness:

East Horsley with 1,760 homes is currently the largest settlement borough outside Guildford itself with a housing density of 8.1dph within its settlement area. The proposal at Wisley Airfield is to build 2,100 homes, which is 19% more housing than in East Horsley at a density of 6 times as much (49.1 dph) which is similar to that utilised in a metropolitan area. This sort of development is completely out of character for an area of rural Surrey and the character of the whole area would be irreparably damaged if the Wisley Airfield development goes ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
POLICY P2: Green Belt

Paragraph 4.3.13: Proposal to inset East Horsley from the Green Belt

Policy P2 proposes that East Horsley should be inset from the Green Belt, instead of being ‘washed over’ as it is today. Currently development is permitted within the settlement boundary, although this area is still considered to be Green Belt with a particular planning regime being applicable.

East Horsley is set in a rural location and the village has the look and feel of a rural village. Its Green Belt status has been a key factor in preserving that character. Moreover, being ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt has not been a serious constraint on development within the village. For example, GBC’s planning records indicate that no less than 149 net new homes were added to the village housing stock through in-filling and brownfield developments between 2000 and 2015.

GBC attributes the need to inset East Horsley to NPPF requirements, arguing that the test for remaining ‘washed over’ is that the village should make an important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt. This East Horsley clearly does. No less than 36% of East Horsley is composed of woodlands, whilst inside the settlement area there is an average housing density of just 8.1 dwellings per hectare (‘dph’). Woodlands and large residential gardens make a vital contribution towards biodiversity, provide wildlife corridors, and furnish those open spaces which are vital to the character of the greenbelt. It is one thing for a planner to study a map and see a settlement area filled with housing, but it is quite another actually to come to a rural village like East Horsley and see how the Green Belt has preserved the rural character and openness of this village.

Today East Horsley is a picturesque and flourishing rural community, which has and continues to experience steady incremental growth as a result of being ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt. Therefore there is no need to change its status.

I therefore OBJECT to the proposal to inset East Horsley from the Green Belt and requests that this proposal be dropped from the Local Plan.

Paragraph 4.3.16 and Proposals Map: Settlement Boundary changes in East Horsley

GBC are proposing to make a number of changes to the settlement boundaries of East Horsley and so expand the settlement area, as set out in the Proposals Map, with the justifications seemingly provided in the Green Belt & Countryside Study prepared by the consultants, Pegasus.

I object to two specific boundary changes, which have been proposed, as follows:

1. i) There is a proposal to move the East Horsley settlement boundary westwards from behind the houses on the west side of Ockham Road North up to the eastern boundary of Lollesworth Wood. This proposal removes over 5 hectares of agricultural fields from the Green Belt. The present boundary line is clearly defined by a deep and well-maintained drainage ditch which is classified by the Environment Agency as a ‘main river line’ and therefore represents a highly defensible Green Belt boundary. Moving this boundary west to the edge of woodland in no way improves its defensibility. Under NPPF rules Green Belt boundaries should only be changed in ‘exceptional circumstances’. I do not believe this proposal can be considered as an exceptional circumstance. Clearly the only justification for this change is to bring a large agricultural field within the settlement area in order to provide more housing land. However, under NPPF rules this is not a sufficient justification for changing a Green Belt boundary. As such, I believe it is an invalid proposal. I, accordingly, OBJECT to this proposed boundary change.

1. ii) There is also a proposal to move the East Horsley settlement boundary westwards from behind the houses on the west side of Kingston Avenue up to a tree line running along the Parish Boundary at the western edge of Kingston Meadows. The result is to take all of Kingston Meadows out of the Green Belt. Kingston Meadows is the main public recreational space of East Horsley, comprising various sports facilities and playing fields. The present settlement boundary is clearly defined by a deep and well-maintained drainage ditch running along its eastern side. It therefore represents a very defensible Green Belt boundary. Moving this boundary westwards to
the edge of woodland in no way improves its defensibility. Under NPPF rules Green Belt boundaries should only be changed in ‘exceptional circumstances’. I do not believe that this can be considered as an exceptional circumstance. As such I believe this is an invalid proposal. I accordingly OBJECT to this proposed boundary change.

In the Green Belt & Countryside Study and its accompanying Topic Paper, GBC justifies the need to make changes in settlement boundaries in order to meet unfulfilled housing need in the Borough. However, Green Belt rules make it clear that unfulfilled housing need is not normally considered to be ‘an exceptional circumstance’. If it were the entire Green Belt would already be covered in tarmac.

The NPPF is clear that every movement in settlement boundaries must be justified by ‘exceptional circumstances’. GBC have offered only a generic justification in their Topic Paper of meeting unfulfilled housing need, but a case by case justification has not been provided. As such, I believe Local Plan Response 13.06.16 the settlement boundary changes referred to above (and many others) are invalid without such detailed justification.

Paragraph 4.3.17: Proposal to remove Wisley Airfield from the Green Belt I OBJECT to the proposal to remove Wisley Airfield from the Green Belt. The only justification for this proposed change is unfulfilled housing need which is not considered an exceptional circumstance. The proposed Wisley development is discussed further below in the Site Allocation section.

INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES This section of the Proposed Submission Local Plan sets out details covering a range of infrastructure policies.

POLICIES I1, I2 & I3 These three policies cover Infrastructure & Delivery, Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’ and Sustainable Transport. Whilst I support the general policy statements as presented in each case, it is the detailed infrastructure proposals for Guildford Borough which give us cause for concern. I believe there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will exacerbate this problem. I would make the following comments specifically about infrastructure in East Horsley today:

- Roads across the parish are in poor condition with many potholes. Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic;
- The principal through roads traversing East Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. As a senior SCC councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: “East Horsley has lanes, not roads.” East Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV’s now using them;
- Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains. Any substantial development as indicated within the Local Plan will increase hard surfaces in the area and therefore the rainfall runoff will increase into local watercourses and exasperate localised flooding.
- The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs;
- There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Dorking or Woking; and
- The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients.

Train services to and from Horsley to London on the ‘Guildford via Cobham’ line are already at full capacity at peak times. The current service has to be substantially improved BEFORE allowing further development. Such improvements should include additional train services and additional stations to support new communities.

It is recognised that, as stated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the maintenance of adequate infrastructure and its expansion to meet growing needs is the responsibility of the relevant infrastructure provider. This is often not GBC itself.
but rather, for example, Surrey County Council, South West Trains or utility companies. Surely GBC must see the infrastructure improved first before approving any new developments.

In respect of East Horsley, there are only two specific proposals in Appendix C:

LRN 25 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme.

It is not clear what is proposed here, and its timing and funding have to be considered uncertain. It is stated that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution. However, it Local Plan Response 13.06.16 is not at all clear what development is likely to give rise to such a contribution, but it certainly implies that funding could only come if there were a development; and

HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5 – 15 of the plan. There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example roads, pavements, drainage, and schools. Furthermore, it is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this. Although an expansion of the Medical centre is proposed in the Infrastructure Schedule, this is not until years 5 – 15 of the Plan. Given that it is already at capacity, I believe that this needs to be implemented earlier.

Local primary schooling is also a very pertinent issue. There are 11 housing development sites identified in the LAA for East and West Horsley, which taken together would result in the building of 593 new houses in the two parishes that are today served by a single primary school - The Raleigh, in West Horsley.

Planning guidance suggest that this number of new homes will require the provision of around 150 additional primary school places to accommodate such an increase in population. Today there is no spare capacity at The Raleigh, yet no proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in the Horsley’s. I believe that the failure to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure to meet the needs of what is there already is a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

I therefore OBJECT to the infrastructure proposals on these grounds. I also OBJECT to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

There is a legacy of approving development without the appropriate infrastructure, and the infrastructure lags to the point it cannot cope, whether this schools, trains, roads or utilities. GBC in their local plan set out a vision of development, however the details of the infrastructure upgrades needed to today are not firm legal commitments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy P2 proposes that East Horsley should be inset from the Green Belt, instead of being ‘washed over’ as it is today. Currently development is permitted within the settlement boundary, although this area is still considered to be Green Belt with a particular planning regime being applicable.

East Horsley is set in a rural location and the village has the look and feel of a rural village. Its Green Belt status has been a key factor in preserving that character. Moreover, being ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt has not been a serious constraint on development within the village. For example, GBC’s planning records indicate that no less than 149 net new homes were added to the village housing stock through in-filling and brownfield developments between 2000 and 2015.

GBC attributes the need to inset East Horsley to NPPF requirements, arguing that the test for remaining ‘washed over’ is that the village should make an important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt. This East Horsley clearly does. No less than 36% of East Horsley is composed of woodlands, whilst inside the settlement area there is an average housing density of just 8.1 dwellings per hectare (‘dph’). Woodlands and large residential gardens make a vital contribution towards biodiversity, provide wildlife corridors, and furnish those open spaces which are vital to the character of the greenbelt. It is one thing for a planner to study a map and see a settlement area filled with housing, but it is quite another actually to come to a rural village like East Horsley and see how the Green Belt has preserved the rural character and openness of this village.

Today East Horsley is a picturesque and flourishing rural community, which has and continues to experience steady incremental growth as a result of being ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt. Therefore there is no need to change its status.

I therefore OBJECT to the proposal to inset East Horsley from the Green Belt and requests that this proposal be dropped from the Local Plan.

Paragraph 4.3.16 and Proposals Map: Settlement Boundary changes in East Horsley

GBC are proposing to make a number of changes to the settlement boundaries of East Horsley and so expand the settlement area, as set out in the Proposals Map, with the justifications seemingly provided in the Green Belt & Countryside Study prepared by the consultants, Pegasus.

I object to two specific boundary changes, which have been proposed, as follows:

1. There is a proposal to move the East Horsley settlement boundary westwards from behind the houses on the west side of Ockham Road North up to the eastern boundary of Lollesworth Wood. This proposal removes over 5 hectares of agricultural fields from the Green Belt. The present boundary line is clearly defined by a deep and well-maintained drainage ditch which is classified by the Environment Agency as a ‘main river line’ and therefore represents a highly defensible Green Belt boundary. Moving this boundary west to the edge of woodland in no way improves its defensibility. Under NPPF rules Green Belt boundaries should only be changed in ‘exceptional circumstances’. I do not believe this proposal can be considered as an exceptional circumstance. Clearly the only justification for this change is to bring a large agricultural field within the settlement area in order to provide more housing land. However, under NPPF rules this is not a sufficient justification for changing a Green Belt boundary. As such, I believe it is an invalid proposal. I, accordingly, OBJECT to this proposed boundary change.

1. There is also a proposal to move the East Horsley settlement boundary westwards from behind the houses on the west side of Kingston Avenue up to a tree line running along the Parish Boundary at the western edge of Kingston Meadows. The result is to take all of Kingston Meadows out of the Green Belt. Kingston Meadows is the main public recreational space of East Horsley, comprising various sports facilities and playing fields. The present settlement boundary is clearly defined by a deep and well-maintained drainage ditch running along its eastern side. It therefore represents a very defensible Green Belt boundary. Moving this boundary westwards to the edge of woodland in no way improves its defensibility. Under NPPF rules Green Belt boundaries should only be changed in ‘exceptional circumstances’. I do not believe that this can be considered as an exceptional circumstance. As such I believe this is an invalid proposal. I accordingly OBJECT to this proposed boundary change.
In the Green Belt & Countryside Study and its accompanying Topic Paper, GBC justifies the need to make changes in settlement boundaries in order to meet unfulfilled housing need in the Borough. However, Green Belt rules make it clear that unfulfilled housing need is not normally considered to be ‘an exceptional circumstance’. If it were the entire Green Belt would already be covered in tarmac.

The NPPF is clear that every movement in settlement boundaries must be justified by ‘exceptional circumstances’. GBC have offered only a generic justification in their Topic Paper of meeting unfulfilled housing need, but a case by case justification has not been provided. As such, I believe Local Plan Response 13.06.16 the settlement boundary changes referred to above (and many others) are invalid without such detailed justification.

Paragraph 4.3.17: Proposal to remove Wisley Airfield from the Green Belt I OBJECT to the proposal to remove Wisley Airfield from the Green Belt. The only justification for this proposed change is unfulfilled housing need which is not considered an exceptional circumstance. The proposed Wisley development is discussed further below in the Site Allocation section.

INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES This section of the Proposed Submission Local Plan sets out details covering a range of infrastructure policies.

POLICIES I1, I2 & I3 These three policies cover Infrastructure & Delivery, Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’ and Sustainable Transport. Whilst I support the general policy statements as presented in each case, it is the detailed infrastructure proposals for Guildford Borough which give us cause for concern. I believe there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will exacerbate this problem. I would make the following comments specifically about infrastructure in East Horsley today:

- Roads across the parish are in poor condition with many potholes. Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic;
- The principal through roads traversing East Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. As a senior SCC councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: “East Horsley has lanes, not roads.” East Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV’s now using them;
- Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains. Any substantial development as indicated within the Local Plan will increase hard surfaces in the area and therefore the rainfall runoff will increase into local watercourses and exasperate localised flooding.
- The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs;
- There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Dorking or Woking; and
- The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients.

Train services to and from Horsley to London on the ‘Guildford via Cobham’ line are already at full capacity at peak times. The current service has to be substantially improved BEFORE allowing further development. Such improvements should include additional train services and additional stations to support new communities.

It is recognised that, as stated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the maintenance of adequate infrastructure and its expansion to meet growing needs is the responsibility of the relevant infrastructure provider. This is often not GBC itself but rather, for example, Surrey County Council, South West Trains or utility companies. Surely GBC must see the infrastructure improved first before approving any new developments.

In respect of East Horsley, there are only two specific proposals in Appendix C:

LRN 25 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme.
It is not clear what is proposed here, and its timing and funding have to be considered uncertain. It is stated that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution. However, it Local Plan Response 13.06.16 is not at all clear what development is likely to give rise to such a contribution, but it certainly implies that funding could only come if there were a development; and

HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5 – 15 of the plan. There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example roads, pavements, drainage, and schools. Furthermore, it is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this. Although an expansion of the Medical centre is proposed in the Infrastructure Schedule, this is not until years 5 – 15 of the Plan. Given that it is already at capacity, I believe that this needs to be implemented earlier.

Local primary schooling is also a very pertinent issue. There are 11 housing development sites identified in the LAA for East and West Horsley, which taken together would result in the building of 593 new houses in the two parishes that are today served by a single primary school - The Raleigh, in West Horsley.

Planning guidance suggest that this number of new homes will require the provision of around 150 additional primary school places to accommodate such an increase in population. Today there is no spare capacity at The Raleigh, yet no proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in the Horsley’s. I believe that the failure to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure to meet the needs of what is there already is a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

I therefore OBJECT to the infrastructure proposals on these grounds. I also OBJECT to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

There is a legacy of approving development without the appropriate infrastructure, and the infrastructure lags to the point it cannot cope, whether this schools, trains, roads or utilities. GBC in their local plan set out a vision of development, however the details of the infrastructure upgrades needed to today are not firm legal commitments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/226  Respondent:  15595553 / Carol Davis  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of West Horsley who works in Send I am writing to object again to the Guildford Local Plan.

As one of the 30,000+ local residents who objected to the Local Plan in 2016 I note that there is very little evidence of change with regard to expansion into the Green Belt. I also note that some areas have had large plans withdrawn completely (Normandy and Flexford) whereas other areas, mostly to the east of Guildford, have more than their fair share of proposed development in the Green Belt

I object to the fact that there has been NO change to the insetting of West and East Horsley from the Green Belt

I question the housing numbers put forward by Guildford estimating that the town will grow by 25% by 2034. This is nearly double the predicted growth for Guildford from the Office for National Statistics. Guildford MUST constrain its housing growth and do more to protect the Green Belt. There needs to be more housing in the town centre and on brownfield sites
I object that there have been NO changes to improve the sustainability of the West Horsley development sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3458  Respondent: 15601953 / Stephen Yandle  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- Amount of new housing far exceeds local need.
- Housing density excessive when compared with existing development.
- Would transform the Horsleys into a sizable town, something for which no case is made.
- No local support.
- Collective impact of these 6 sites on a small part of the borough not considered. Should not be treated as isolated, separate sites.
- Total amount of new building out of scale with the planned development elsewhere the borough, especially less sensitive urban areas not protected by Green Belt.
- Sites unsustainable. Key infrastructure lacking. No adequate provision is made to increase it – e.g. poor wastewater capacity, lack of schools, absence of traffic management plan, flooding.
- No account taken of additional impact of Wisley Airfield site on Horsleys.
- Extension of settlement boundaries too permissive. Horsleys characterised by streets with development along only one side of the road. Policies allow too many adjacent green fields to be developed by squaring off boundaries and claiming they don’t contribute to Green Belt “openness”.
- Green Belt gap with neighbouring settlements hugely narrowed, especially if Wisley Airfield is built on.
- Will harm compliance with NPPF 81 – e.g. by making cycling (including Prudential cycle races) too dangerous, ruining the rural setting of Waterloo Farm campsite, destroying the ambience of Grange Park Opera’s new “Theatre in the Woods”.
- Policy A40 especially unviable because of high water table and poor drainage, leading to regular winter flooding.
- Safe access and egress at Site A40 unachievable, owing to flooding, high speed limits, poor sight lines, narrow access to existing properties, inadequate pavements for elderly and schoolchildren, increasing use by recreational cyclists etc.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3548  Respondent: 15608193 / P K Sukumaran Nair  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a regular visitor to the area, I would like to raise my objections to Guildford Borough Council’s Draft Local Plan.

My son and his family live in the East Horsley. I visit weekly to look after my grandchildren and therefore also the area’s facilities. I also live in Surrey, on the border between Camberley town and Frimley village. Since moving in over 30 year
ago, I have seen first-hand what a dramatic change housing and development can make on an area; transforming from being relatively quiet to becoming a major conurbation.

There are few places in the South of England that are as beautiful and charming as the countryside and villages of the Surrey Hills. Unlike the area around Camberley, I was under the impression that the green belt would protect the welfare of the children, the well-being of the village communities and an area of outstanding natural beauty. The proposed plan seems intent on destroying, rather than protecting the area’s character.

The proposed increase in housing would have a severe negative impact, and seems far too large for such small villages. Changing village and green belt boundaries should not be allowed. Transport and roads will not be able to cope with the step change increase in use, from the moment the construction starts. Roads are already in poor condition, there are limits on how village roads can be developed and there will be no way to ‘bypass’ the traffic away. The infrastructure impacts seem to be underestimated or unplanned for; overfilled schools, medical facilities where it is hard to get an appointment and even drainage.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3576  **Respondent:** 15609441 / Marie-Luise Lockwood  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?**

I OBJECT to the proposed boundary change to move the settlement boundary westwards from the houses on the west side of Kingston Avenue to the tree line running along the parish boundary on the west edge of of Kingston Meadows which would result in taking all of Kingston Meadows out of the green belt.

I have lived in Old Rectory Lane East Horsley for nearly 38 years, my property edges onto the Kingston Meadows we have the right to a gate opening (and pay annually for this) onto this wonderful open community space which is so well loved and used by Horsley residents and friends.

The circle of trees that was planted by the council when the decision was made to keep this land as open space, still shows the intention for this use.

the playground, exercise equipment, tennis courts, BMX track, all contribute to that feel.

Dog walkers and local exercise classes all make good use of this space.

In the spring the meadows are full of wildflowers, the occasional deer and no doubt, plenty of wildlife "out of hours" our children used to run free, and now the next generation comes to visit, open the gate to run off with a football.

The meadows also get extremely wet, almost flooded, I would worry what would happen to my property if there was any change to the existing use.

even with a small ditch outside our garden, we still get water standing within our property.

No sound reasons have been given for the proposed extension of the boundary, which seems to be aimed solely at increasing the land available within the settlements for future additional development. Moving the green belt boundary westwards does not constitute an 'exceptional circumstance' under the NPPF rules and as such I believe this to be an invalid proposal.
Therefore I OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGE

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3712  Respondent: 15618817 / Carla Hollingsbee  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write to register my OBJECTION to the proposed building/housing development proposals that are being put forward by the GBC in their Plan.

Although I do not live there at the moment, my Mother lives in East Horsley and, apart from visiting her 2 or 3 times per week, our plan is to move there in 3 years time. So, you can see I have a deep vested interest and concern as to what happens to East Horsley.

So, any potential new housing developments are particularly important to me.

My principle objection is about infrastructure. The roads, the schools, the services are even now at breaking point…..so the effect of a developments at Wisley Airfield, opposite the station at East Horsley, or at the Thatcher’s Hotel is ill thought through, and frankly, incredible.

The roads around East Horsley are, in the main B roads and lanes. This is not the area to add 5,000 or 6,000 cars a day. It would be dangerous, people’s lives would be at risk and the pollution from the cars would dictate that we as adults and particularly our children would have to go around wearing masks like they do in Japan and China. Is this what the planner’s want?

It is inconceivable that the writers of the Draft Plan didn’t reach the conclusion that the East Horsley/Wisley Airfield axis is NOT the place for development.

In addition the Ockham Road South between the two village ‘centres’ in East Horsley is so narrow (around Coningsbees) that two busses cannot pass each other. ….and many many times I have seen big vehicles mount the pavement at that point….just image another 100 cars per hour coming through there! Just last week I was driving towards the station from Thatcher’s direction and a lorry – which must have been about 8 ft wide forced me off the road – ie I had to mount the pavement.

This area also floods and many times I have seen pedestrians splashed with gutter water. No doubt all these problems are curable but, as we all know, Surrey County Council – who are responsible for highways – have no money…..so how they are going to afford all the other grandiose schemes like slip roads on to the A3 and dynamic improvements to the roundabout underneath the A3 at the end of Ockham Road North? It is all just ‘pie in the sky’ thinking.

Whist writing I would also condemn any proposal that targets building on woodland. My thoughts are about Garlic Arch on the old Portsmouth road between Ripley and Send.

Building on grassland is one thing but never, never ever should woodland be considered. It is the home of thousands of animals and plants – and it MUST be preserved. We share this planet with myriads of other creatures….and it is the responsibility of the Planners to safeguard all of us….not to destroy everything that is worthwhile and valuable in this world.
This is now the time that the Planners of GBC have to be strong, thoughtful and they have to stand up and be counted. If we cannot build more houses then say so to the government or anybody else for that matter and challenge them to do their worst. But…do not weaken your own resolve.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

### Comment ID: PSLPA16/3860  Respondent: 15634113 / Joby Lees  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

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 live in Guildford but my Sister and her family and my Mother all live in East Horsley. We've all lived in the area for many many years. It is a lovely place to live and we have enjoyed the scenery and the fact that there is so much Green Belt around meaning lovely spaces to enjoy. Even within these areas there has been a population increase over the years with of course an increase of houses cars etc. Which is inevitable. However it has always been a relief knowing that whatever happens and however many houses are built, the Green Belt is safe and the area will not be destroyed as promised by the Conservative Party.

The Green belt is an integral part of the community. If the planning permission is granted, the environment will be affected with local wildlife, fauna and flora possibly being destroyed for ever. If the houses are built then the population will triple. As the population has grown already the roads and transport has not increased and has not been improved; so the roads which are already poorly kept and constantly full (and don't get me started on the amount cyclists which are already hogging the roads) will get worse and will probably not be maintained or up graded. There is a lack of public transport so more people use their own cars which means generally 2 cars per house which will double quadruple road usage and more traffic jams and hold ups. Water works which are expensive and average will need up grading which will mean higher costs. More sewage works will need to be built which again means higher costs to those that are already paying. The A3 which is already used to capacity will have more traffic causing more traffic jams meaning the commute to work whether going towards London or Guildford will take much longer.

If the planning permission for the Green Belt goes ahead the Area of Natural Beauty which is why most people move here will be completely destroyed. Once gone it's gone for good and we can never get it back.

I vote that we DO NOT go ahead with the building of more houses and buildings.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

### Comment ID: PSLPA16/4356  Respondent: 15701089 / Nick Allen  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am also concerned about the proposal to inset East Horsley from the green belt (Para 4.3.16). East Horsley retains its country village character as a direct consequence of its low housing density and significant green space and woodland features, all of which would be at risk with the reduced protection should East Horsley be removed.
I also note that each of the proposed developments has a housing density far above any comparable housing in the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/370  Respondent: 15805601 / Guildford Greenbelt Group (Sir or madam)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to the changes to Policies A36 to A41 (East and West Horsley) The number of potential development sites has been reduced by two (A36 and A41, representing a total of 138 dwellings). This leaves four sites (A27-40) which still represent a total of 395 new dwellings.

Marginal changes such as these would still leave 70% of all new development in the borough built on Green Belt sites. No “exceptional circumstances” or any other justification is advanced for this strange imbalance. The deletion of two Horsley sites fails to correct the issue of relative overdevelopment in East and West Horsley, which is both excessive in absolute terms and disproportionate in relation to the rest of the borough.

No attempt is made to assess the cumulative impact on the Horsleys – either of the four sites now proposed, or of Site A35 (Three Farms Meadow, alias “Wisley Airfield”), with over 2,000 new homes only 2 miles away. This piecemeal approach leaves the future of the Horsleys at the mercy of ad hoc planning applications, which is the opposite of what a Local Plan should intend. The new plan Policies put greater emphasis on the need for adequate facilities and infrastructure to underpin development. But this is not reflected in any new wording on the Horsley sites, thus leaving most local objections unaddressed. Again, this defect curtails the plan’s usefulness as a practical planning tool at a site level and undermines its credibility among residents.

The plan fails to mention most of the known sustainability issues and infrastructure constraints affecting the Horsley sites, including public transport, traffic, road safety, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, flooding/surface drainage and shops.

These were fully set out in responses to last year’s public consultation. The density of new housing on the four Horsley sites too is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the locality at present.

Sites situated on the periphery of existing development in the Horsleys encroach on surrounding open fields and require the extension of settlement boundaries. The plan presents no arguments for this which, contrary to NPPF paragraph 79, will contribute to creeping urbanisation by attenuating the Green Belt corridors separating the Horsleys from neighbouring settlements. Collectively, the four Horsley sites breach NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been an outstanding success story in the Horsleys, as detailed in response to the last consultation. Assets include a dense public footpath network, parish parks, sports fields, a campsite of international standard, Britain’s newest rural opera theatre and the popular Olympic cycle route. These examples of positive planning depend on a Local Plan that protects the Green Belt, maintains its openness and beauty and avoids urbanisation and traffic congestion. Sites A35-41 are hostile to this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/42  Respondent: 17164033 / David Roberts  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Sites A36-41 (East and West Horsley)

This submission focuses on changes made to the 2016 draft Local Plan. In the case of Sites A36-41, the changes are minimal. This ignores the high volume of serious objections submitted to this part of the plan.

The number of potential development sites has been reduced by two (A36 and A41, representing a total of 138 dwellings). This leaves four sites (A27-40) which still represent a total of 395 new dwellings.

The new draft remains objectionable for three main reasons:

1. Based on Guildford Borough Council’s own figures, marginal changes such as these would still leave 7% of all new development in the borough built on Green Belt sites. No “exceptional circumstances” or any other justification is advanced for this strange imbalance.

2. The deletion of two Horsley sites fails to correct the issue of relative overdevelopment in East and West Horsley, which is both excessive in absolute terms and disproportionate in relation to the rest of the borough.

3. No attempt is made to assess the cumulative impact on the Horsleys – either of the four sites now proposed, or of Site A35 (Three Farms Meadow, alias “Wisley Airfield”), with over 2,000 new homes only 2 miles away. This piecemeal approach leaves the future of the Horsleys at the mercy of ad hoc planning applications, which is the opposite of what a Local Plan should intend. It would not be difficult (e.g. with the help of the draft West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan) to set out a proper, more integrated vision for this part of the borough. Without this, the plan is not a plan for the Horsleys in any practical sense.

The Inspector will also want to have regard to the feeling among Horsley residents that this limited approach is deliberate – driven by a concealed wish to turn their community into new dormitory town. Plausible claims have been made of political bias by a Council leadership representing the western end of the borough, which is less threatened by London urban sprawl.

The new plan Policies put greater emphasis on the need for adequate facilities and infrastructure to underpin development. But this is not reflected in any new wording on the Horsley sites, thus leaving most local objections unaddressed. Again, this defect curtails the plan’s usefulness as a practical planning tool at a site level and undermines its credibility among residents. The plan fails to mention most of the known sustainability issues and infrastructure constraints affecting the Horsley sites, including public transport, traffic, road safety, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, flooding/surface drainage and shops. These were fully set out in responses to last year’s public consultation.

The density of new housing on the four Horsley sites too is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the locality at present.

Sites situated on the periphery of existing development in the Horsleys encroach on surrounding open fields and require the extension of settlement boundaries. The plan presents no arguments for this which, contrary to NPPF paragraph 79, will contribute to creeping urbanisation by attenuating the Green Belt corridors separating the Horsleys from neighbouring settlements.

Collectively, the four Horsley sites breach NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been an outstanding success story in the Horsleys, as detailed in response to the last consultation. Assets include a dense public footpath network, parish parks, sports fields, a campsite of international standard, Britain’s newest rural opera theatre and the popular Olympic cycle route. These examples of positive planning depend on a Local Plan that protects the Green Belt, maintains its openness and beauty and avoids urbanisation and traffic congestion. Sites A35-41 are hostile to this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The below refers to changes made to the 2016 draft Local Plan. In the case of Sites A36-41, the changes are minimal. This ignores the high volume of serious objections submitted to this part of the plan.

The number of potential development sites has been reduced by two (A36 and A41, representing a total of 138 dwellings). This leaves four sites (A27-40) which still represent a total of 395 new dwellings.

The new draft remains objectionable for three main reasons:

1. Based on Guildford Borough Council’s own figures, marginal changes such as these would still leave 56.7% of all new development in the borough built on Green Belt sites. No “exceptional circumstances” or any other justification has been demonstrated to justify this.

2. The removal of two Horsley sites fails to correct the issue of overdevelopment in East and West Horsley, which is both excessive in absolute terms and disproportionate in relation to the rest of the borough.

3. No attempt is made to assess the cumulative impact on the Horsleys – either of the four sites now proposed, or of Site A35 (Three Farms Meadow, alias “Wisley Airfield”), with over 2,000 new homes only 2 miles away. This piecemeal approach leaves the future of the Horsleys at the mercy of ad hoc planning applications, which is the opposite of what a Local Plan should intend. It would not be difficult (e.g. with the help of the draft West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan) to set out a proper, more integrated vision for this part of the borough. Without this, the plan is not a plan for the Horsleys in any practical sense.

The new plan Policies put greater emphasis on the need for adequate facilities and infrastructure to underpin development. But this is not reflected in any new wording on the Horsley sites, thus leaving most local objections unaddressed. The plan fails to mention most of the known sustainability issues and infrastructure constraints affecting the Horsley sites, including public transport, traffic, road safety, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, flooding/surface drainage and shops. These were fully set out in responses to last year’s public consultation.

The density of new housing on the four Horsley sites too is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the locality at present.

Sites situated on the periphery of existing development in the Horsleys encroach on surrounding open fields and require the extension of settlement boundaries. The plan presents no arguments for this which, contrary to NPPF paragraph 79, will contribute to creeping urbanisation by attenuating the Green Belt corridors separating the Horsleys from neighbouring settlements.

The remaining four Horsley sites breach NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. Sites A35-41 are contrary to this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I am writing to object to the Guildford Local Plan. I have visited an open event at East Horsley village hall and seen the changes proposed.

My key objections are:-

Overall numbers of houses required are still too high. With Brexit and the economic uncertainty we do not require these high number of houses.

The movement of the boundary of the greenbelt around Horsley has no justification - as highlighted by East Horsley Village Council letter on the local plan.

The site at Wisley remains in the plan but you have removed other sites. I object to the building of homes at Wisley Airfield.

There are no meaningful infrastructure investment to accompany the proposed developments in the plan.

Overall I add my support to thew letter written by East Horsley Village Council on this matter.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/129  **Respondent:** 17254689 / Sue Martin  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I am writing to express my concerns over the revised plan. I was horrified to find that the land that had been given to the Raleigh School has been taken out of the local plan. There is urgent need for the school to be rebuilt as the quality of life for that pupils is suffering due to lack of up to date facilities and also space. The parking around the school has always been bad and with the increase numbers attending the school it will only get worse. There is no cost involved as the and has been given and moving the school would then in turn free up the site for low cost housing which is badly needed in the village. I feel it is very short sighted for the council to turn this opportunity down. Both my daughters attended the Raleigh many years ago and benefited greatly from excellent teaching and I would hate for the next generation of children not to have the same opportunities.

I hope that you will take my views concerning this matter into account.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/179  **Respondent:** 17285377 / Claire Cooper  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**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 limited changes and raise our continuing concerns regarding your weakly amended 2017 plan for the Horsleys. It appears that GBC are continuing to fail to listen to the voice of the local communities and their very valid concerns.
At this point these centre around, but are not limited to, the four housing development sites which remain in your plan.

We have viewed the plans and would like you to recognise that the 30,000 objections to your 2016 plan appear not to have been listened to, as there is little evidence that the current plan reflects local community views.

I look forward to hearing that GBC have finally listened to the objections lodged during the public consultation period which is indeed why we assume the process exists.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/193  **Respondent:** 17288385 / Ben Bramley Brett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Namely that it is unacceptable that the Local Plan is still proposing to “inset” East Horsley from the Green Belt. Plus changes in settlement boundaries mean the East Horsley settlement area will increase by 37% and include most roads south of the A246. This will cause huge congestion, pollution, danger, increased crime etc that will irreparably destroy what is a very pleasant part of the world for young families, older generations and young people to live.

Development of 100 homes is still proposed near Horsley Station - the trains are already overcrowded, this area is already very heavily populated, and poorly maintained, this will only serve to extend 'suburbia' into Horsley and increase danger to current locals.

This part of Surrey is reaching overcrowding levels with people being granted permission to build multiple properties on what were standard sized gardens without a new village being placed in the area. And then move on tax free. As you know around 57% of all new housing in the Local Plan is on land presently Green Belt, his has to be unsustainable and driven only by unnecessary greed, there must be other areas of Surrey and the UK where this is more appropriate. While the ONS forecasts population growth for Guildford at 10.4% over the Local Plan period, GBC proposes to increase its housing stock by 22% - why is this necessary?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/228  **Respondent:** 17299681 / Aileen Aitcheson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )**

It is proposed that East Horsley is to be “inset” from the Green Belt. This proposed change in settlement boundaries means that the East Horsley settlement area will increase by 37%. At the moment, one hundred houses are proposed near East Horsley station and over two thousand on the former Wisley Airfield, only about one mile from the East Horsley parish boundary. The site at Wisley has increased to include two more farms!

East Horsley is a small village which does not have the infrastructure of roads, rail, parking, medical facilities or schooling to support such a huge increase in population. Fifty seven percent of new housing proposed is on land that is
currently categorised as Green Belt. This is flouting government law which established Green Belt to protect the
countryside for future generations.

While the ONS forecasts population for growth for Guildford at 10.4% over the Local plan period, GBC proposes to
increase the housing stock by 22%. Since Brexit, forecasts of increasing population numbers have been reduced, yet
GBC are continuing to predict massive increases in population, which quite frankly, does not make sense.

Again, I wish to register my strong opposition to the changes proposed by GBC in their latest draft of the Local Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/229  **Respondent:** 17299713 / Dawn Kelly  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I am opposed to the amended 2017 plans for the Horsley area as there is hardly any change from the 2016 plans which are
ridiculously excessive. We need to protect our countryside and greenbelt. Changing a greenbelt area to an extended
village is not necessary. The plan to establish FOUR housing developments (rather than 6) remains excessive to
population growth.

The area would suffer considerably with another 2000 homes, sheltered/care homes, gypsy/traveller pitches, retail parks
and schools on the former Wisley Airfield and surrounding fields.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/234  **Respondent:** 17300321 / Brian Aitcheson  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( No )

I have looked carefully at the new draft Local Plan and I wish to OBJECT for the following reasons.

It is proposed that East Horsley is to be “inset” from the Green Belt. This proposed change in settlement boundaries
means that the East Horsley settlement area will increase by 37%. At the moment, one hundred houses are proposed near
East Horsley station and over two thousand on the former Wisley Airfield, only about one mile from the East Horsley
parish boundary. The site at Wisley has increased to include two more farms!

East Horsley is a small village which does not have the infrastructure of roads, rail, parking, medical facilities or
schooling to support such a huge increase in population. Fifty seven percent of new housing proposed is on land that is
currently categorised as Green Belt. This is flouting government law which established Green Belt to protect the
countryside for future generations.

While the ONS forecasts population for growth for Guildford at 10.4% over the Local plan period, GBC proposes to
increase the housing stock by 22%. Since Brexit, forecasts of increasing population numbers have been reduced, yet
GBC are continuing to predict massive increases in population, which quite frankly, does not make sense.
Again, I wish to register my strong opposition to the changes proposed by GBC is their latest draft of the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/291  Respondent: 17307937 / Eufi Atkinson  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of East Horsley I write, YET AGAIN, to OBJECT most strongly to the Proposed Guildford Local Plan 2017.

The 2016 Local Plan had some serious effects on our village:

- The extension of the settlement boundaries of the Horsleys into the Green Belt
- The removal of the extended village areas from the Green Belt
- The proposal to develop SIX (!) large housing sites and several smaller sites in the extended settlement area

The changes in the Guildford Local Plan 2017 are minimal, FOUR of the original development sites remain, including the proposal for 2,000+ houses, plus sheltered/care homes, Gypsy/Traveller pitches (!!!), employment/retail space and two schools on the former Wisley Airfield.

Wow, is that a town or a city?!

There were, I understand, over 30,000 objections to the 2016 Local Plan which identified a clear desire to limit expansion into the Green Belt. I see no evidence in the Guildford Local Plan 2017 that this plea has been heeded.

Why do we have to, yet again, write to express our objections the proposed developments? This process is clearly designed to wear the local residents down until the plans get implemented. 30,000 objections last year, but yet again, here we are having to comment on a Local Plan that keeps being thrust down our throats.

Scale of the Proposed Developments:

The developments will further aggravate the already overstretched infrastructure of both East and West Horsley. The road through East Horsley (Ockham Road North & South) is inadequate even now, and cannot be upgraded. Normal cars have to slow down just to pass each other in certain parts, and climb onto the pavement when a truck passes through.

And you want to add further traffic to the area?!

The development plans for 2,000+ new dwellings plus considerable related infrastructure on the Wisley Airfield, is only two miles from East Horsley. I am of the opinion that the Horsley area will not be able to absorb the increased population, traffic and pollution.

It is not realistic to assume that the new town will restrict itself to the Wisley Airfield area. Their daily routine will spill into the surrounding areas including East Horsley. We do not have sufficient facilities, schools, surgeries and other services. Gas, electricity and telephone services in the area are already operating at full capacity on very old pipes, wires and exchanges. Local roads are too narrow and winding to take the existing traffic, and there is insufficient parking anywhere, even in front of most homes. The local roads were built in the 1930s or before, and are mostly no more than narrow lanes where cars have to slow down to pass each other. The access roads to East Horsley are narrow and winding and are not sufficient to handle even today’s traffic.
The scale of the proposed Wisley Airfield development is way out of proportion and way out of character to the existing infrastructure and the space available in this small, picturesque old village. The new town will completely destroy the special character of our historic village.

Station Parade a “District Centre”?

There is a clear misunderstanding of the nature of the facilities in our village centre, it would be completely inappropriate to target the area for future urban development. Please, get out of your offices and come and see the village in action on any normal week day and week end, see how the facilities, roads, drainage etc are already overstretched. As a certain tennis player often said: You cannot be serious with these proposals!

Green Belt:

The Green Belt is a policy for controlling urban growth. The idea was developed so as to have a ring of countryside where urbanisation would be resisted, maintaining an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure could be expected to prevail. The fundamental aim of a Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and consequently the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness.

The Metropolitan Green Belt around London was first proposed by the Greater London Regional Planning Committee in 1935. The Town and Country Planning Act 1947 then allowed local authorities to include Green Belt proposals in their development plans. In 1955, the then Minister of Housing Duncan Sandys encouraged local authorities around the country to consider protecting land around their towns and cities by the formal designation of clearly defined Green Belts, to prevent urban sprawl.

The 2012 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued by the Government clearly sets out the following purposes (amongst others) for including land with the Green Belt:

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

How do you reconcile the Wisley Airfield proposal, and the removal of the Horsleys from the Green Belt, with the NPPF’s guidelines above?

It appears that you now want to ignore the very reason for having designated Green Belts around urban areas, and specifically around my village of East Horsley. I strongly OBJECT to your proposals.

Objection:

I know that I am not the only person writing, yet again, to OBJECT to the Guildford Local Plan 2017. I hope that the GBC, as our elected representatives charged with representing our interests, will LISTEN TO THE COMMUNITY.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/365  Respondent: 17350497 / Ellie Punshon  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

I have looked carefully at the new draft Local Plan and I wish to OBJECT for the following reasons.
East Horsley is a small village which does not have the infrastructure of roads, rail, parking, medical facilities or schooling to support such a huge increase in population. Fifty seven percent of new housing proposed is on land that is currently categorised as Green Belt. This is flouting government law which established Green Belt to protect the countryside for future generations.

It is proposed that East Horsley is to be “inset” from the Green Belt. This proposed change in settlement boundaries means that the East Horsley settlement area will increase by 37%. At the moment, one hundred houses are proposed near East Horsley station and over two thousand on the former Wisley Airfield, only about one mile from the East Horsley parish boundary. The site at Wisley has recently been increased to now include two more farms!

While the ONS forecasts population for growth for Guildford at 10.4% over the Local plan period, GBC proposes to increase the housing stock by 22%. Since Brexit, forecasts of increasing population numbers have been reduced, yet GBC are continuing to predict massive increases in population, which quite frankly, does not make sense.

Again, I wish to register my strong opposition to the changes proposed by GBC is their latest draft of the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/443  **Respondent:** 17412801 / John Thornton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I have reviewed the limited amendments proposed to the Local Plan and I maintain my objection to the plan - particularly as it impacts on East Horsley.

The level of development still proposed would be too much for the already over stretched local facilities
The plans mean an unacceptable weakening of our respect for the green belt and the advantages it brings to all. Within this plan the unbelievably unrealistic plans to create a new town on the old airfield at Wisley must be ruled out again. The facilities in the area including roads and public transport simply could not cope with this level of new development.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/498</th>
<th>Respondent: 17425089 / Clare Punshon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

I have looked carefully at the new draft Local Plan and I wish to OBJECT for the following reasons.

East Horsley is a small village which does not have the infrastructure of roads, rail, parking, medical facilities or schooling to support such a huge increase in population. Fifty seven percent of new housing proposed is on land that is currently categorised as Green Belt. This is flouting government law which established Green Belt to protect the countryside for future generations.

It is proposed that East Horsley is to be “inset” from the Green Belt. This proposed change in settlement boundaries means that the East Horsley settlement area will increase by 37%. At the moment, one hundred houses are proposed near East Horsley station and over two thousand on the former Wisley Airfield, only about one mile from the East Horsley parish boundary. The site at Wisley has recently been increased to now include two more farms!

While the ONS forecasts population for growth for Guildford at 10.4% over the Local plan period, GBC proposes to increase the housing stock by 22%. Since Brexit, forecasts of increasing population numbers have been reduced, yet GBC are continuing to predict massive increases in population, which quite frankly, does not make sense.

Again, I wish to register my strong opposition to the changes proposed by GBC is their latest draft of 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: pslp173/511</th>
<th>Respondent: 17427873 / Bill Learmonth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley</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? ( )

As a Resident of West Horsley I welcome the removal of the proposed housing developments A36 and A41. However, their removal represents little more than a sop to the impact of the overall development proposal on the Community that is East and West Horsley, Ockham, Ripley and the Green Belt.

The Horsley Countryside Preservation Society state that there were over 30,000 objections to the 2016 Plan. Given that the number of Residents of West and East Horsley, Ockham and Ripley number less than 10,000 suggests that the wider Community, equally, reject the Development Proposal.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp173/530  **Respondent:** 17432801 / Claire Stone  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Firstly, my main objection is the idea of insetting West and East Horsley from the green belt and I reject the fact that no change is being proposed about this. The very idea of the green belt is to protect the beautiful countryside from being overrun by the metropolitan sprawl. To start moving this line I believe is the beginning of the end of our stunning countryside that defines our neighbourhood and has done so for centuries.

I welcome the reduction in the number of new homes being proposed in West Horsley, however there is still very large number of properties proposed on the green belt in East and West Horsley.

Despite the reduction in proposed dwellings, there is no corresponding increase in infrastructure or services such as shops, medical centre, library and Horsley Station proposed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp173/556  **Respondent:** 17440513 / Christopher Diacon  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of East Horsley I wish to register my objection to the proposals outlined in the amended 2017 plan.

It is my clear opinion, even with these changes, the nature and whole environment of our area will be irrevocably changed for the worse and such large scale development is neither appropriate or desirable.

I expect and demand that the views of local residents, who are overwhelmingly opposed to these proposals, to be given significant consideration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp173/723  **Respondent:** 17609921 / Clare and Keith Spacie  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - East Horsley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
We are pleased to see that the inset area for the Horsley excludes the area beyond the A246 and that proposals to consider Clandon Golf Club land for development have been dropped. Both would have been significant encroachments on genuinely open land and potentially led to infill development along a substantial corridor between Merrow and beyond East Horsley village. We agree that no further allocation should be made for housing in this area to preserve its rural character.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

Total records: 174.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2865  Respondent: 8694977 / James Lewis  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to strongly object to the plans for developments in and around the West Horsley village and the removal of West Horsley from the green belt.

The village is a typical ribbon development consisting largely of one very long road with houses either side. West Horsley feels more Rural than East Horsley being surrounded by fields. The infilling of these fields with housing would irrevocably alter the very nature of the village and turn it into another part of the continuous conurbation that runs from London out to Bookham. If the intention of the council is to make Guildford an outer suburb of London than obviously this is one way of going about it. However, the developments are far larger than the service infrastructure, roads, schools, drainage, doctors etc would be able to sustain.

I am not sure with the proposed development at Wisley whether the train services would be able to cope either.

I do not understand Guildford Councils ardent desire to build over the greenbelt, this must be about the 4th time I have had to write in to object to your plans, is the intention to simply keep going until people give up?

I live adjacent to the Manor Farm proposed building site and do not think 135 houses is a reasonable number to put on what is a small plot.

The housing density would be completely out of character with the area.

Furthermore, I do not understand why the council is slavishly following government dictat regarding housing provision, surely it would be better served asking what the government is doing to redistribute people across the country rather than cramming them all into the south east.

I therefore object to the proposed plan

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/653  Respondent: 8768161 / Adam Johnson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The strength of feeling throughout the village against the proposed relaxation of the planning guidance is considerable. This opposition is shared by all of the local residents that I have spoken to, as well as by the West Horsley Parish Council. I believe that the views of those who have chosen to make their homes within the community should be paramount when making decisions which will have such a radical and irreversible impact on the village. Removing East and West Horsley from the Green Belt, and encouraging additional development on such a scale, would exclude and ignore the strong feelings of the local community. Overall, I understand that the 2016 Local Plan Draft received over 30,000 objections, and these seem to have been largely disregarded in the current draft. It seems a case of the Borough
Council continuing to publish the same document with minor changes, rather than addressing the very real concerns which local residents have over the proposals.

In summary, I strongly oppose the current drafting of the Proposed Submission Guildford Borough Council Local Plan. In particular, I oppose the removal of West Horsley and East Horsley from the Green Belt, the extension of development beyond the current village boundaries, and plans for 395 houses across the two villages (of which 295 are planned for West Horsley),

I also object because all of the development sites are proposed to be at unsuitably high densities, out of keeping with the current character of the villages.

So far as I am aware, no "exceptional circumstances" have been put forward, let alone proved, in order to justify this development in the Green Belt.

I remain of the view that the plans for West and East Horsley contained within the Draft Local Plan are inappropriate, misguided, and would be deeply damaging to our community.

I urge you to listen to the views of the local community and to protect the exceptional quality of the rural spaces and villages 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: PSLPA16/2886</th>
<th>Respondent: 8806273 / Peter Leonard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 wish to express my objections to the Local Plan Strategy document specifically in relation to the removal of the Horsleys from the Green Belt and the proposal to build up to 593 houses in the two villages over a five-year period.

Exclusion from the Green Belt – In objecting to this proposal in relation to West Horsley (and the other villages similarly threatened in Surrey), I do not believe that the Council in its strategy document has demonstrated that there are exceptional circumstances as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to justify these changes to the Green Belt boundaries.

I believe that the removing of West Horsley from the Green Belt is challengeable for each of the 5 legal purposes of the Green Belt. These are;
• To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas
• To prevent neighboring towns merging into one another
• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
• To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Increasing the size of the village by over 35% in 5 years can only be seen as a significant encroachment on the countryside as well as increasing urban sprawl. Most of all, such a large number of new-build houses will destroy the setting and special character of this village.

Note: Meeting unmet housing needs cannot legally be considered to be an exceptional circumstance. Furthermore, the justification that forms the basis for this change appears to be at odds with the Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013-2031 where no case was made for large-scale development in either West or East Horsley.
Housing number calculation and methodology - I object to the fact that I am unable to review the mathematical model used by the council’s consultants to arrive at the high number of houses proposed for the Horsleys. It cannot be acceptable for this to remain confidential.

Infrastructure – My objections relate to the fact that the council has failed to demonstrate in its Plan how it plans to deal with infrastructure issues especially as it plans to have 593 houses erected in the Horsleys in a five-year period. Of concern is that;

1. There is no Strategic Environmental Assessment included
2. There is no sustainability assessment presented for any of the sites
3. There is no infrastructure document present.

Therefore there is no account as how the council plans to deal with issues such as;

• Road and Transportation – Traffic generation from the proposed new housing would be considerable and the present narrow lanes and roads would need major redevelopment. This would be compounded by the limited public transportation in West Horsley with a bus service through the village. Horsley station and surrounding roads would also see a significant increase in traffic movement. It has a difficult access and parking is limited and often full on a weekday. There is no scope to increase parking.

• Drainage and sewage – Road drainage and winter flooding are continued concerns for the village. Increased runoff from the additional housing will add to the problem especially as some of the sites are prone to flooding in any event. Sewage systems will need major rebuilding and there is no supporting documentation explaining how such infrastructure will cope in the future.

• Schools – There is a lack of capacity at local state schooling at both primary (The Raleigh) and secondary (The Howard of Effingham School) level. With no increased capacity in the Local Plan, there will be a need for families to travel greater distances from the village. This will further impact road traffic and road infrastructure. Additionally the Glenesk and Cranmore schools are already well supported by families living in Guildford and other villages and result in significant traffic problems at each at the end of the school day on Ockham Road North and the A246 respectively.

• Medical – Currently there is severe pressure on the only Medical Practice serving East and West Horsley plus areas beyond the villages. It would not be able to cope with such a large population especially within the timeframe envisaged.

• Village facilities – Using the description that the shopping parade in East Horsley is a “Rural District Centre” to support the Council’s justification for locating large numbers of housing is totally inaccurate. The range and size of the shops is limited and the parade experiences severe parking constraints. The single small shop at the southern end of West Horsley would not be able to support the additional housing at the Bell& Colvill site. Parking can only cope with 5 cars at a time.

Note - The impact of 2000 houses proposed for the old Wisley airfield at Ockham on the broader Horsley infrastructure will be equally as dramatic as it is only 2 miles away.

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>PSLPA16/2775</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8812897 / Fiona Atkinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South</td>
<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 write to object to the above Submission. We have lived in West Horsley for 6 years, locating here from another rural area for job purposes. This area is not only an area of outstanding beauty, it is also a protected Greenbelt site, implemented following the war. To get rid of this protection, is to give away part of the values so many people fought for, and will be taken from our children.

Although I understand the need for more jobs and housing, there are areas in the UK desperate for development to improve income in the area, such as parts of Wales that have lost local industry. Countries such as India have managed to develop business and technology sites in new areas, and it is very short-sighted if we cannot develop similar infrastructure. Over-developing one area will increase division in the UK. Some development is needed, but it must retain the village feel in rural areas and therefore should be based on small developments, that use brown sites where possible, or small areas of land that will not impact greatly on local roads and services. The A246 for example, blocks as soon as there is a problem on the A3. Large developments will cause further traffic problems/congestion, as well as put further pressure on schools and health centres. If we are not careful, London/Guildford will become an urban sprawl, with loss of access to the countryside for everyone.

We need to support local communities to develop their own relationships and support networks. Developing large estates where people commute to work in other areas does not promote this process. In-fill of development of 4-12 houses across a few small sites supports local families and jobs, without turning the villages into a suburb where no-one knows anyone, with a loss of access to countryside and ways of life. At present, West and East Horsley both have strong communities and support networks.

There are people in other areas of the country desperate for opportunities to work and to develop their communities, and they are not being heard as each borough focusses on their local target, and not the wider picture. Industry needs encouragement to support this process, and I hope others can see and support this.

The numbers of houses suggested in East and West Horsley are too large for the size of the villages, would put further pressure on roads and services, and reduce Greenbelt, land meant to be protected for generations. In the time we have lived here, we have seen re-introduction of live-stock, both sheep and cows to local land, which is a fantastic achievement. The forested areas help manage pollution, a growing problem in the area.

I understand the challenges ahead are hard, but once rural areas are lost, they cannot be regained. I hope that these views can be considered.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Traffic flow in the area is already too heavy all narrow rural roads never designed for the purpose. Inevitably the intended development will make this situation infinitely worse and will eventually result in widening and urbanising them resulting in desecration of the present environment.

There is already considerable pressure on schools, medical services, drainage, gas and electricity supply, roads and transport etc. and a further population increase that this will cause will only end up with the need for yet further Green Belt land being gobbled up resulting in unacceptable urbanisation.

As regards the Wisley airfield development proposals I have already written to you about this expressing my very strong objections. Together with the proposed expansion of the Horsleys, the result would effectively be a complete new town. This is unacceptable.

Of course minor controlled development has to take place as circumstances change but wholesale destruction of a village environment is totally unacceptable. The response to population growth demands imagination and vision and must not require such extensive change and disruption to existing communities.

I do hope that notice will be taken of my very strong objections to the current proposals.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2700  **Respondent:** 8843393 / Graham Sharman  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

**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 proposal to remove the Horsleys from The Green Belt. No reasons have been given for the proposed changes.

Ockham Road South cannot cope with any more traffic. It is not wide enough for an articulated to pass a car, let alone the bus. This makes the pathway impossible to walk along safely. I experience this every time I go out.

The schools are full, and The Medical Centre is at bursting point.

Ever since I have lived here 1989 infilling has been going on, and I am sure will keep on. The area cannot cope with any large developments.

I OBJECT STRONGLY to the development of another 600+ houses being developed in the HORSLEYS and a further 2000 in Ockham. How will the Station and its car parking space cope with this?

Drainage is inadequate. My driveway floods every time we have a deluge. Ockham Road south becomes a fast running stream, which in turn swishes round into Oakwood Drive. I live in the first bungalow on the left.

HOW CAN WE COPE WITH THIS GETTING WORSE?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3109  **Respondent:** 8857857 / Steffan Perkins  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

---
I live and work in the Borough of Guildford and like its predecessor I totally object to the current local plan, I do not believe it has taken into the consideration the opinions and the lively hoods of those it will affect most. The proposed increase in housing especially in a village such as West Horsley is totally out of proportion with its current size and places far to heavier a burden on the villages limited public services and infrastructure. Large parts of West Horsley flood locally during heavy down pours which are becoming more frequent, the doctors are always full and struggles to supply the village as it is with sufficient medical cover, the roads as they are can not cope with the current level of school traffic as it is. Ockham road North is currently dangerous and I hope not but a serious injury can not be far off like wise with The Raleigh the current amount of parents driving into the vicinity on small country roads is dangerous, all of this will be exacerbated should the current local plan be implemented. I feel there should be far more study into local infrastructure before any houses numbers are agreed on.

Lastly West Horsley is currently a nice place to live and a village to feel proud of as it welcomes many tourists each year this will only be adversely affected as the plan stands at the moment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/39  Respondent: 8861121 / T.E Hart  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Housing Needs – I am not aware the Borough has carry out a survey of the housing needs in the area. In our village on brown field sites which have been previously developed there has been a tendency to construct large houses, with almost no consideration for first time buyers or those wishing to downsize.

Lack of Facilities - The village does not have sufficient facilities to support more development.

- The medical centre is oversubscribed. The large number of houses proposed and increase of population would necessitate an increase of the number of doctors in the village with a larger medical centre.
- The schools would need to be enlarged. The Raleigh School site is very restricted. There is not the land available on the site to construct more classrooms and the access via two residential roads is appalling. In my opinion with any large increase of development in the village a new school would need to be constructed. This would have the advantage of releasing the existing site of the school for development.
- Statutory Undertakers – I do not believe that there is sufficient capacity to cater for the additional developments. Before any sites are considered for approval it is essential that a feasibility study is carried out to determine whether the sewage, drainage, electricity and gas networks can accommodate any further development.
- Highway Safety – The roads in East and West Horsley are relatively narrow and the visibility is often poor, therefore any substantial increase in traffic would lead to more accidents. I am involved with the speedwatch in West Horsley and the speed of traffic often travels at speeds higher than the limit. It is submitted that vehicles entering and leaving an access have to accelerate, slow down or stop in the road whilst other traffic passes them. Such manoeuvres give rise to misjudgement of speed, distance and clearance, which is one of the main causes of accidents. Accesses are potentially dangerous and their numbers should be restricted in the interests of safety and traffic flows. I recommend that a full traffic and capacity study should be carried out prior to any development being approved. Any necessary highway improvements should also be submitted for comment.
- The road structure has not been constructed to a sufficient standard for the existing traffic.
- Pavements East Lane, Ockham Road South and North are narrow and as a consequence a hazard for pedestrians, especially women with prams and toddlers. The additional traffic would make matters worse.
• There is not any provision on the roads in Horsley for cyclists. I was witness to a fatal cycling accident outside my house.
• There is not sufficient parking at the railway station at present so any increase of population would exacerbate the situation. I also understand that the trains at peak hours are very crowded with standing room only.
• There is often insufficient parking in the village centre.
• A large number of houses would completely change the character of the village.

The above comments are primarily concerned with East and West Horsley. The major development proposed at Wisley Airport would further exacerbate these issues.

Of the sites proposed the area south I most strongly object to the area A41 south of East Lane. It destroys the character of the road having open land on the south side and would lead to an increase of pressure of more development to link with the remainder of housing on East Lane on the southern side.

On the above grounds it is submitted that the proposals for the Draft Local Plan be rejected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Connisbees and I already see cars parked there all day with the owners walking down to the station. If the car park becomes full, so will the layby and then we’ll have cars parking on Ockham Road itself creating even more traffic problems.

1. The additional population created by the new developments is likely to be around 2,000 or more with perhaps 400-500 children of school age. There are not the medical or educational facilities available to cope with these additional residents.
2. And perhaps most important of all the plan contravenes the Green Belt regulations in that the requirement for the development does not meet the “special circumstances” set out.

The only exceptions to my objection are in respect to:

1. The five smaller developments proposed of between 5-15 houses could, if carefully planned and executed with consideration for the local ambience, fit in well and the total number of 60 houses would represent a reasonable growth rate.
2. The Thatcher’s Hotel development if restricted to retirement housing. The residents would benefit from the facilities at the southern end of the village with Church and shops and also the nearby location of other retirement properties. There would be little impact on commuter transport or road usage generally and none on schooling.

So with the exception of points (7) and (8) above I object to all the sites proposed in the New Local Plan and trust the Council will remove them from the local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/790  Respondent: 8888161 / B.A. Mowlem  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The revised plan is little different from the previous one but in more detail. My basic objection is is that both villages will no longer enjoy Green Belt status, in its place will be something called village boundary. It will have no clout and only open other areas for development.

There will be at least 600 new houses with as a result the usual one car per house and some even more. To this add further cars genated by the 2000 houses at Wisley think of the traffic jams which will result.

The population will increase who will need services, there no mention of how these will be provided.

Who set all this in motion, the Govt. that was formed some 6 years ago. The promises as usual were the countryside, what was left of it would be protected, but the existing rules were torn up and all this set in motion, once again we have been betrayed.

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 writing to strongly object to the local plan with regard to the Horsleys.

I have lived with my family in West Horsley for thirty years. This village has historic roots and prides itself on retaining its rural heritage. eg we have no street lights by choice.

I can see that the plan proposes to increase the West Horsley households by a completely unacceptable percentage, which would change the nature of the village for ever.

This scale of housing would give a population increase higher than the national estimates for population growth.

Our village school is already full with no physical room for expansion. Even the private schools do not have room for a large influx of pupils.

Our doctors surgery is extremely busy already.

The railway carpark at East Horsley (and also Effingham Junction) is full daily.

Our main drainage system is already inadequate with back up occurring in the drains at some of the houses at the northern end of the village. (Have GBC gained assurance from utility companies and Surrey County Council that they have the funds to adequately improve drains and roads?)

The plan gives no demonstration of the exceptional circumstances required to remove the Horsleys from the green belt and extend the boundaries of the Settlement area.

I am unable to understand on what grounds Station Parade East Horsley has been designated a "District Centre"

I strongly object to the size of the larger proposed development areas which will completely fill on green spaces and create an urban sprawl, physically changing the village of West Horsley for ever.

The Horsleys seem to have been lumped together, whereas they are very different in character with West always retaining its historic rural roots.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2498  Respondent: 8938337 / Catherine Gray  Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object most strongly to Guildford Borough Council’s local plan for housing and development. As a resident of East Horsley I am deeply concerned by the proposals, which will have a profoundly damaging effect on the character of the village, and will stretch the local services to beyond breaking point.

It is extremely frustrating that I have previously written on many of these points, as did many others during the consultation process for the local plan in 2014, and yet the current local plan contains the same major flaws. It would seem that GBC is taking no notice of the concerns of residents, and has not made any attempt to explain why it feels that re-drawing Green Belt boundaries is justified, nor to review the clearly incorrect estimates of housing need.

Once again, and in summary, there are a number of key points which I REJECT:
1. The proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt. This contravenes the National Planning Policy Framework and will destroy the openness inherent in the planning and building within the settlement boundary. The changes proposed by GBC will destroy this openness permanently and GBC have in no way demonstrated ‘exceptional circumstance’ in order to justify this.

2. The proposal to extend the settlement boundaries of the Horsleys which goes totally against the principles of Green Belt planning. GBC have shown no evidence that justifies this proposal.

3. The result of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment referred to in the proposed plan. Estimates that 593 additional houses are required to be built within 5 years of adopting the plan are hugely inflated. Other estimates, provided by detailed analysis using a number of different methodologies have shown that the total number of new houses required in East Horsley is in the order of 130 to 180 over the next 15 - 20 years. This is in line with population growth over the last 12 years, and takes account of the local demographic, the nature of local businesses, and the lack of students living in the Horsleys (which appear to have disproportionately influenced GBC’s calculations). Development on this scale is much more reasonable. I absolutely accept the need to increase housing stock, including the provision of affordable housing, but the scale of development must be proportionate, and the character of any development must be in keeping with the current character of the Horsleys, which are, and should remain, within the Green Belt.

4. The implication that the village infrastructure can cope with the significant increase in housing stock and therefore population. The local schools and medical centre are oversubscribed. The roads and pavements are suited to a small rural community. The proposal looks to increase the housing in West Horsley by 35%. This is totally unacceptable and the village infrastructure cannot cope with an increase of this magnitude.

5. The proposal to remove Fangate Manor from the Green Belt and include it within the Settlement Boundary. There are no exceptional Planning circumstances to justify removing Fangate Manor from the Green Belt, and changing the Settlement Boundary does not in any way enhance the defensible nature of the Settlement Boundary. It merely involves moving the boundary from one hedgerow to another, but leads to the loss of Green Belt and agricultural land.

6. The designation of Station Parade as a “District Centre”. One wonders whether the person responsible for drafting this comment has actually ever set foot within the Horsleys? Station Parade is simply a parade of local shops within a village, comprising services valuable to local residents. It is hardly a “District Centre” attracting people from surrounding villages.

7. The proposed major development at Ockham (former Wisley Airfield). This would have a significant impact on the Horsleys. Whilst there are many arguments against the appropriateness of developing the Wisley Airfield site, our main concern is around the ability of the current transport networks to cope with the increased demand. There is no rail connection to this site so it is highly likely that commuters would access Horsley and Effingham Junction stations to travel to London by rail. The car parking at these sites is already limited, and the nature of the roads connecting Horsley and Ockham is such that cycling would not be a safe or attractive option for many. The A3 and M25 (at the A3 intersection) would be put under increased strain. Already there are traffic problems on this section of the A3 and the M25 at peak times. Increasing the demand by placing another 2000 homes in close proximity (not to mention those homes proposed for Burnt Common and Gosden Hill Farm, Burpham which will also likely put additional stress on the A3) will make this section of the A3 more congested and less safe.

Finally, there is an ERROR in the Land Availability Assessment dated February 2016, and we ask that GBC corrects this. There is a plan on page 299 that appears to show access to Fangate Manor from Manor Close. Manor Close is a private road, and access will not be granted. Our residents association, MCRA, would oppose any change to the character of this very quiet road. The road and the verges are narrow and are not suited to any growth in traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3113  Respondent: 9095745 / Lesley Batt-Rawden  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South
I object to the local plan with regards to West and East Horsley. I object to the villages being removed from the Green Belt. The proposed increase of 35% more homes in West Horsley is unacceptable and will dramatically change the nature/character of the villages forever, as will the extension of the boundaries of the Settlement areas of the Horsleys. The density of the proposed developments will be significantly greater than any other single area in the Borough. The plans will impose an unsupportable burden on schools, roads, medical services, parking facilities and the trains/public transport. The villages would be swamped with extra cars and people using the shops, station and other facilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I do not think that the Local Plan has been well thought out. Here is Horsley we need high quality homes for downsizers (not something suitable for a first time buyer). There are many long-term residents of Horsley who do not wish to move from the area but because of the lack of smaller properties with LARGE rooms choose to remain in their own large 4 or 5 bedroom properties. These should be providing the homes for the next generation.

Older people also want a small outside space and in this way the Beechcroft development is perfect although not all older people want to live in an over 55s estate. The area designated for new homes at the Thatchers would be a perfect location for high quality two bedroomed homes with large living areas and small gardens or courtyards.

I am therefore writing to object in the strongest terms to the local plan for Horsley.

I have lived in East Horsley for over 21 years and it is a lovely place to live and work.

I am in no doubt that if any of the proposals contained within the local plan are followed through then we will lose what makes the Horsleys a vibrant and complete community.

We are a village, and we act like a village and it is worth holding on to this.

Removal from Green Belt

What is the point of the Green Belt if it can be removed on a whim? What are the exceptional circumstances that have been demonstrated for this to apply. I would appreciate a response on this point.

Settlement Boundaries.

This decision too seemed to have no basis. There is scope to build additional houses within the boundary (in much lower numbers) and it is vital that we retain the Horsleys as a distinct village.

Infrastructure

There is no doubt that the infrastructure within the village cannot cope with the number of additional houses proposed. The parking at the station is full to overflowing, there is constant heavy traffic already on our narrow roads - particular problems on Ockham Road South and the drainage system fails every time we have a heavy shower. I do not have personal experience of local schools but I understand they are full and that medical facilities are stretched. We have quite a lot of older people in Horsley and they are a greater burden on the Health Service and deserve to be treated quickly.
Station Parade

The erroneous designation of Station Parade as a District Centre seems to have happened because somebody pressed the wrong button on their calculator. We have a collection of village shops - no more - and the village is not equipped to cope with the development proposed.

Villages at Ockham and Burnt Common

The impact of these proposed developments on our village would be enormous - extra traffic before and after complete and the demand for facilities within the village.

Concern over Housing numbers

It is hard to believe that there is sufficient demand within our area for so many houses. No one objects to "infill" but this is a major change in the shape of our village which seems to have been decided on against all the evidence. Is it true there is sufficient brown field land within Guildford to build a large proportion of these homes? I would appreciate a response to this.

I am concerned that some local businesses are being sacrificed in order to build houses that we do not need. Two local businesses are about to disappear as a result of the new Opera House (construction traffic is already a problem)

While most younger residents work in London there are many middle aged and older people who work locally. It is one of the joys of living in Horsley that friends and neighbours are truly part of the local community. It is important that we retain this balance.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2923</th>
<th>Respondent: 10569953 / Darius Hughes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South</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 state my objections towards the Guildford Borough Council Local Plan 2016. I think that it will ruin our beautiful countryside, and I am deeply concerned about the Local Plan 2016.

Loss of Green Belt

I object to the removal of the Horsleys from the Green Belt because I do not want building on protected countryside.

Overloaded medical facilities

I object to the building of more houses in the area which will put strain on the already overloaded medical practice in East Horsley.

Schools are full

I object to the building of more houses in the area because The Raleigh and The Howard of Effingham schools are already full.

Drainage
I object to more houses being built because the drainage system in the villages is inadequate. There are floods on the roads which prevent me walking to the station sometimes.

**Roads**

I object to more houses being built because the roads are too busy and this will make them busier.

**Car parks**

I object to having more cars in the villages because there is limited car parking space already and more cars will mean more car parking will be needed.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2676 **Respondent:** 10824705 / TK Williams **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

**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 Council plans to inset East/West Horsley from the Green Belt.

Also, I strongly oppose the GBC plans to propose a major housing building programme in both East/West Horsley and on the old Ripley Airfield. I find the whole scheme totally abhorrent. My reasons are as follows:-

1 The local infrastructure is already overloaded and up to its limits. The schools are full. The medical services at Horsley Medical Centre are stretched to capacity and the drainage on the roads cannot cope. As it is; the roads flood with heavy rain.

2 The local railway stations will not be able to cope with approx an extra 1500 persons. The rush hour trains are already full and there will be insufficient car parking space. There certainly is no adequate bus service in the area.

3 The proposals to build what amounts to another Surrey village on Ripley Airfield is ridiculous. 2100 new houses means at least 4000 cars.

How can our beautiful rural villages accommodate these unacceptable proposals from Guildford Borough Council.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2497 **Respondent:** 10832577 / Gillian Rosscornes **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I wish to add my voice to the many objections you will already have received regarding the above plans for the Horsleys and the surrounding villages.
My main objection is to the infringement of the Green Belt in this area. This land is of outstanding natural beauty and needs to stay this way for the future generation to enjoy.

My concern is also for the increased amount of traffic that would arise from the number of houses suggested---also the pressure on local schools; GP Surgeries; car parking at the stations and in the villages etc.

I have lived in Horsley for over fifty years and have seen many changes during this time---but the one that really concerns me is the heavy and continuous traffic that now passes down our roads--this is dangerous now and will become seriously so if these new plans go forward. I ask you to rethink the New Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I wish to object to your plan.

Horsleys are in the Green Belt and there are no proven reasons for removing this protection.

The Horsleys are already crowded to the extent that local children cannot always obtain entry to local schools.

The Medical facilities are exceedingly stretched.

Winter time the roads are often under water because of inadequate drainage.

In short the Horsleys cannot cope with more houses.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I strongly OBJECT to the proposal to remove West Horsley and East Horsley villages from the Green Belt and the proposed development of all the new homes in the area.

It will put even greater strain on our already limited facilities and resources such as schools Doctors, Railway Stations, and
Local Shops together with the limited parking spaces in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2289  **Respondent:** 10967329 / Steve Johnson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Dear Sir/Madam,

Proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt - The "exceptional circumstances" required before taking this action have not been demonstrated.

Extension of the boundaries of the Settlement areas of the Horsleys - No sound reasons have been given for the proposed changes, which seem to be aimed solely at increasing the land available within the settlements for future additional development.

Infrastructure already overloaded - The local Schools are full. Medical facilities stretched. Drainage is inadequate, roads & car parks are overloaded with little or no scope for improvements.

Station Parade is designated a "District Centre" - This "classification" results from a complete misreading of the nature of the facilities in the village centre & would inappropriately target the area for future urban developments.

Development of over 2,000 house village at Ockham (former Wisley Airfield) - The impact on the Horsley villages of such a huge mixed housing, retail, commercial, traveller & schools development, under 2 miles away, would be enormous. The plan also includes extensive developments at Burnt Common (400 houses & commercial developments) & Gosden Hill Farm, Burpham (2000 houses & mixed use developments).

Major doubt concerning housing numbers - The inflated number of new houses proposed arises from a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) that was generated by a consultant's mathematical model which is not revealed in the plan. Nor, apparently, to Guildford Borough Council (GBC). This SHMA target housing number is then further increased by GBC to give a population increase which is almost 70% higher than the official national estimates for population growth in the Borough. The scale of this increase has alarming results e.g. an increase of up to 35% in existing West Horsley households - greater than any other single area in the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2737  **Respondent:** 10985153 / Denise Liparoto  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The green belt was put in place to prevent urban sprawl and to prevent homogenising rural communities.
NO COMPELLING REASON HAS BEEN GIVEN FOR TAKING THE HORSLEYS OUT OF THE GREEN BELT. I VIOLENTLY OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSAL.

The Horsleys has very distinct character which will be ruined by the granting of planning permission for all of the projects that have been proposed which is a sort of opening the floodgates approach incoming on all sides.

I object to the size of the development at Wisley airfield and its resultant effect on traffic and services in the area.

I object to the proposed development of The Thatchers site again for its affect on traffic putting pressure on a double bend both off which there are already 3 road turnings plus the turning for the development itself and the petrol station. Apart from the developer who benefits no doubt there will be very few houses that address the issues of what is needed locally.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/60  Respondent: 11015425 / David Jenne  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In the policy statement our village is wrongly classified as two villages, West Horsley South and West Horsley North. West Horsley’s Defined Settlement Area boundaries DO NOT need to be extended and no exceptional circumstances or justification for insetting these areas from the Green Belt have been presented. Expansion of both West and East Horsley is unsustainable with limited bus services on week days only through West Horsley it clearly means an unmanageable amount of additional cars on the road. The roads within the village are so bad that I consider them to be the worst I have driven on in the United Kingdom and are in need or urgent repair. My own and my daughter cars have been damaged by dangerous potholes and the roads will simply not be able to cope with the increased traffic that will come with the building of so many houses.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2288  Respondent: 11023553 / Patricia Rapenne  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Dear Sir/Madam,

Proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt - The "exceptional circumstances" required before taking this action have not been demonstrated.

Extension of the boundaries of the Settlement areas of the Horsleys - No sound reasons have been given for the proposed changes, which seem to be aimed solely at increasing the land available within the settlements for future additional development.

Infrastructure already overloaded - The local Schools are full. Medical facilities stretched. Drainage is inadequate, roads & car parks are overloaded with little or no scope for improvements.
Station Parade is designated a "District Centre" - This "classification" results from a complete misreading of the nature of the facilities in the village centre & would inappropriately target the area for future urban developments.

Development of over 2,000 house village at Ockham (former Wisley Airfield) - The impact on the Horsley villages of such a huge mixed housing, retail, commercial, traveller & schools development, under 2 miles away, would be enormous. The plan also includes extensive developments at Burnt Common (400 houses & commercial developments) & Gosden Hill Farm, Burpham (2000 houses & mixed use developments).

Major doubt concerning housing numbers - The inflated number of new houses proposed arises from a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) that was generated by a consultant's mathematical model which is not revealed in the plan. Nor, apparently, to Guildford Borough Council (GBC). This SHMA target housing number is then further increased by GBC to give a population increase which is almost 70% higher than the official national estimates for population growth in the Borough. The scale of this increase has alarming results e.g. an increase of up to 35% in existing West Horsley households - greater than any other single area in the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/65  Respondent: 15111713 / Niall Malak  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My concerns as a resident of West Horsley is the lack of infrastructure and removal from the Green Belt.

We have a shortage of school places, you can't see your GP due to so many people.

I feel this removal from the Green Belt will be a trigger for all the developers to think of the Horsleys as fair game and Change the fabric and feel of the village forever.

Where is the guarantee any of these houses will be for 1st time buyers or even affordable?

I estimate they will be more like millionaire pads with no real improvements for he local population.

Where is the protection for our green spaces and any guarantee the number quoted is fixed for 20 years or more?

I'm not against new homes, provided they are for the benefit of this who need them. I also can't see why the need to take the villages out of the green belt?

There seems to be no guarantees or protection for the villagers and certainly no thought through infrastructure plan.

Therefore, I object to the volume of the plan and the lack of accountability of the so called plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/477  Respondent: 15225857 / BlackOnyx Developments limited  Agent: AECOM (Philip Scott)

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

PROPOSED SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN (REGULATION 19) – JUNE 2016

WEST HORSLEY (SOUTH): PROPOSED INSETTING FROM GREEN BELT AND PROPOSED SUBMISSION HOUSING ALLOCATION SITE A37 - LAND ADJACENT TO AND REAR OF BELL AND COLVILL, EPSOM ROAD, WEST HORSLEY

On behalf of our client, BlackOnyx Developments Limited, please accept and register these formal representations to the Borough Council’s Proposed Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19) in relation to the Proposed Submission insetting of West Horsley (South) from the Green Belt and Proposed Submission Policy A37 Land at and to the rear of Bell and Colvill, Epsom Road, West Horsley.

These representations confirm our support for the following Proposed Submission policies:

- Proposed Submission Policy S2: Borough Wide Strategy
- Proposed Submission Policy P2: Green Belt
- Proposed Insetting of West Horsley (South)
- Proposed Submission Site A37: Housing allocation: Land at and to the rear of Bell and Colvill, Epsom Road, West Horsley

Background

BlackOnyx Developments Limited fully supports the Borough Council’s Submission Local Plan in relation to the proposed insetting of West Horsley (South) from the Green Belt and the proposed allocation of 1.4 hectares of land at and to the rear of the Bell and Colvill, West Horsley as set out in Proposed Submission Policy P2 and Proposed Submission Site Allocation A37.

BlackOnyx Developments Limited has entered into an agreement with the freehold owner of No. 28 The Street, West Horsley to acquire the land in relation to the northern part of Proposed Submission Site A37, we are able to confirm that the northern part of site A37 is available and deliverable during the early part of the Plan period for housing development.

Proposed insetting of West Horsley (South)

West Horsley is a sustainable settlement which has grown significantly to the north of the A246 (Epsom Road) and includes a wide array of housing types together with a mix of local services and amenities including a car sales garage and service repair workshop, a shop, church, two pubs, Cranmore School, a village hall, and a community hall. Despite this, the entirety of the village is currently washed over by the Green Belt in the adopted Local Plan 2003. This approach is inconsistent with the Government’s latest advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (‘NPPF’).

In this important regard, the Government makes it clear that Green Belt villages should not to be seen as areas where no development should come forward, but rather where development opportunities, which do not intrude into the purposes underlying the Green Belt designation, can be provided, they should be grasped. This is clear from NPPF paragraph 79 where the importance of the Green Belt is recognised, through the reiteration of the purposes of Green Belt in paragraph 80 and the approach to boundaries in paragraph 85. Paragraph 86 deals with washed over villages directly and the policy advises that washing over is not the proper approach for those areas where the settlements do not make a Green Belt contribution.
Throughout the preparation of the new Local Plan, the Borough Council has consistently (and publicly) acknowledged that the current policy approach to Green Belt and villages does not accord with the NPPF. For example, paragraph 4.111 in the Draft Local Plan (2014) states:

“All our villages, except Ash Green, and our major previously developed sites are currently washed over by the Green Belt designation. National planning policy states that only those villages whose open character make an important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt should be included in the Green Belt. Those that do not should instead be inset from the Green Belt, removing their Green Belt status. It also states that we should not include land in the Green Belt which is unnecessary to keep permanently open. It is important to stress that whilst the Green Belt policy would no longer apply, other development control policies will still serve to restrict any inappropriate development in these places, including for instance Conservation Area status.”  (Paragraph 4.111 Draft Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites - July 2014).

**Promoting Sustainable Patterns of Development**

The adopted 2003 policy approach to washing over villages with Green Belt has had a significant restrictive impact on the ability to deliver new homes and jobs across the borough. It has clearly played its part in the failure of the borough to meet housing need which has resulted in a step change increase in recent years as evidence by the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN).

In that respect, we note from the Proposed Submission Local Plan the Borough Council’s proposed spatial development strategy and the commitment to delivering up to 13,860 new homes during the new Plan period as part of promoting sustainable patterns of development (to meet acute housing need in the borough). This new approach is set out in **Proposed Submission Policy S2: Borough Wide Strategy. We strongly support the aims and objective of Policy S2.**

In particular, we note that Proposed Submission Policy S2 has been informed and developed through a series of evidence based assessments including five volumes of the Green Belt and Countryside Study (‘GBCS’) and various iterations of borough-wide housing need assessment. We note that the Council’s Proposed Submission Policy S2 seeks to distribute housing growth fairly across the borough with a focus towards supporting and creating sustainable settlements. We consider that the Borough Wide Strategy is credible and robust and is in accordance with the aims and objectives of the NPPF.

Additionally, we also note the depth of information and evidence contained in the Borough Council’s GBCS (2014) which provides an objective independent assessment of the characteristics of settlements and villages including **West Horsley (South).** The GBCS confirms that areas of West Horsley (South) to the north of the Epsom Road including the Proposed Submission Site A37 are part of the village and as such lend themselves to inclusion within the inset settlement boundary rather than the open countryside. In accordance with the policy principles of the NPPF we agree that West Horsley (South) does not contribute to the open characteristics of the Green Belt and should therefore be inset from the Green Belt.

[IMAGE 1]

**Green Belt and Countryside Study Volume IV Stage 3: West Horsley (South) – Proposed insetting from Green Belt**

**Proposed Submission Housing Site A37**

Proposed Submission Housing Site A37 comprises either previously developed (brownfield) land, or comprises land located within the heart of the village and largely surrounded by ‘medium density development’ as confirmed in the Borough Council’s GBCS (2014). The GBCS also concludes that proposed Submission Housing Site A37 has defensible boundaries, and land to the rear of Bell and Colvill has no visual connection to the open countryside. Furthermore, the entirety of the proposed Submission Housing Site A37 has no particular landscape, ecological, or heritage value.

The Proposed Submission housing site benefits from access to a local bus route and the nearest train station (East Horsley) is only 1.9 miles away and can easily be reached by cycle or car. We note that the LAA and GBCS both
conclude that the proposed submission site is sustainable and accessible and its development would not be detrimental to sustainability objectives.

[IMAGE 2]

**Extent of Proposed Submission Policy A37: Land at and to the rear of Bell & Colvill, Epsom Road, West Horsley as illustrated in the LAA and Proposed Submission Local Plan**

A range of baseline studies have been undertaken to assess the likely impacts of delivering housing development in this location. The studies include: a transport assessment, planning assessment, flood risk assessment, ecological (stage 1) assessment, acoustic report, and landscape and visual impact assessment. All the studies carried out demonstrate that housing development can be delivered on the proposed submission site without causing any harm to amenities or the local environment.

Indeed the provision of new housing on Proposed Submission Site A37 will benefit local services and amenities by ensuring that the village caters for housing needs, retains a mix of people (including young people), and helps to ensure the continued health of services and facilities in West Horsley.

[IMAGE 3]

**West Horsley (South) – Proposed Submission Local Plan - Inset Plan showing extent of village that should be inset from the Green Belt**

**Housing Need**

The need to ensure that development opportunities are seized in Guildford borough is particularly important given that past housing delivery has not met identified housing needs and consequently the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land.

In this respect, it is highly notable that the annual housing Monitoring Report 2014/2015 published in October 2015 acknowledges that the Council has only 2.4 years of housing land supply against a requirement to identify 5 years housing land supply. Furthermore, housing need in the borough has risen from 322 dwellings per year to an Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) of 693 homes per year as identified in the West Surrey SHMA (2015) because housing land. The OAN includes a significant uplift for affordability, economic factors and student growth. The Council needs to facilitate a step change in housing land supply and delivery to meet local need.

The Council’s sustainable development strategy (Proposed Submission Policy S2: Borough Wide Strategy) identifies that the Council’s preferred approach is to focus future housing growth in the most sustainable locations which the Council identify as:

- Guildford town centre
- Urban areas
- Inset villages
- Identified Green Belt villages

This strategy is clearly in conformity with the aims and objectives contained in the NPPF. In that respect, sustainable, accessible settlements such as West Horsley (South) can play an important role in the borough’s development strategy
and make a meaningful contribution towards accommodating new housing development to meet acute housing need. The Council’s recognition of this in the Proposed Submission Local Plan is therefore supported.

**Conclusion**

Proposed Submission Policy P2 Green Belt acknowledges that the current adopted 2003 Local Plan policy approach of washing over villages and settlements with Green Belt is not in accordance with the Government’s advice contained in the NPPF (2012). The NPPF is abundantly clear that only villages and settlements whose open characteristics contribute to the purposes of the Green Belt should to be subject to Green Belt designation.

The NPPF also advises that villages have an important contribution to make in terms of accommodating new housing development to help meet housing need as part of sustainable spatial patterns of development. It is completely appropriate that West Horsley (South) takes its fair share of housing growth during the new Plan period. In this regard, the provision of housing on Proposed Submission Site A37 will benefit local services and amenities by ensuring that the village caters for local housing need, retains a healthy mix of people (including young people), and will help to ensure the continued health of village services and facilities.

The current planning policy approach and the washing over of settlements within Green Belt has contributed to a lack of available housing land within Guildford borough. The borough can only currently demonstrate a 2.4 year supply of housing land against a requirement to identify 5 years of deliverable housing land supply.

We note that the GBCS 2014 has objectively assessed the characteristics of West Horsley (South) and its boundaries in relation to the Green Belt. The GBCS has concluded that West Horsley (South) should be inset along new defensible boundaries to incorporate Proposed Submission Site A37.

Furthermore, Proposed Submission Site A37 has already been subject to a range of baseline technical assessments which demonstrate that the proposed submission housing site is of no particular landscape, ecological, or heritage importance. In addition, safe vehicular access to the Proposed Submission Site can be delivered and the land ownership is not a constraint to development.

In light of all of the above, it is clear the case that the proposed insetting of West Horsley (South) within the Green Belt, together with the allocation of Site A37, are appropriate policy objectives and are fully in conformity with the Government’s advice contained in the NPPF. The Proposed Submission Local Plan should be supported accordingly.

I would be very grateful if you would confirm that these representations in support of Proposed Submission Policies; S2: Borough Wide Strategy, P2: Green Belt, the insetting of West Horsley (South), and the Proposed Submission Housing Site A37: Land at and to the rear of Bell and Colvill, Epsom Road, West Horsley have been registered and are ‘duly made’.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:  
- Picture 2 Aecom.png (145 KB)  
- Picture 3 Aecom.png (271 KB)  
- Picture 1 Aecom.png (273 KB)

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2526  **Respondent:** 15257281 / Kath Frackiewicz  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

**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 to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt and for extending the boundaries of the Settlement areas of the Horsleys, thus possibly leading to a substantial number of new homes being built.
2. The public facilities and public transport are already at full capacity. The only practical way to reach East Horsley is by car and parking is already difficult, therefore additional vehicular traffic arising from more people living in the vicinity or coming to East Horsley could not be catered for and would be chaotic for the residents already living there.

3. The infrastructure in East & West Horsley is already over stretched. For instance in East Horsley we have had Thames Water checking the sewers as they have concerns about their capacity. When we have heavy rain we have flooding - refer to government maps which places part of East Horsley on the 'Flood Plain'. The roads around East & West Horsley are already very busy and in many places 2 cars travelling in opposite directions struggle to pass - never mind any larger vehicle. Examples of this can be found on Ockham Road South between Bishopsmead shops and the railway station.

West Horsley - I have no objection in principle to use the Bell & Colville Garage Site for housing.

The remainder of East & West Horsley - As well as the Green Belt issue I mention at the start of my letter, I object to increasing the size of these villages by some 500 additional houses, mainly the proposed additional housing sites in West Horsley. This would destroy the character of both East & West Horsley. In addition to adding the 500 or so houses, such an increase would severely impact East Horsley since West Horsley has no facilities to speak of, i.e. no shops, surgery, bank, library, etc. Therefore more people would travel to East Horsley and further increase the parking problem there. There is a primary school (Raleigh) which is shared with East Horsley but I understand that this is full and certainly the secondary school at Effingham is full. So again any significant increase in people living in East & West Horsley would probably swamp the schools facilities we already have in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2528  Respondent: 15257281 / Kath Frackiewicz  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In conclusion East & West Horsley as well as Ockham are village communities and I wish them to remain so. Brownfield sites in the Guildford area should be the starting point for any additional housing. Guildford Borough Council being an elected body together with it's Councillors should all be fighting for the wishes of the citizens who have elected them. Whilst I recognise that some additional new housing is required, GBC have a responsibility not to pursue a policy of providing excessive new homes in areas which will encroach into the Green Belt and destroy the wonderful environment of our pretty villages that we live in.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/794  Respondent: 15294881 / Jean Smith  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object strongly to the building on green belt if started where would it stop.

I object strongly to the new interchange at burnt common the by pass was built to do exactly that, bypass the villages. The road cannot be widened to take traffic plus Clandon road two large vehicles cannot pass in certain parts of this road plus send rd could not take extra traffic.
I object strongly to building houses on the greenbelt land and a industrial space at Garlick's Arch, I have lived here 50 years and know that land can flood also cannot build under Pylons where would all this extra traffic go as often it comes to a standstill now roads are in an appauling state also this field grows corn etc.

I object to houses = 2 travellers pitches send hill as once again very small narrow roads for traffic who will be responsible for rubbish and spoilt countryside from travellers pitches which always happens, I have seen this before.

I would like to ask as it is at the moment my grandson could not get into any of the 4 schools requested so now he will have to be driven to school and also his sister where they have a school within walking distance which my grand daughter does now she is 7 he is 4. So where are all these other children going to school. Perhaps this is why obesity is here?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/872  Respondent: 15303681 / Nicola Stockbridge  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

OBJECTION TO REMOVE THE HORSLEYS FROM THE GREEN BELT AND SPECIFICALLY TO THE WATERLOO FARM PROPOSED SITE.

I have recently moved into the area, and did so because of the countryside view open to the rear of my property, being the paddock of Waterloo Farm. I had no idea that within a matter of a few months I would be facing the prospect of potentially 120 houses being built to the rear of my property.

I would like to object to this potential site, as it would affect my privacy and light to the rear of my property. This area already suffers from drainage problems and the property to the rear is designated paddock at present. It would also majorly devalue my property, as it is the privacy and view that I bought my home for. We also have a multitude of wildlife to the rear of the property. Deer often venture into my garden, as well as pheasants, rabbits and many birds. Bats can often be seen in the early evening sky. I seriously doubt this would happen if the paddocks and open land are replaced by new homes

Horsley is a quiet country village, and with the amount of new homes you hope to build, this will no longer be the case. This is not why myself, and many others, have moved into the area.

I do not believe that the local infrastructure can cope with the numbers of new houses you propose. The schools are full, roads in poor condition, medical facilities stretched, drainage in this area is extremely poor and there is little parking available already.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/874  Respondent: 15303745 / Zackary Stockbridge  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
OBJECTION TO REMOVE THE HORSLEYS FROM THE GREEN BELT AND SPECIFICALLY TO THE WATERLOO FARM PROPOSED SITE

I currently live with my mum at [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998]. We moved here in February and I've been very happy here because we have lots of wildlife in our back garden. We often have deer in the asleap at our back door, as well as pheasants, owls, wood peckers, rabbits and we often see bats early in the morning and late at night. I love living here because we have lots of light in our back garden and a beautiful view of the paddocks, and it's very private. It's lovely to look out my bedroom window at the wildlife and gorgeous trees.

Unfortunately I have not been able to get into the local schools, as we've been told they are full. Raleigh School is on my doorstep but that is also full so my brother cannot attend.

So I'm objecting to you changing my back yard and making my community too busy. I like that it's quiet and has a lovely village feel.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
mass) and populations (East Horsley: 3785 people and West Horsley: 2828 people) is significantly larger than other villages in the Borough and contain a higher number of key community services and facilities making it the most sustainable rural settlement in the Borough. The document further advises that the area could support additional housing development in the future if suitable sites are found. In order to achieve this the advice is that the settlement boundary would need to be amended. This approach accords with the advice of the NPPF (See Paragraph 5.5) and the settlement (Green Belt) boundary has been changed. In both cases, the Promoter supports the Borough Council’s decision.

2. Planning Strategy for West Horsley (South)

2.1 The Submission Local Plan, through its Spatial Vision and Borough Wide Strategy (Policy S2), indicates that there is the need to deliver 13,860 additional homes by 2033. The location for this housing includes both urban and rural areas. It is proposed, for instance, to allocate 1200 dwellings on non-strategic sites within and around existing villages, some of which are now inset from the Green Belt, and over 750 dwellings as extensions to existing villages. The Submission Local Plan advises that these dwellings can offer a variety of housing choice in villages and help contribute to supporting local services and the important role they play in village life.

2.2 The village of West Horsley was, historically, washed over by the Green Belt designations. It is now, however, identified on the Key Diagram/Policies Map as being “white” and thus an “area inset from the Green Belt”. It is also shown on the Diagram/Map as being outside the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This means that the village is no longer subject to the need to maintain the openness of the Green Belt or constrained by the very important national landscape designation.

2.3 The West Horsley (South) Inset Map indicates that the village has a Conservation Area and an Area of High Archaeological Potential. A Site Allocation (A37) is identified at the southern end of the village and is deemed suitable to accommodate around 40 homes.

2.4 The Promoter supports the provisions of Policy S1 (Sustainable Development). The allocation of land for housing development in the village confirms that it is a suitable and sustainable location.

2.5 The provisions of Policy H1 (Homes for All) is supported by the Promoter. The reasoned justification for the policy (Paragraph 4.2.5) acknowledges the Borough Council’s support for an appropriate mix of homes in villages. It also accepts that although new development must be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area this does not preclude the delivery of smaller units as these are capable of being designed in such a way that respects the prevailing built form.

2.6 The Promoter’s main concern, and thus principal objection to the wording of the Policy, is that in promoting “Housing Mix” it does not permit the net loss of existing/allocated housing. The situation is such that the loss of an existing house or couple of houses could act as enabler to the redevelopment of land to the rear i.e. a backland site that is effectively landlocked.

2.7 The Promoter objects to the allocation of the land (Policy A37) to the rear of Bell and Colvill, Epsom Road, West Horsley on the grounds that, although it seeks to utilise some brownfield land (being an existing car showroom and workshop and two detached dwellings (Braeside and Bijou)), a large proportion of it is located in the village’s Conservation Area. This is deemed to be a significant constraint which is not helped by the fact that the site suffers from surface water flood risk a well, as acknowledged by the Borough Council. Moreover, other relevant issues include the loss of employment land (B2/Sui generis), given its association with the sale and repair of cars, and the presence and potential loss of a number of mature trees.

3. Promotion of land for development

3.1 The Promoter’s land is 2ha in area and comprises of a number of fields adjacent to each other. The attached Location Plan confirms its location and extent. The plan also provides an indication of possible points for vehicular access, to bring the land forward for development, and this would involve the demolition of one of the existing houses, excluding Silkmore being the listed building.
3.2 The land is surrounded on three sides (to the north, east and south) by existing built development. The remaining boundary (west) is defined by existing mature hedges and other boundary treatments.

3.3 The dwelling, Silkmore, was designated a listed building (Grade II) in June 1967. It occupies a substantial plot, with landscaped gardens. The house has been subject to alterations in both the 19th and 20th centuries.

3.4 The area is predominantly residential in character. The other existing dwellings along the east side of the land are all modern in age being built in the mid 1960’s (Willowpond) and mid 1980’s (Ashley Cottage) respectively.

3.5 The adjacent road, Silkmore Lane, is unclassified. It has a semi-rural appearance being formed of a tarmac carriageway with grass verges either side.

3.6 The West Horsley (North) Inset map confirms that the land is located outside the village’s Conservation Area and Area of High Archaeological Potential. It is also neither in Flood Zone 2 nor Flood Zone 3 according to the Environment Agency Flood maps.

3.7 The West Horsley (North) Inset map confirms that the land is located outside the village’s Conservation Area and Area of High Archaeological Potential. It is also neither in Flood Zone 2 nor Flood Zone 3 according to the Environment Agency Flood maps.

4. Conclusions

4.1 The Promoter agrees with the Borough Council that, in order for them to meet their housing requirements, the village of West Horsley (North) is both a suitable and sustainable location for new housing development. He supports, therefore, the provisions of both Policies SD2 and H1. In saying that, however, he is not convinced that the land identified for housing purposes under Policy A37 is the right choice given its environmental sensitivity.

4.2 The land identified by the Promoter had very good potential for development, including housing. It is devoid of any significant constraints and is located outside the designated heritage assets. The setting of the listed building is accepted as being a key factor for consideration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: [Guildford BC Submission Local Plan West Horsley Representation July 2016 Plan.pdf](#) (2.0 MB)

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2294  **Respondent:** 15483489 / Mary K Main  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

**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 proposal to take the Horsleys and neighbouring villages out of the Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to warrant such an action.

Whilst accepting that there is a need for some additional housing, I strongly OBJECT to the proposal to build as many as 593 additional homes in a settlement of about 3000, which is the present size of the Horsleys.

The projected housing requirements for the Borough do not have any basis which has been defined. No proposal should be put forward for consideration until it is made clear why a certain number of dwellings are required and the reliability of this projection.
Before adding to the population of the Horsleys, the infrastructure must be upgraded. Local education and medical facilities must be made capable of expansion. Currently, the roads are inadequate for the traffic which uses them. If the population is really going to take to riding bicycles (or tricycles) as a regular form of transportation, then the provision of a network of cycle tracks is an essential precursor.

Mixing cyclists and motor transport is dangerous and severely disrupts the normal flow of traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2308  Respondent: 15484001 / Theo Trayhurn  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My family and I live in West Horsley [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 wife) and I would like to object in the strongest terms to what seems a particularly poorly considered local plan in the context of East and West Horsley (the "Horsleys"). There are many potential heads of objection but the following strike me as particularly pertinent:

- From a legal perspective, the local plan does not demonstrate the "exceptional circumstances" that would be required to remove the Horsleys from the Greenbelt.

- The proposals outlined in the local plan would increase West Horsley's housing stock by 35% over a very short period of time. This is a ridiculous position in any event for a village such as West Horsley but an increase in population density of this magnitude would clearly require significant infrastructure development (given the current pressure on education, traffic, drainage and other infrastructure). The local plan does not address this issue. The fact that the local plan has proposed such a fundamental increase to West Horsley's housing stock without addressing this issue raises serious questions as to the core integrity and competence of the local plan.

We expect much better from our elected council and the local plan will be subject to significant challenge if pushed through in anything resembling its current form.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2496  Respondent: 15502497 / Karen Young  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing in the strongest terms possible to voice my objection to the proposed plan for the new housing development sites in East and West Horsley. I have lived in West Horsley for 20 years – my husband and I moved to the village as we considered the area to be one of outstanding natural beauty where we could bring up our family in a safe, pollutant free environment. During the time that we have lived here, there have been a substantial number of new houses being built which, generally speaking, have been sympathetically developed on land which had previously had housing or by extending plots within established gardens – as has been seen on our road – Nightingale Crescent where 2 new houses were built.
The suggestion that the Horsleys’ require the number of new houses proposed is ridiculous. The local amenities are just about coping with the number of residents currently housed in the two villages. Without significant input into increasing the local amenities – such as schooling, doctor’s surgery, dentists etc the two villages cannot sustain any further increase in the population. Our local roads are already under increased pressure from the daily number of vehicles and again without a significant amount of investment into their upkeep, the road surface will getting increasingly worse.

We fondly refer to East and West Horsley as being beautiful caring villages – the new proposed plan would create a monstrous sprawling housing estate – a far cry from the countryside village that we moved to in 1996. I love where I live and I certainly don’t wish for the Horsleys to change in anyway!

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2674  **Respondent:** 15568161 / Andrew Homewood  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I am writing to notify my concerns regarding the Guildford Local Plan (the Plan) and specifically the development as outlined in East & West Horsley where it would appear that the proposal incorporates nearly 600 new houses to be constructed within a five year period of the adoption of the Plan.

Whilst I appreciate the need to provide additional housing stock it is imperative that any development of this magnitude considers commensurate attention and improvements to the hinterland’s basic infrastructure. I am not convinced that this infrastructure improvement is adequately demonstrated or supported within the Plan.

My major concerns include:

1. There is a proposal to remove East & West Horsley from the Green Belt. My understanding is that this drastic action should only be contemplated in “exceptional circumstances”. I do not believe that these “exceptional circumstances” have been adequately demonstrated.

2. There appears to be a proposal to extend the boundaries of the Settlement areas of East & West Horsley. It is not clear to me why these changes are proposed with no persuasive reasons or evidence to support the proposal. I am advised that the sole purpose of this extension appears to be aimed at increasing the land available within the settlements for future additional, but as yet unspecified, development. This is a serious concern.

3. I have previously mentioned my concerns regarding the additional burden the Plan’s proposals would place on the existing infrastructure. There is already inadequate car parking at both Horsley and Effingham Junction railway stations each of which cater for very heavy commuter traffic. Local schools appear to be more or less at capacity. The medical services are clearly stretched at present and obtaining appointments with doctors is difficult with long waiting times as routine. Drainage and water supply pipework appears overloaded and inadequate with frequent bursting of pipes and overflowing of drains in winter. The road surfaces are poor, potholed and in need of regular repair. The Drift, a very popular and busy cut through from West to East Horsley, is a prime example. There appears to be little or no scope or interest in improvement and certainly nothing that I have seen in the Plan which offers any comfort here.

4. I notice that Station Parade is designated as a “District Centre”. I understand District Centres to be large groups of shops, together with appropriate supporting non-retail facilities and services, which collectively form a coherent shopping centre. I am further advised they normally feature not less than 50 units, often many more, and are well placed to serve the County’s major population concentrations. To classify Station Parade as a District Centre demonstrates a serious failure to comprehend the nature of the facilities currently provided in the village centre and would leave the area at risk of further, future, damaging and inappropriate urbanisation.

5. There is a staggering proposal to develop more than 2000 housing units on the former Wisley Airfield at Ockham. This is represented as a new housing village. The impact on East & West Horsley of such a massive
mixed housing, retail, commercial, traveller and schools development all less than two miles away would be significant and damaging. The additional proposals for extensive development at Burnt Common (400 houses and commercial developments), Gosden Hill Farm and Burpham (2000 houses and mixed use developments) only compound the adverse impact on East & West Horsley.

6. I am advised that there is a major doubt concerning the basis upon which the additional housing numbers have been proposed. It appears that the inflated number of new houses proposed arises from a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SMHA) that was generated by a consultant’s mathematical model but the basis and detail of that model is not provided or revealed in the Plan. Nor, I am advised, has the model been shared with Guildford Borough Council (GBC). I am advised that the SMHA target housing number has then been further increased by GBC to extrapolate a population increase which is almost 70% higher than the official national estimates for population growth in the Borough. It is clear that the scale of this increase has alarming consequences and produces potentially unsafe results such as a projected increase of up to 35% in existing Horsley households. This, I am advised, is greater than any other single area in the Borough and tends to suggest that the basis upon which the number of additional houses has been calculated may be in need of the most careful scrutiny.

For these reasons I must register my objection to the Plan as currently proposed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I feel that the intended additional 593 houses in the Horsley area are a ridiculous increase in relation to the amount of current residential housing. The current infrastructure is already overloaded and I cannot see how current provisions will be able to support such a dramatic increase in housing over the next 5 years. I feel it would be irresponsible to place such additional pressures on the locals schools and medical facilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I write as someone who has lived in West Horsley my entire life to register a strong protest against the proposal of Guildford Borough Council to remove Green Belt status from West Horsley and East Horsley. The introduction of an estimated 35 per cent new homes in West Horsley alone would irreparably alter the character of the village and is, for the reasons I will enumerate below, an incredibly ill-thought out scheme.

The scale of this plan is unsustainable for a multitude of reasons:

- I wholly object to the unwritten expectation that all the villages on the A3 corridor will, sooner rather than later, become an urban sprawl linking this area to the suburbs of south west London.

- Our environment is attractive and of national importance for flora, fauna and geographical issues.

- The importance of maintaining the Green Belt to prevent the urbanisation of Surrey's rural communities, like West Horsley and East Horsley, is paramount. Our legacy should not be to leave behind a landscape to resemble a concrete jungle – which I fear will be the consequence of the scale of the proposal drawn up by Guildford Borough Council.

- If we are to protect the Green Belt for future generations we need to ensure it is only lost after strict examination against laid down criteria and after all suitable Brown Field sites are fully utilised.

- Our concern about the Cayman Island registered company's promotion on the former Wisley Airfield will have unimaginable and irreversible consequences on all the villages surrounding the site, obviously including West Horsley.

- It is incumbent on the Local Plan that the unsatisfied demand for housing is established as a genuine local demand for people born it the locality, or who need to live in the locality as a consequence of their local employment; or are existing residents needing to downsize or upsize.

- In West Horsley, we have watched a succession of smaller, and therefore ‘affordable’ properties, be granted planning permission by the Guildford Borough Council allowing them to be rebuilt into substantially larger, and therefore hugely more expensive homes. Where has the coherent thinking been behind that policy?

- The infrastructure is already at capacity. Our roads, through West Horsley and East Horsley, are congested at peak times of the day since commuter and school traffic has become significantly increased in recent years.

- Traffic increases from the proposed new housing estates will exacerbate an already critical overload of cars in the village.
• This congestion then spreads to all the adjacent roads. Furthermore, the state of these roads, and all others within the two villages, are narrow with poor or limited paving. In places, in West Horsley, there is barely room for two four-by-four vehicles to pass; and the presence of trucks, which are seen with greater frequency as our villages are used as cut-through between the A3/M25 and the A246 Guildford-Leatherhead road, causes traffic to slow to a halt. This is also placing pedestrians at risk.

• Also, there are several points in East Lane, in West Horsley, that are repeatedly flooded through the winter. In essence, the pressure on our roads and drainage is at a worryingly fraught level today.

• Erosion of verges and ditches is already a threat caused by flooding and unusual weather patterns of late. The effect of concreting over the Green Belt land will further reduce the natural drainage system and drive water into existing drains that are already at risk of overflowing.

• Parking is already an issue, too. The station car park, serving both villages, is almost full on most days from Monday-Friday. Parking at the three parades of shops is also regularly overloaded.

• The Raleigh School in West Horsley is full with no room on the site for expansion. The Howard of Effingham Secondary School, traditionally the school that children from West Horsley transfer to at the appropriate age, is also at maximum capacity.

• At school times, when parents deliver or collect their children from the Raleigh Primary School, or the preparatory schools, Glenesk and Cranmore, it is not an exaggeration to describe East Lane, Ockham Road, Northcote Road, Northcote Crescent and Nightingale Crescent as chaotic. It does not bear thinking about how much worse these roads would become in the event of an influx of housing on the scale being considered.

• The Horsley Medical Centre is operating at what appears to be maximum capacity – again parking to keep an appointment at the surgery is already a game of chance. Like the local schools, the Medical Centre has limited scope, or no scope at all, for building development and is at full capacity.

A traditional village life has been maintained throughout my 29 years living in West Horsley; with strong clubs and associations—most of which I have been a part of from my childhood until the present day—as well as an abundance of local businesses, and producers of food local to the area.

There is limited employment within the Horsleys, and the bus service is one designed to meet the needs of ageing, rural community inhabitants; not those seeking to work in Guildford or Woking, for example. The rail service is already heavily used throughout the week – and the railway station is substantial distance from much of the housing in West Horsley.

It is the duty of our generation to maintain the natural beauty – and significant importance – of villages like West Horsley for the generations of the future. We think we are doing a decent job of that. After all, history has shown that the constructions of 1960’s style development of cheap housing created more problems in rural areas than it solved: rising crime, unemployment, and communities without a soul.

Once farmland has been commissioned for development, we have arrived at a point of no return.

This plan destroys the very essence of Surrey – so attractive not only to those of us living here in West Horsley, but for those that relish the chance to visit and enjoy the Green Belt that has been part of our heritage for a century.

I repeat: this Local Plan proposed by Guildford Borough Council is inappropriate and should be condemned for the damage and destruction that would be wreaked upon West Horsley killing a village that is vibrant, well-maintained and cherished by those who live here.

Yours sincerely,

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPA16/2804  Respondent: 15574561 / Pippa Ede  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object strongly to the proposed New Local Plan for East and West Horsley. We have lived in both East and West Horsley for approximately 35 years and so know the area extremely well. We feel certain that the proposal of a further 533 houses in the area will put inordinate strain on the local services, schools, GP practice, roads, parking and general infrastructure. The list is endless.

Having lived in the Horsleys for such a long time, we have seen very many new houses and apartments built on available land and infills which has already put additional strain on local facilities; examples include the GP practice and parking at the shops and the train station in East Horsley.

I should be grateful if you would note my objections accordingly

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2822  Respondent: 15575233 / Anthony Crovella  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write to strongly oppose the Draft Local Plan for Guildford.

As a resident of West Horsley I am appalled by the contents of the draft, the proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt and the proposal for over 500 new homes in East and West Horsley.

The local infrastructure - schools, roads, GPs, local shops are already stretched. The introduction of a vast number of new homes will push local services to breaking point.

The exceptional circumstances required to remove East and West Horsley from the Green Belt have not been demonstrated and no sound reasons have been given for the extension of settlement boundaries around the villages.

It is clear that the draft local plan is flawed, and I urge Guildford Borough Council to reconsider.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2862  Respondent: 15578241 / Cheryl stevens  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I am writing to voice my concern and objection to the local plan. It would appear to me that these areas around Horsley/Ripley/Send are being targeted specifically to enable developers to make a great deal of money. Having lived in this area all my life I have seen small areas built on which have mostly been in keeping with the green belt preservation. However, this area has extremely high valued property. It is therefore a complete fabrication that any development in this area would be affordable. To cram hundreds of houses into this area means making a great deal of money for companies (even if a handful were available at lower cost - the majority would be priced out of reach of most buyers).

The scale of these developments would have a huge detrimental impact on the area due to increased traffic and people. These are rural roads - not built to manage the numbers of cars/people who live there now let alone an increase.

I find it interesting that in your tourist leaflets you site as one of the attributes of this area as the 'peaceful rural / green villages within convenient distance of London'. You are therefore seeking to destroy the most attractive elements of this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2884  Respondent: 15578785 / Bailey Donnell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My understanding is that Horsley to be taken out of the Greenbelt there has to be an exceptional case. I have neither seen or heard any case being made that shows an exceptional circumstances so surely it cannot happen.

I have lived in Horsley fro 13 years. It is a lovely village and with all the proposed developments locally it will be destroyed beyond repair. This cannot be allowed to happen.

I love cycling around our local village and roads and with all the new houses, cars that will come it will not be as safe and there will be accidents

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3152  Respondent: 15587713 / Jennifer Marshall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am a current member of the Horsley Countryside Preservation Society and spent many years of my youth living in both E. and W. Horsley.

I have very fond memories of this beautiful rural area.

I was horrified when I read in a recent HCPS magazine of the hundreds of extra homes that Guildford Borough Council are planning to build in these areas and the encroachment on the precious Green Belt….which plays such a major part as being the Lungs of the country.

---
It is very sad to see the probable demise of “Thatchers”, a major land mark for so many years. My sister, at one stage, owned Fangate Manor Farm, and is horrified how this land is proposed to be subdivided into a housing estate. I object very strongly to these plans.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3155  Respondent: 15587809 / Maureen Slater  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I was absolutely horrified to hear of the proposed ruination of the Horsleys by cramming it with hundreds of houses in a beautiful rural area.

I spent most of my younger years there enjoying the woods, riding in the Sheepleas and walks with the dogs on the many footpaths. We attended many happy functions at the famous Thatchers, in fact we recently on a return visit to the U.K, met up with friends there for lunch. For 10 years I owned and lived at Fangate Manor.

A beautiful smallholding of 6 acres where I had cows, chickens, pigs and dogs. Manor farm was one of my neighbours. I have been told that even that is to

Be subdivided-----how DARE you ruin that and Thatchers. Is nothing sacred any more in the rural villages, will the U.K become like Australia, destroy the heritage

And stick up concrete multi-story housing blocks. I hope not.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/648  Respondent: 15608769 / Heather Mason  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Horsley South

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 submission of the Guildford Local Plan (2017) in relation to housing development sites in West Horsley village. Although two sites have been removed (A36 and A41) from the previous local plan, the proposal of four sites (A37, A38, A39 and A40 adding up to approximately 395 new homes) is still completely inappropriate for the size of the village and would not be sustainable for the following reasons:

- The burden on local infrastructure would be unsupportable. Many roads and lanes are narrow and already congested with traffic at peak times queuing to pass through the village. Even the limited public transport service struggles to pass through the village uninterrupted which causes congestion and delays.

- The only shop in West Horsley, which is a specialist cheese shop, does not provide a wide enough range of goods for peoples’ basic needs. Village residents have to travel to East Horsley to shop. Parking facilities near and around the main parade of shops at Station Parade, East Horsley are already often full during most times of
the day. The addition of nearly 400 extra dwellings (which would be at the very least an extra 800 people and possibly that many cars) would create unsustainable pressures on the local infrastructure.

- The planned population increase would severely negatively impact on the Medical Centre’s capacity to cope with resident’s needs. Parking at Horsley Medical Centre is currently under significant pressure as it is, the car park is frequently full making access to it very difficult and frustrating.
- Several roads throughout West Horsley village frequently flood after severe bouts of wet weather and drainage is a constant problem. I am extremely concerned that the construction of nearly 400 additional properties would only serve to make the situation much worse and negatively impact the local infrastructure and environment.
- Other facilities in the village (e.g. the village hall, local churches and halls) are well used but parking at these sites is either non-existent or inadequate for the number of cars that need to be parked. The consequences of this is already regularly causing problems because cars are being parked in lanes nearby (especially Silkmore Lane, where I live) or in The Street which results in through-traffic being unable to pass through the village on both sides of the road.

In addition to this, I wish to register my objection to the proposal to extend the village boundary into green belt land behind the houses on the west side of Silkmore Lane. This opens up the extremely unwelcome possibility of development rights on rural land which I strongly feel will be detrimental to the character of West Horsley village.

I believe The Guildford Plan (2017) entirely fails to make a justifiable case for locating such large number of homes in West Horsley. I feel it also categorically contravenes the requirement by law to ‘promote sustainable development through the balancing of social, environmental and economic considerations to achieve the best overall outcome’. The proposals of adding so many extra dwellings in West Horsley village is not sustainable and does not balance social and environmental considerations at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Whilst your study states that this parcel of land has limited access at present a new access to this site would have to be negotiated but there are several possibilities including the demolition of one or two existing houses to make way for such access. An access up the driveway to Barcombe Farm from The Street is also perfectly possible.

This site would NOT be a visual intrusion on the village as it is tucked away behind the Overbrook estate and Fulkes Cottages and bounded by woodland to the East and the South, and cannot be seen from higher ground or other roads.

I am confident that the selection of this site would find more favour within the village than those proposed given that some more development in the village is said to be necessary. Furthermore it could be at a density more appropriate to the village situation rather than the extremely high densities proposed.

Regarding the remainder of the plan I would like to see in it proposals to deal with future medical facilities which are at present overstretched, Increased parking at Horsley Rail Station which is at present full on most weekdays, increased capacity of local schools in order to deal with the proposed increase in population.

I view the plan as being produced at a very high level with less than sufficient consideration to the actualities that exist in a lot of the various locations in the Borough.

[Map]

[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:** [Scan_1720500011_Redacted.pdf](#) (2.8 MB)
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Jacobs Well
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/283</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 8848033 / Paul Gerrard</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Jacobs Well</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>“Map Amendment” seems imprecise on first map. Yellow highlighted boundary surrounds a larger area than the local shopping centre with shopping centre itself apparently unmarked. By contrast, the shopping centre does seem to be marked correctly on the second map.</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>Mark shopping centre correctly on first map (presumably by outlining in bold as on second map).</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: pslp173/318</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 8848033 / Paul Gerrard</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Jacobs Well</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>“Map Amendment” seems imprecise on first map. Yellow highlighted boundary surrounds a larger area than the local shopping centre. By contrast, the actual shopping centre does seem to be marked correctly with bold outline on the second map.</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>Outline shopping centre correctly on first map.</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: PSLPA16/291</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10747297 / Pauline Willgoose</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Jacobs Well</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>As a long term resident of Jacobs Well I object to Jacobs Well being considered taken out of the Green Belt, this village although changed in the 45 years I have been there is still in the countryside, it is surrounded by fields, open countryside and a place where one can breath. The boundary of Woking is very close to where I live and I do not want to join up with the town which in turn is joined up to the urban sprawl of London. This is a village let us keep it so The proposed link road to Slyfield, over the deepest part of the flood plain is positively a crazy scheme, the traffic which is already heavy will have a knock on effect on congestion through the village, although I have already objected to this I am again objecting. Please consider local residents and their safety and enjoyment of village life.</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: PSLPA16/690  Respondent: 10811745 / Ann and David R. Wright  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Jacobs Well

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We wish to comment on the Local Plan with particular regard to Jacobs Well and area.

We object to the removal of Jacobs Well from the Green Belt creating a presumption in favour of infilling in the village.

We object to the figure of 693 houses per annum being the forecast of Guildford Borough Council to build in and around Guildford and especially on Green Belt land. Even with the infrastructure improvements promised, can this number of houses be justified or sustainable.

We object to flood plains near Jacobs Well being used for roads and houses such as the Clay Lane Link Road. The flood plains are there for a purpose to preserve Guildford town from being flooded and local areas.

We fully agree with GBC decision not to include the field owned by Cassidy Slyfield in SARP.

Thank you for considering these comments on the Guildford Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1713  Respondent: 11547041 / Jen Wright  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Jacobs Well

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Jacobs Well greenbelt - I object to Jacobs Well and Blanchards Hill being removed from the greenbelt with the resulting presumption in favour of building houses. Firstly, the rural character of the area will be ruined by the removal of the surrounding fields and green areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/471  Respondent: 15220289 / Belinda Barratt  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Jacobs Well

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 to build a link road on Clay Lane - particularly phase 2 with the massive roundabout designed for Jacobs Well which is totally out of keeping in the village and moreover it is sited on a very dangerous corner.

2) I object to the burial ground north of Salt Box Lane in Jacobs Well (policy no A23) being removed from the green belt which will no doubt lead to in-filling in the village with more housing being built.
3) I object to the number of houses being built being 693 houses per annum. How will our infrastructure cope with this? Also many of these sites are planned on the green belt.

I do hope local councillors will take some notice of the concerns of local people who will live with the implications of these decisions.

**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>pslp173/416</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15437889 / Janet Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Jacobs Well</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I support the inclusion of Jacobs Well as a Rural Centre providing much needed services from our parade of shops.

**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>PSLPA16/2432</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15496513 / Paul Houghton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Jacobs Well</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to submit some general comments on the local plan:

1. Jacobs Well greenbelt - I object to Jacobs Well and Blanchards Hill being removed from the greenbelt with the resulting presumption in favour of building houses. Firstly, the rural character of the area will be ruined by the removal of the surrounding fields and green areas.

2. Secondly, the area is not well equipped infrastructure wise to deal with the increased traffic and people that increased housing would lead to. Clay Lane, Jacobs Well Road and Blanchards Hill are already extremely busy roads. Blanchards Hill has no footpath and is 40mph making it dangerous for there to be further traffic and pedestrians. Although if it is removed from the green belt then I would expect the road safety to be investigated and a 30mph limit put in place along the road as per most residential non green belt roads.

3. I also object to infilling and adding houses to the Jacobs Well village when there is no other infrastructure to support this. It is already the case that living on Blanchards Hill we cannot be certain of which primary or secondary school our child would be able to attend and this uncertainty would only increase if further houses were to be built. In general if more houses are to be built across the borough then schools designed for the villages (inset or not) need to be built or existing nearby schools expanded. For example, our nearest primary school is Burpham at 0.9 miles but we are highly unlikely to receive a place and children from Jacobs Well village are forced to go to schools all over Guildford which is unacceptable and difficult for working parents. For secondary school the rules are even more ludicrous as the existence of a relatively small Church of England school, Christs College, as our nearest school, which takes 50% of Christian faith and then children from several feeder schools first means that our child cannot reasonably be likely to be offered a place at this school in most if not all years. However the "nearest school" criteria used by most other schools (for example our second nearest, George Abbott) then means that we would not get into another nearby school either. Therefore until the schools situation for villages like Jacobs Well is fixed or the local schools are forced to change their admittance criteria
so as to cater for people in such villages without them being left to have a place in whichever dire school still has places left each year, then I do not think that further houses should be built in such areas.

4. There are also no other facilities in Jacobs Well such as doctors etc.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2970  Respondent: 15583201 / M.J Ryan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Jacobs Well

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of Guildford for some 36yrs I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Local Plan, which was hastily published and without an adequate time consultation period with local citizens. I object to the removal of our villages from the Green Belt, including my own village, Jacob’s Well. Such a course of action would allow developers to dramatically alter the structure and cohesiveness of local communities against the will of many existing residents whilst destroying rural / semi-rural areas forever.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Total records: 9.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Keogh Barracks, Ash Vale

No representations received for this section.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Mount Browne & University of Law

No representations received for this section.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3723  Respondent: 8557217 / Mrs Angela Gray  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This is my updated version of my objections to the local plan including photographic evidence of flooding on site A47 plus map and updated text.

Please use this as my objection.

<see attachments for additional information>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  
- IMG_2109.JPG (57 KB)  
- Map for East of The Paddocks.docx (1.5 MB)  
- IMG_2108.JPG (72 KB)

---

Comment ID: pslp173/474  Respondent: 8557217 / Mrs Angela Gray  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1287</th>
<th>Respondent: 8583137 / The House of Commons (Mr Jonathan Lord MP)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 have received many thoughtful and well-argued representations from local residents objecting to GBC’s draft plan in relation to Normandy, and specifically with regard to the site allocation 46 and 47.

I would ask GBC to weigh very carefully all responses to the consultation from Normandy residents and also from important local organisations such as the Parish Council (and its elected Councillors) and the Normandy Action Group (and its Chairman and leading Officers). I have a very high regard for the two local Councillors in Normandy, David Bilbe (GBC) and Keith Withan (SCC), and I would like to express my full support for both their representations and, in particular, the key points that Cllr Witham has discussed in detail with me (below).

Response to GBC Draft Local Plan Consultation

GBC Draft Borough Plan re Normandy - Site Allocation 46 and 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."

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.

The birthrate 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 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 effects 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 SNCl'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.

**IMPORTANCE OF THE GREEN BELT:**

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.

2. 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

JONATHAN LORD MP SUMMARY:

In summary, I cannot see any substantive justification for taking the very attractive Green Belt land of site 46/47 out of the Green Belt and I can see many solid arguments against such a retrograde step. I would therefore urge GBC to maintain and protect the Green Belt status of this site so that its natural beauty and its important contribution to the local habitat and landscape can continue to be enjoyed by future generations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Normandy Parish Council has consulted with its residents on GBC’s amended Local Plan 2017 and would like to make the following comments, which are a combination of Councillors’ and residents’ opinions.

As per the consultation’s requirement, our comments are confined solely to those changes in the revised 2017 Plan.

In addition, we have restricted ourselves to those changes that affect Normandy and Flexford directly, although we know that many of our residents feel strongly about some of the other aspects of the revised Plan, in particular that insufficient attention has been paid to protecting and preserving the Green Belt across the Borough. We commented at greater length on the version submitted for consultation in 2016, and we assume those comments will form part of GBC’s submission to the Planning Inspector.

- 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.

**Removal of Infrastructure Schemes AM4, BT4, EG6, FRR4, FRR5, LRN18, LRN19, PED1, SANG13, SED3, WCT5, WS4 and OS4**

We accept that the removal of Sites/Policies A46 and A47 has greatly reduced the need for these infrastructure projects, so in that respect we offer no objection to their removal as well. However, Normandy and Flexford have for many years suffered problems with traffic management and flood risk and these will continue to worsen, particularly if other developments proceed (10,000 homes are planned within a ten mile radius of Normandy). Please note that we will continue to press for improvements, but for the sole purpose of this consultation and the removal of A46 and A47, we support their removal 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:</th>
<th>PSLPA16/2532</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8607233 / The Trustee's of the Tyman Pension Scheme (Mr Tim Hunt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent:</td>
<td>Alex Moseley</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford</td>
<td></td>
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Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites - June 2016

1. **Introduction**

1.1 Guildford Borough Council are currently consulting Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19), on the Proposed

1.2 Within the document provides list of allocated sites which were considered based on their individual merits

1.3 White and Sons have been employed by The Tyman Pension Scheme to provide general comments on the spatial strategy of the Submission Local Plan in view of further promoting residential development at land at two sites comprising of land north of Gravetts Lane, Guildford and two separate parcels of land at Crickets Farm, Normandy. This letter should be read in conjunction with the attached plan

2. The Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and sites

2.1 As suggested within the document, it states that the policies and site allocations contained within the Proposed Submission Local Plan are informed by an up-to-date, extensive and robust evidence base. The borough’s specific housing and employment needs have been determined through our published Joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Employment Land Needs Assessment.

2.2 The Council’s Land Availability Assessment determines the availability, suitability and viability of sites for development. The evidence base will also continue to be updated throughout the plan period to ensure that the plan remains flexible and adaptable to change.

2.3 We would like to take this opportunity to suggest that the following sites are given consideration during this process. In the interests of comprehensiveness, there is scope to consider other sites at this stage of the Local Plan process. It is
understood that the Council at this pre-submission stage propose a housing delivery target of 13,860 new homes to be provided during the plan period which roughly equates to 693 homes every year, when taking the average. Such a figure cannot be achieved on pure reliance on brownfield sites and so it is inevitable that other sites will need to be considered. It also equally bores down to a site’s availability for development.

2.4 The Tyman Pension Scheme have previously put forward sites in Wyke Lane, Normandy and at Gravetts Lane, Guildford for residential development and these remain available for residential development and supporting open space (including SANGs). Justification for these sites is given below.

3. Potential Development Site Allocations

Potential Residential Allocation at Land at Crickets Hill Farm, Normandy

3.1 The proposed submission Local Plan identifies that Normandy and Flexford Village as being capable to accommodating 1,100 new homes under new site allocations A46 and A47.

3.2 It is suggested that the two parcels of land at Crickets Hill Farm, Normandy would help to assist future housing allocations in the area as shown on the enclosed plan. My clients are offering both plots. The largest plot measuring 8.7 ha falls to the south of Guildford Road and the other, totalling 2.5 ha, falls to the west of Wyke Lane and shares its northern boundary with housing belonging to Wyke Avenue.

3.3 Both locations are located in the Green Belt and are in this sense in the same designation as the existing local settlements, including the allocated plots covered by policies A46 and A47, located to the west. Both allocations require the release of Green Belt in order to meet housing need in the borough and to meet the plans for expansion of Normandy and Flexford.

3.4 It would be appropriate to attach weight to both locations on the basis that the land to the south of Wyke Avenue abuts a sizable estate with the land being bordered by access roads, therefore offering the opportunity to amalgamate development to the same extent to that already observed to the north. It is suggested that the plot would lend well to a repeat density and configuration seen to the north in view of ensuring efficient and effective use of the plot, should it be allocated.

3.5 The larger plot of land carries with it a Site of Nature and Conservation Importance (SNCI) designation together with part of the site being donated to a disused Sewerage Station, with the definitions of the previously developed land therefore falling in its favour. The area is largely characterised by sporadic residential development, and whilst this was perhaps how the area has evolved over time, it sets the precedent to character. Any new development proposed on the larger parcel of land would be sensitive to the site’s biodiversity requirements with the consensus in policy terms being one of enhancement. There would also be opportunities to provide substantial landscaping to promote lower density development to ensure that any built form is screened from the public highway.

3.6 The weighting for a SNCI against the other biodiversity related designations identified by Policy 14 ranks SNCIs below SACs, SPAs and SSSI. It is fully expected that a proposal for development will demonstrate how benefits could be brought about to the land. My client would agree to enhancements of the SNCI should the plot to the south be considered in isolation for development.

3.7 It is suggested that sites which are available should come forward as suitable alternatives to those considered to meet a substantial housing figure in this area. The reliance which is almost solely placed on site A46 is significant. Should it transpire that any of the parcels of land which fall within this designated area are not available for redevelopment, then it would be difficult to implement all the area’s housing requirements. The suggestion that the other sites should be considered is one that carries merit and it is suggested that the allocation of sites being put forward in this instance represent a suitable alternative.

Potential Residential Allocation at Land to the North of Gravetts Lane

3.8 Turning attention to Gravetts Lane, the subject plot site is situated behind existing housing that fronts the lane and measures 4 ha. In general the site is located between Stoughton, to the east and Fairlands to the west. However, its distance
from both villages would ensure that there is no cohesion between the two with the site being more accessible to Stoughton.

3.9 It is suggested that the land at Gravetts Lane that was also previously proposed for development and shown on the enclosed plan would be clearly linked to these potential residential allocations, and the potential Built Up-Area Boundary (BUAB) of Guildford. It is suggested that there are limited physical/environmental designations affecting the site, although the western boundary of the proposed allocation is considered to be in a Flood Risk Zone 3. There is also an existing vehicular access onto the site.

3.10 As with the sites above, this potential allocation is located within the Green Belt and is also within 400m to 5km of the Thames Basin Heath SPA, where the impact of development can be avoided. In terms of Green Belt policy, the site is partly enclosed to the south and east by residential development along Gravetts Lane, to the north by substantial tree coverage and partially to the west by buildings at Gravetts Lane Farm. If the potential allocations Land north of Keens Lane, Guildford (Policy A22) were to proceed, then this potential allocation would border the BUAB of Guildford to the south and east, such that it would be a modest extension to the town. The A22 site is earmarked as achieving 140 new home Comparatively, the subject site would offer scope to provide just as many units, based on a mixed provision being brought to the fore. We would suggest that if the aforementioned site allocation were to proceed, then the allocation of this land for residential development should be considered satisfactory, given that the site has permanent physical and defensible boundaries.

3.11 In response to early criticisms that Gravetts Lane might be inappropriate on highway grounds, the site area shows there to be adequate provision to provide access on the outside of bend in the road. This therefore means that it would be highly probable that a safe arrangement could be applied in addition to offering traffic calming measures to reassert any misconception This aspect should not deter the prospect of the site being considered.

3.12 In addition, we would suggest that this land is not readily visible from public highways and is enclosed by existing development substantially to the south and east and partly by buildings to the we Consequently, the land is not necessary to keep the Green Belt permanently open and the release of Green Belt land for residential development should be considered suitable in this location, particularly if considered as part of a larger housing scheme that would include allocation of site A22 of the Submission Local Plan Strategy and Sites.

I trust that the above and enclosed is satisfactory, but if you have any comments or queries, then please do not hesitate to contact me.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  

---
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Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford  

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Owing to the inability of the infrastructure to cope with such large developments I wish to SUPPORT the removal of Site A46 and A47 from the GBC Local Plan. The roads, wastewater, sewerage flooding, electricity supply and healthcare could not have coped. These sites were also on greenbelt land.

I wish to OBJECT to the removal from the greenbelt the:

- Homes in Guildford Road,
- Land at the Northern end of Glaziers Lane,
- Land in Flexford
- Walden Cottages
I am writing to OBJECT against the planning for development in Normandy and in particular to site A46 which proposes a development of 1100 and a secondary school. I highlight my reasons below.

Firstly this area is recognised as highly sensitive Greenbelt. In the meeting held in Feb 2016 Mr Spooner, head of GBC even advised that Normandy would not be built on unless there was a case for exceptional circumstances. He did not mention any school until asked directly by a member of the public, at which stage he said that the building of a school would indeed TRUMP the Greenbelt. I believe that Mr Spooner was already fully aware of a developers proposal, Taylor Wimpey, which included the building of a 7 form entry secondary school.

As my horses live on a parcel of land I have been fully aware of the developers comings and goings so since 2014 and the offers made to landowners in the form of ‘options'.

Originally the parcel of land A46 was highlighted to be put into the new local plan as 'safe guarded' but seeing as this plan has never been approved, this land cannot therefore be classified as safeguarded and has in fact gone straight into the latest plan, as a bit of a late entry. I think that the developers have seen this as an easy opportunity to grab a large portion of land and little or NO thought has been given to this properly by the council. The land is mostly owned by 4 parties, 2 of which do not live locally and the other 2 embroiled in a bitter divorce - of course all parties would be keen to sell. Taylor Wimpey and another developer Kitewood have been aggressive with the offers of options and all by about 7 acres have options on them.

We have been advised by Mr Spooner that following the executive meeting in early June 2016, if there is no school on parcel A46 then there will be no building.

I firmly OBJECT to the building of the school for the following reasons:-

1. There is no need for a secondary school. With local schools, namely Ash Manor, Kings college, Christ college all underscribed and also offering space for development on their own sites, should need arise, there is NO need for an additional school here. New schools is Hoebridge offer further capacity and a further institution at Guildford Technical college taking children of 14 upwards offers even more places.

The likelihood of starter homes and affordable housing producing such a volume of secondary school children is totally unrealistic and in a poll of 300 people held on 22/6/16 only 4 people had a child of secondary age.

I would also like to highlight that if a school should be built, would it include a sixth form? It is very difficult to get to any sixth form from Normandy but at the same time, for sixth form students, the location of Normandy is unappealing as during their free periods mid day - and they get a lot of these, there is nowhere for them to socialise/shop etc. My 3 children have travelled further afield to attend sixth forms that offer a social side as well as academical. They have all coped well with this and broaden friendship circles.

Next the transport to and from site A46 between the C16 and the D60 road ... Both LANES. Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane. Both dangerous roads, with one pavement on one side and both having dangerous bridges. In this year alone there have been 5 accidents involving bicycles, 2 serious and one fatality on the A323 involving a motorbike. Children as young as 16, year 11, can ride a moped and these roads are far too dangerous for these vehicles. There is no significant budget made for improving Westwood Lane or Glaziers Lane, the minimal £3m that Taylor Wimpey has projected for road infrastructure won't even adjust the railway bridge in Westwood lane which is tricky at the best of times. The bridge in Westwood Lane is single traffic only, with a blind spot leading out of Beech lane and cannot take a
double decker bus .... Not that we really have a bus service anyway!

Next the railway .... A teeny weeny unmanned station with no way of purchasing a weekly child subsised ticket. I know this for fact as I have this problem every week for my youngest daughter journey to Farnborough sixth form. The station mainly serves great western trains and SW trains. You cannot preorder students tickets at Ash either because you have to buy them after 12pm for next day and the ticket office closes at 12! If there is any increase in train services then there is no chance of ever getting through Ash as the level crossing barriers, which are currently down more often than they are up, will be permenantly shut. This level crossing, although a bridge is proposed for 2024, this needs addressing before any building anywhere is undertaken.

If the children are expected to travel from the proposed developers at Blackwell farm you may also wish to address the Christmas pie trail, it frequently floods and is dark and woody, not safe for children to walk or cycle on their own. I would never let my children use this path as parts of it are very remote.

Next the environment. I KNOW Site A46 well, my horses live on the land. It's is arable farming land, used for cattle and hay. The soil is clay, meaning it is rock hard in the summer and a quagmire in the winter. My horses stand knee deep in mud from October to April. If it rain in the summer, the water cannot run off fast enough and it DOES experience flooding. I have offered Mr Spooner to spend a day on the roads and the farm to witness it himself, sadly he is too busy. It is crucial to keep the ditches within this area clear to prevent flooding further down in the village towards the Guildford road and it was due to flooding in summer 2007 that the foot and mouth spread, the prime site of foot and mouth was indeed behind Peakmead farm with the cattle based on the footpath that runs right through the middle.

My house has also been flooded in 2006 when a flash flood caused the water runs of course to burst and us and a number of houses on the A323 Guildford road lost the contents of the whole if the downstairs. This brings me on to parcel of land directly behind our house, it had been rejected as a cemetery due to the flooding issues but still showing as residential in the plan, I OBJECT to this being included too ..... Unless you wish to build the houses on stilts!

How can anyone dispute that there isn't wildfire in these beautiful fields. It is a haven for hedgehogs, badgers, rabbits, skylarks and swallows, buzzards, frogs and newts and the secretive dormice. Taylor Wimpey are running a dormice survey but unfortunately have set the traps at such an angle that the dormice would need climbing harnesses to get in and stay in the traps. It has a number of ancient oak trees and is truely beautiful. These picture were taken in a sunny day in May, however in the winter, other than the footpath, the whole area is a marsh. In an seriously concerned that the concreting over of this area will lead to massive flooding in Normandy as the water will have nowhere to soak away.

Wanborough station already floods after even a few showers.

Sewage is another issue, Normandy already suffers from inadequate sewer removed facilities and it is know that Pirbright is already co corned at how they will cope should the new development go ahead as our sewerage travel and is processed by them. In 2014 a main sewer pipe collapsed in Glaziers lane causing the road to shut on and off for several weeks. On a wet day, we can smell drains in our house and in Glaziers lane sewerage frequently backs up and leaks. Internet has recently been addressed but we are still poor compared to other villages and it is a lottery as to how close you are to a magic green broadband box as to how got your service will be. Normandy is also a black spot for mobile service. We have very limited reception in our house.

So here are a number of reasons for my strong OBJECTION, not to mention that we live in a democratic society and this is our village, and as the residents we should be listened to. In. The recent meeting on 22 June 2016, not a single person out of the 300 attendees wanted your plan in Normandy. Do we not deserve to be listened to?

Photos attached in PDF

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: Picture attachment for Karen Lawson.docx (2.8 MB)
Removal of sites Policies 46/47

I am greatly relieved that common sense has prevailed – not to double the size of Normandy and Flexford by building 1,100 houses and a school in our precious Green Belt: it’s the wrong place, fed by country lanes, with dangerous railway bridges, is a floodplain and also… Green Belt!

So I support this changes to the plan.

Change to the Green Belt coverage of Normandy and Flexford

I am not clear why GBC have ignored the policy of the Green Belt and seem keen to try to find ‘exceptional circumstances’ where it can to build its unsubstantiated housing target.

I object to the change in the plan to remove the Green Belt coverage in settlements in Normandy, Flexford and Walden Cottages marked on the maps in Appendix H. There is no evidence to prove why these random areas have been selected as all contribute, as do the settlement areas not selected, to the openness of the Green Belt and no ‘exceptional circumstances’ have been proved. This openness has in fact has been stated by the planning inspectorate in previous planning appeals. The area around these selected settlements do also contribute to the rural economy. They also are close enough to the Surrey Hills ANOB given the geography of the land allowing views that fulfil the Green Belt obligations. The area has already been identified as one of ‘high sensitivity’ yet that doesn’t seem to count when this insetting has been proposed. If this was allowed to happen then there will be pressure in the future to join up the resultant ‘urban islands’ into a wider urban area.

The Green Belt was created to prevent urban sprawl and should be permanently protected.

I also object to the statement under Green Belt Policy P2 (4.3.13) that claims Normandy and Flexford (and many other villages) are now inset from the Green Belt. Its in the Plan to do that very thing - so cannot be right. I also object to any of these villages being changed to be inset from the Green Belt.

Infrastructure improvements

With all the current development and proposed around the area – especially in the sacrificial lamb Ash – the pressure on roads, Doctors etc will only get worse.

It is vital that the infrastructure is agreed and implemented before any large scale development takes place.

The most key are LRN17 Puttenham Hill/A31, LRN24 A323/324 Junction and LNR21 Ash Railway Station flyover and I support the plans - although the ‘likely cost and funding source’ don’t appear to be very robust.

Traveller Sites in Normandy and Flexford

Like the settlement areas in Normandy, Flexford and Walden Cottages, the sites at Palm House Nurseries (Policy 49) and Whittles Drive (Policy A50) are proposed to be inset.

I object to this as it will remove the development restrictions in an area sensitive to residents in the village of Normandy and Flexford and no evidence has been provided for ‘exceptional circumstances’. I can forsee that it will result in even less respect for the planning law.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
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</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly object to the proposal to 'inset' the three settlement areas of Normandy, Flexford, and Wyke/Walden Cottages as shown on the "Normandy and Flexford" maps. Previously these areas formed part of a much larger project (Policy/Site A46) to remove a huge part of Normandy Ward from the Green Belt. Although the withdrawal of the latter development is welcome I object to the insetting of these settlement areas 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'. They 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:**
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I would like to state that I am against all the proposed development to our lovely countryside around our village and Normandy.

My family and I moved from London 44 years ago to live within this green and pleasant land around our village.

Please consider other locations which would be more appropriate for this scale of development. This surely does not have to be on our Green Belt landscape.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
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I OBJECT strongly to the development of 1100 and 50 houses and secondary school proposed for Normandy and Flexford.

- GBC should not be using Green belt land.
- The INFRASTRUCTURE is inadequate to cope with the extra housing – inadequate sewerage system, doctors surgery.
• The Aldershot Road into Guildford will not be able to cope with the extra traffic generated by 1150 homes = 2300 cars. Unclassified rural roads and two railway bridges are unsuitable for an increase in traffic.
• There is some doubt that there is a demand for a secondary school in this part of Guildford and the traffic generated would add to the congestion on the rural roads by a secondary school.
• This extra traffic will inevitably “rat run” through Wood Street Village which is already being eroded away by EXCESSIVE SPEEDING traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---
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Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write to you to offer my views as part of the ongoing public consultation process launched by the council in regard to its Proposed Submission Local Plan. As a resident of Normandy, I take particular interest in site allocation A46, which covers a total area of 67 hectares in Normandy and Flexford, in a plot bordered by Westwood Lane, Guildford Road, Glaziers Lane and the Guildford-to-Ascot railway line. (This site features in pages 229, 230 and 231 of your June 2016 Strategy and Sites document.)

Having taken considerable time to study the borough council’s Strategy & Sites document (and associated supporting documents) and to attend a number of local meetings organised by Normandy-based groups, it is clear that the borough council’s proposals for site A46 are fundamentally flawed. I would therefore like to object in the strongest possible terms to the development of this site as currently outlined by the authority.

First of all, in very general terms, the scale of the development – which includes proposals for as many as 1,100 homes, a 60-bed nursing home, a secondary school and 700 square metres of retail space – is disproportionate and completely out of scale to the existing settlements of Normandy and Flexford. This is even before additional proposals such as travelling showpeople’s plots and – potentially – a primary school are taken into consideration.

Development on this site and of the scale being envisaged would totally destroy the character of the existing settlement and would show a blatant disregard for land that is justifiably considered as green belt – and which should therefore be protected from such developer-led exploitation.

Your own documents acknowledge that this land is currently designated as “fields” and that site A46 contains several areas recognised as “ancient woodlands”. In addition, you acknowledge that there are a number of listed buildings within the vicinity. (I personally live in a grade-two listed property, dating from 1600, so take a very personal interest in history and rural life being blatantly ignored or threatened.)

Under the plans being considered by Guildford Borough, these historically important lands, woodlands and buildings would be lost or impacted upon forever.

Having considered the council’s plans in detail, I am far from convinced that the authority has investigated or exploited all opportunities for the development of brown-field sites before turning its attention to (and potentially letting the bulldozers loose on) Normandy’s green space. Your own documents note that you wish to “create a sustainable and inclusive community”. The cost, however, would be to completely degrade or destroy an existing community in Normandy and Flexford.

While you talk about “appropriate mitigation for flood risk and flood risk management”, these are merely hollow words that totally underestimate the long-established problems faced by Normandy and Flexford in relation to flooding. If developers manage to make the 67-acre site “flood-free” (which I would greatly doubt), they would merely pass the
problem on to surrounding lands and properties. This is irresponsible and unforgiveable and would have huge financial,
insurance and quality-of-life implications for people already resident in Normandy and Flexford.

The proposed development at site A46 would also have huge impacts on local roads and would create even more traffic
and access problems for local people. I would invite councillors and planning officers to visit Normandy and Flexford at
peak times – and then to imagine the further chaos that will be caused by 1,100 additional homes, not to mention 1,400
pupils (or more) on a typical “school run”!

I am only too conscious that any objections to your proposals must be based on hard facts, not simple emotions or
“NIMBYism”. I would therefore highlight the following specific points for your consideration:

• Guildford Borough Council has failed beyond any question to demonstrate “exceptional circumstances” why site A46
should lose its Green Belt status and therefore be developed.
• The allocation of site A46 for development does not take account of local communities’ needs and priorities – and
therefore falls down on National Planning Policy Framework.
• Potential development of brownfield sites across the borough has not been adequately assessed before green belt has
been lined up for potential sacrifice.
• A doubling of the size of Normandy and Flexford’s population is disproportionate and would destroy the rural
environment.
• The council has failed to take serious consideration of the potential impact on local roads and commuters and the
potential for creating gridlock in an already-pressured road system.

• The impact of additional vehicles (particularly queuing as they attempt to get on to or along the A323) would cause
unacceptable levels of air pollution and would put public health at risk.
• There is no evidence whatsoever that a secondary school (or an additional primary school) will be required for
Normandy. (If there is a need in the borough, there are arguably much better sites that would not require such huge
numbers of people to travel by road to reach the new facilities.)
• The environmental impact (on valuable green space, ancient woodlands and potentially diverse wildlife) would be huge
 – and has not been considered adequately by the council.
• A number of important or protected species (such as hedgehogs, newts, snakes, badgers, bats and dormice) are known to
live in and around Normandy, so are threatened by the development of site A46.
• Flood risk and flood management has not been considered adequately.
• The development site falls just 800 metres from the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area, so ignores
requirements for “protection zones” to be respected around such locations.

Finally, I express my grave concerns that development of site A46 would be so clearly unjustifiable that Guildford
Borough Council would face inevitable (and potentially protracted) legal battles if it presses ahead with its plans.

As a local council-tax payer, I can see that valuable financial resources would be lost and – at a time of ongoing national
and international economic uncertainty – that the borough council would therefore have to make further and wholly
unnecessary cuts to local services. We do not live in an economic climate where much-needed resources can be
squandered on doomed legal battles by our elected representatives and their officials.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am writing to strongly object to the proposed planning permission for sites A47 (land to the east of the Paddocks) and A46 (land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford) within the Guildford Borough Local Plan.

A46 was not proposed or considered as a strategic site in the first consultation. In fact, in the 2014 consultation, this site was ‘safeguarded’ and was not removed from the Metropolitan Greenbelt. ‘Exceptional circumstances’ have not been demonstrated or approved by the inspectorate. In the Solihull ruling, boundary cannot be drawn around sections of land and urbanised, (A46/A47/A50).

With regard to any future development of planning, Normandy and Flexford’s need and priorities have not been decided by the residents. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 1 ‘provides a framework within which local people and their parish councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans reflecting their needs and priorities of their communities.’ Evidence has shown that at least 2 years ago, documentation for A46 was submitted on behalf of Taylor Wimpey to Guildford Borough Council Planning Policy. At this stage, NO ‘Meaningful engagement was made or requested from local people’, despite NPPF 155 clearly stating that ‘early and meaningful’ engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods and local organisations being essential.

There is no proven need for a secondary school in Normandy, yet this is one of the primary reasons and rationale as to why sites A48 and A47 (due to A47 site’s ‘close proximity to the proposed new secondary school’) have been identified as proposed sites for planning permission and building in the Guildford Borough Local Plan. Indeed, the birth rate has fallen in the last 2 years and secondary schools to the west of the Borough are under subscribed by 736. Another 480 places will be 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 (no catchment areas). Blackwell Farm was suggested to be a more accessible option for a school. With no proven need for a secondary school in the Normandy and Flexford area, comes no development requirement.

I purchased [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 2012, moving in to the property in September of that year. The property backs onto the proposed site (A47). During the process of purchasing the property, I conducted (via my solicitor) all the necessary searches as well as conducting my own due diligence. The biggest concern surrounded site A47 and whether this would ever be built upon. We were sufficiently satisfied that site A47 was in fact green belt (and privately owned) and could not and would not be built upon. As such we purchased the property.

You can imagine our surprise and immense concern on discovering the plans set out by Guildford Borough Council in relation to building on this beautiful piece of green belt land. My understanding of green belt is that, "it is a policy for controlling urban growth; the idea is for a ring of countryside where urbanisation will be resisted for the foreseeable future, maintaining an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure can be expected to prevail. The fundamental aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open and consequently the most important attribute of green belts is their openness."

Privacy is of paramount importance to us. As things stand, we are not overlooked at any side of our property (a key reason why we purchased the property) and are afforded privacy by the trees on site A47, immediately at the back of our house, (another key reason why we purchased the property).

In fact, so magnificent are the views at the back of my property (looking onto site A47) that I have retained an open wire fence to allow me to enjoy the views and nature that site A47 supports year round. I regularly see and watch a broad spectrum of animals and birds on site A47 including, herons, blue tits, robins, wood peckers, starlings, wood pigeons, black birds, magpies, chaffinches, sparrows, owls and bats. Additionally, I see hedgehogs and toads. I also enjoy watching the 2 horses that currently reside on site A47. I’d point out also that, this proposed planning permission would bring a threat to the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA), being within the 400m – 5km zone of protection.

As I’m sure you are aware site A47 is also a floodplain which had significant surface water on it throughout the early part of 2013 and more recently in 2015. A ditch runs directly adjacent (on site A47) to my property and the ditch was also flooded during this period and most times there is any medium to heavy rainfall. Building further properties on site A47 will not improve this situation and could ultimately cause more problems in a village with a history of flooding.
I currently reside in a cul de sac (which was a key reason for purchasing the property) and as such am not subject to any through traffic. I appreciate that one of the possible access points to any development on site A47 could be between numbers [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998]. This would mean that my property would reside on a through road, that there would be constant traffic (in both development and after completion), that my currently peaceful road would become increasing noisy, the potential for increased crime in the area, polluted with exhaust fumes and would result in my general privacy being infringed. Myself and my wife moved to Normandy with the hope that we may start a family in the future and that any children we have would have the option to play freely and safely in the cul de sac. It angers me that this may not be an option for those children or grandchildren that neighbours may have. An additional point is that we moved from an overcrowded area and deliberately sought out a peaceful, semi-rural cul de sac.

I would also like to highlight my objection to the likely massive increase in traffic on both Flexford Road and Glaziers Lane as possible access points. Even if the site access is not via The Paddocks, surely a significant increase in construction traffic (and thereafter residential traffic) will cause me and my fellow Paddocks residents increased disruption in our travels in and around Normandy. Glaziers Lane is called ‘Lane’ for a reason – it does not provide adequate pavement or road infrastructure for the increased road and pedestrian traffic which both a new school and increased population in the village of at least 1100 new homes would bring.

I would also like to make the point that I am opposed to our lovely village of Normandy being cherry picked for so much unnecessary development. At least 1100 new dwellings (some of which will be social housing) would nearly double the size and population of Normandy. This would obviously put increased stress on existing infrastructure for water, sewage, gas, electricity, telephones and broadband services. As mentioned above, this would also add a massive increase in traffic which will require extensive and costly urbanisation of local roads. It would remove and destroy the rural character of the village and make Normandy a large (and probably ugly) commuter dormitory for Guildford. I do not want this.

To conclude, unsurprisingly, I will fight this proposal for housing (of any kind, including social housing). I will work in unison with my fellow neighbours and ensure that this proposal does not go ahead. For all the reasons given above, it angers me that you are even considering it as an option.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to the ‘insetting’ in the Green Belt of the three most settled areas of Normandy and Flexford for 2 reasons.
   
   1. Firstly, no case has been made on the grounds of ‘exceptional circumstances’ for removing this land from the Green Belt, and by so doing, GBC will make it easier for further attrition of the Green Belt to take place in future as a result of extensions to the settlement area on adjacent Green Belt land (Traveller site at Palm House Nurseries (Policy/Site A50).
   
   2. Secondly, all three settlements contribute to the openness of the Green Belt and should therefore remain ‘washed over’ by it. This view has been supported by Planning Inspectors, who have indicated while rejecting recent appeal decisions that the land at Flexford and Normandy contributes to the openness of the Green Belt. ‘Insetting’ will make it much harder to sustain this crucial openness in future.

With regard to the 10,000 homes that will likely be built within a 10 mile radius of Normandy as a result of various Local Plans, this will put more pressure on our roads and will have a detrimental impact on our village alongside other rural communities. I would urge GBC to commit to the improvements that are necessary to the roads and other infrastructure for the scale of these developments ahead of construction, such as the new road bridge and footbridge at Ash to enable the closure of the level crossing (ref. LRN21).
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3640</th>
<th>Respondent: 8731361 / Caroline Robertson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford</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 strongly object to the proposed planning permission for sites A47 (land to the east of the Paddocks) and A46 (land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford) within the Guildford Borough Local Plan.

A46 was not proposed or considered as a strategic site in the first consultation. In fact, in the 2014 consultation, this site was ‘safeguarded’ and was not removed from the Metropolitan Greenbelt. ‘Exceptional circumstances’ have not been demonstrated or approved by the inspectorate. In the Solihull ruling, boundary cannot be drawn around sections of land and urbanised, (A46/A47).

With regard to any future development of planning, Normandy and Flexford’s need and priorities have not been decided by the residents. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 1 ‘provides a framework within which local people and their parish councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans reflecting their needs and priorities of their communities.’ Evidence has shown that at least 2 years ago, documentation for A46 was submitted on behalf of Taylor Wimpey to Guildford Borough Council Planning Policy. At this stage, NO ‘Meaningful engagement was made or requested from local people’, despite NPPF 155 clearly stating that ‘early and meaningful’ engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods and local organisations being essential.

There is no proven need for a secondary school in Normandy, yet this is one of the primary reasons and rationale as to why sites A46 and A47 (due to A47 site’s ‘close proximity to the proposed new secondary school’) have been identified as proposed sites for planning permission and building in the Guildford Borough Local Plan. Indeed, the birth rate has fallen in the last 2 years and secondary schools to the west of the Borough are under subscribed by 736. Another 480 places will be 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 (no catchment areas). Blackwell Farm was suggested to be a more accessible option for a school. With no proven need for a secondary school in the Normandy and Flexford area, comes no development requirement.

I purchased 36 The Paddocks in 2012, moving in to the property in September of that year. The property backs onto the proposed site (A47). During the process of purchasing the property, I conducted (via my solicitor) all the necessary searches as well as conducting my own due diligence. The biggest concern surrounded site A47 and whether this would ever be built upon. We were sufficiently satisfied that site A47 was in fact green belt (and privately owned) and could not and would not be built upon. As such we purchased the property.

You can imagine our surprise and immense concern on discovering the plans set out by Guildford Borough Council in relation to building on this beautiful piece of green belt land. My understanding of green belt is that, "it is a policy for controlling urban growth; the idea is for a ring of countryside where urbanisation will be resisted for the foreseeable future, maintaining an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure can be expected to prevail. The fundamental aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open and consequently the most important attribute of green belts is their openness."

Privacy is of paramount importance to us. As things stand, we are not overlooked at any side of our property (a key reason why we purchased the property) and are afforded privacy by the trees on site A47, immediately at the back of our house, (another key reason why we purchased the property).

In fact, so magnificent are the views at the back of my property (looking onto site A47) that I have retained an open wire fence to allow me to enjoy the views and nature that site A47 supports year round. I regularly see and watch a broad
spectrum of animals and birds on site A47 including, herons, blue tits, robins, wood peckers, starlings, wood pigeons, black birds, magpies, chaffinches, sparrows, owls and bats. Additionally, I see hedgehogs and toads. I also enjoy watching the 2 horses that currently reside on site A47. I’d point out also that, this proposed planning permission would bring a threat to the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA), being within the 400m – 5km zone of protection.

As I’m sure you are aware site A47 is also a floodplain which had significant surface water on it throughout the early part of 2013 and more recently in 2015. A ditch runs directly adjacent (on site A47) to my property and the ditch was also flooded during this period and most times there is any medium to heavy rainfall. Building further properties on site A47 will not improve this situation and could ultimately cause more problems in a village with a history of flooding.

I currently reside in a cul de sac (which was a key reason for purchasing the property) and as such am not subject to any through traffic. I appreciate that one of the possible access points to any development on site A47 could be between numbers 27 and 38 The Paddocks (38 The Paddocks being immediately next door to my property). This would mean that my property would reside on a through road, that there would be constant traffic (in both development and after completion), that my currently peaceful road would become increasing noisy, the potential for increased crime in the area, polluted with exhaust fumes and would result in my general privacy being infringed. Myself and my wife moved to Normandy with the hope that we may start a family in the future and that any children we have would be able to play freely and safely in the cul de sac. It angers me that this may not be an option for them or any other children or grandchildren that neighbours may have. An additional point is that we moved from an overcrowded area and deliberately sought out a peaceful, semi-rural cul de sac.

I would also like to highlight my strong objection to the likely massive increase in traffic on both Flexford Road and Glaziers Lane as possible access points to A47. Even if the site access is not via The Paddocks, surely a significant increase in construction traffic (and thereafter residential traffic) will cause me and my fellow Paddocks residents increased disruption in our travels in and around Normandy. Glaziers Lane is called ‘Lane’ for a reason – it does not provide adequate pavement or road infrastructure for the increased road and pedestrian traffic which both a new school and increased population in the village of at least 1100 new homes would bring.

I would also like to make the point that I am opposed to our lovely village of Normandy being cherry picked for so much unnecessary development. At least 1100 new dwellings (some of which will be social housing) would nearly double the size and population of Normandy. This would obviously put increased stress on existing infrastructure for water, sewage, gas, electricity, telephones and broadband services. As mentioned above, this would also add a massive increase in traffic which will require extensive and costly urbanisation of local roads. It would remove and destroy the rural character of the village and make Normandy a large (and probably ugly) commuter dormitory for Guildford. I do not want this.

To conclude, unsurprisingly, I will fight this proposal for housing (of any kind, including social housing). I will work in unison with my fellow neighbours and ensure that this proposal does not go ahead. For all the reasons given above, it angers me that you are even considering it as an option.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/528  Respondent: 8747233 / Paul Tarry  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

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 A46 and A47 for reasons already stated in my response to the last local plan.

I strongly object to any insetting of greenbelt land at Flexford and Normandy as that will make it easier for developers to gain planning permission to build on what is now greenbelt land.
This would make small islands in the greenbelt which is there to stop built up area joining onto each other forming bigger built up areas.

There has been no proven case to inset this land and it should remain "washed over" by greenbelt. The basic character of this area needs to remain the same as I've seen the results if land being changed like this and built on in other areas.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/118</th>
<th>Respondent: 8747969 / Alan Burchett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford | **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 Strategic Sites A46 (Land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford) and A47 (Land to the east of the Paddocks, Flexford) from the Local Plan. My reasons are that the infrastructure would have been unable to cope with developments of the size previously planned, and that these sites are within the Green Belt and should remain washed over.**

I am also writing to object to the insetting of parts of Normandy and Flexford as this land contributes to the openness of the Green Belt and should therefore remain washed over. There is evidence in past appeal decisions by Planning Inspectors that the land at Flexford and Normandy contributes to the openness 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: PSLPA16/755</th>
<th>Respondent: 8748609 / Paul Bouncer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford | **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 to be found 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.

My concerns centre around the following facts:

- 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:

  o 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.

  o 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 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.

  o 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.

  o 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 as there is no room, many a time you have to stop in advance of the junction to let a large vehicle negotiate the road entrance. Something that will only get worse if the level of traffic increases.

  o 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 on the pavement near these corners another unassessed risk.

  o 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.

  o Adding a School will only bring more cars into the area causing even more chaos and further be compounded 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.

  o 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.

  o Noise and light pollution will increase significantly as will exhaust gasses damaging the countryside and therefore driving our wildlife away.

  o 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.

  o The land in this area is supposed to be safeguarded, how can it now suddenly not be so?

  o 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.

On this basis I would urge you please to removal from the local plan the proposal to develop Normandy’s Green Belt. Please rather look to the conversion of empty offices in Guildford to flats, or develop brown field sites before green belt land is irrevocably lost.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Appendix H Maps H-P, page 24 Normandy & Flexford amendments 3-8
I object to the boundary changes that insert Green Belt boundaries around Flexford and Normandy settlements and Walden Cottages (p24 Amendments 3-8), ‘inserting’ them from the Green Belt. At the detail presented, even when ‘zoomed in’ the new map boundaries are indistinct and provide no basis to distinguish in low-level detail between the 2003 Local Plan established settlement boundaries and where the proposed ‘inset’ boundaries will lie to reveal what new Green Belt land will be included within the ‘inset’ boundaries, for which proof of ‘exceptional circumstances’ (NPPF para 89) is required but not provided by the council in the Evidence Base.

I propose the Green Belt boundaries for Flexford, Normandy and Walden Cottages ‘insetting’ them from the Green Belt be removed from the map on page 24 and that the settlement areas remain “washed over” to contribute to the “openness” of the Green Belt preventing the coalescence of Ash South & Tongham with Normandy. Further, maintaining the “openness” of Flexford and Normandy contributes positively to views into and from the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Beauty from the Hogs Back.

I object to the assertion in Policy P2, para 4.3.13 that Normandy and Flexford “are now inset from the Green Belt”. To remove land from the Green Belt, effectively re-drawing the Green Belt boundary, the council must provide evidence of “exceptional circumstances” as required by NPPF para. 89. The council has provided no such evidence in the proposed submission documents or previous or new Evidence Base documents. No such decision has been taken by a Planning Inspector, therefore the settlements remain in the Green Belt.

I propose the words “are now inset from the Green Belt” in para 4.3.13 are removed and replaced by “are proposed to be inset from the Green Belt”. There is evidence in past appeal decisions by planning inspectors that Flexford and Normandy land contributes to the ‘openness’ of the Green Belt, a key test for remaining ‘washed over’. In particular, the final decision at North Wyke Farm [GBC Application 14/P/00779, PINS Appeal APP/Y3615/W/15/3002308] recognised that Normandy settlement land contributed to the ‘openness’ of the Green Belt. I require my previous comments to the first Regulation 19 consultation to be taken into account. This adds to comments supporting ‘openness’ made in the decisions to grant temporary planning permission for Gypsy pitches at Green Lane East [GBC Application 10/P/00507, PINS Appeal APP/Y3615/A/10/ 2140630] and Palm House Nurseries, Glaziers Lane [GBC Application 09/P/01851, PINS Appeal APP/Y3615/A/10/ 2131590].
I object to Sustainability Appraisal 2017 para 10.4.7, where it is asserted that Policy D4 (Character and design of new development), which refers specifically to design considerations within villages, and a new designation of Open Space (Policy ID4) “that policy is in place to protect open space and village character, which is known to be important to rural communities”. This is no substitute for being ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt and appears instead to knowingly be a sop to the impact of ‘inset’. I propose the removal of the text “that policy is in place to protect open space and village character, which is known to be important to rural communities” from Sustainability Appraisal 2017 para 10.4.7

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/276</th>
<th>Respondent: 8804513 / Ian Buchanan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

NO NEED FOR A SECONDARY SCHOOL

I work at Guildford Grove Primary School which is next to Kings College. I have grave concerns for the future of the pupils in my school as the falling numbers at Kings College puts their local school at risk. The GBC plans would make it far worse. There can be no justification in planning a secondary school in Normandy when all the secondary schools in the surrounding areas are under subscribed and have many places. Money should be invested in the current schools and not try and remove children from those schools in order to fill a school in Normandy. There are very few primary and secondary age children currently living in the village.

TRANSPORT AND ROADS

Many commuters use Normandy to cut through when the A3 and A31 have traffic congestion, which happens most mornings. This then affects Glaziers lane with a restricted weight bridge and Westwood Lane with a restricted lane under a restricted height bridge. The GBC plan will increase the traffic on both lanes significantly.

ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE

The proposed development will negatively impact on or destroy habitats of numerous species. Surrey Hills is an area of outstanding beauty not to be scarred by a huge housing development adding to light and air pollution (with all the extra cars). The area is also next to the Thames basin which protects birds. The green belt includes the land between Flexford and Normandy. In March 2013 Surrey County Council boasted about creating and keeping green belt area and had promised to preserve the green belt. Building on green belt areas defeats the object and reasons for having green belt areas.

Flooding is a concern with streams. Building on this land will contribute to more flooding as the land can’t absorb the rain as it flows over built areas into roads and drains that can’t cope with the flow. The road by the train station is an example, regular flooding making it impossible to even walk through without wellington boots.

It would be so much fairer if the plan was to build 50 to 100 houses in each village NOT over a 1000 in one village! This is a politically led plan in the hope that there will be less political come back however we care too much for our village and environment for this plan to be forced on us.
It is with relief that my wife and I, residents of Normandy for nearly 50 years, see that some of the threats to West Surrey and North East Hampshire proposed in the earlier discredited plan, have been withdrawn, especially policies A46 and A47. There remain however in the revised proposals other threats to the Green Belt which by its existence in its current form helps to prevent the degeneration of the region into a continuous urban sprawl to everybody’s, not only local residents,' detriment.

I object to the ‘insetting’ of settlements at Normandy and Flexford and Walden Cottages as well as the Travellers' sites at Palm House Nurseries and Whittles Drive. Such 'insetting' would represent a serious erosion of the Green Belt and could and most probably would be used further to erode the Green Belt, one of our country's most valuable assets, especially in this part of the South East.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Response to Guildford Borough Council Draft Local Plan – 18th July 2016

I am a resident in Flexford (which is one of 6 distinctly separate hamlets within Normandy Parish) and I have lived here for 5 years. I am a fully qualified ecologist who is a full member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) and I have work as an ecological consultant for 11 years and for a number of clients, many of which are developers. I am therefore fully aware of the needs for housing. However, as a local resident I object to the Guildford Borough Council Draft Local Plan with the proposed developments on sites A46 and A47 in Normandy and Flexford on the following number of issues;

1. Effect on Biodiversity including loss of and damage to habitats which act as wildlife corridors and impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA).
2. Development on Green Belt
3. Insufficient evidence on the need for new schools on Site A46 and therefore the justification for 1,100 homes with associated retail units and residential/care
4. Increased road traffic along a series of local roads that do not have the capacity to sustain this increase in This is both during the development with site traffic and post development with increase in vehicles due to the new schools, retail area, housing and residential/care home.
5. Limited capacity of rail services serving Wanborough Station and also the current limited capacity for Wanborough Station to serve an increase in passengers from the proposed developments in Sites A46 and A47, due to platform size, no disabled access and limited car and cycle.

6. Flooding issues on both proposed development Sites A46 and A47 and also within the Normandy and Flexford areas, such as the approach to Wanborough Station itself.

Taking each issue in turn I shall elaborate below.

1. Effect on Biodiversity including loss of and damage to habitats which act as wildlife

Background

There are a number of nationally and locally important sites for nature conservation within and adjoining the Parish of Normandy.

Normandy Parish includes a large part of Ash Ranges which form part of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA), which is a statutory designated site and designated for its rare birds, specifically woodlark, nightjar and Dartford warbler, under the EC Birds Directive. This site also forms part of the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham Special Area of Conservation (SAC), also 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), which is a statutory designated site and designated for its dry heathland, wet heathland and bog, bryophytes (lichens and mosses), invertebrates (such as the scarce bog bush cricket and tiger beetle), 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).

Within a radius of 2 km from site A47 there are eight non-statutory designated sites. These sites are known as Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCIs) and are selected for the habitats and flora/fauna they support. They are of County or local wildlife importance.

The proposed development site (site A46) contains several areas of ancient woodland. Ancient woodland is defined by Natural England as a site that has had continuous woodland cover since at least 1600 AD. It is a Habitat of Principal Importance (HPI) and is an irreplaceable, wildlife-rich habitat known to support more biodiversity than any other UK land habitat.

The two main areas in or bordering site A46 in the Draft 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 ground flora such as wood sorrel, primroses, bluebells, wood anemones and early purple orchids), but is not included in the Surrey Ancient Woodland Inventory because it is slightly under the minimum registration size of two hectares. Regardless of the size, I strongly believe 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; which if implemented would destroy a precious wildlife corridor.

There is an avenue of mature pedunculate oak trees towards the centre of the footpath that crosses site A46, 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. I have undertaken bat activity surveys (following the latest Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) Bat Survey Guidelines) of this avenue of mature pedunculated oaks and also the mature trees that border Fiddlers with the footpath across site A46 and have recorded a high amount of foraging activity from common pipistrelle bats. Judging by the amount of activity within 30 minutes after sunset this indicates that a bat roost is close by, possibly in one of the many cracks, crevices, splits and woodpecker holes within the trees. The loss of these trees or even any disturbance from lighting would have an impact on those bats and their roosts.
Site A46 falls within 4 one kilometre grid squares (SU9250, SU9350, SU9251 and SU9351) which combine to form a tetrad. From bird records obtained by surveys from Friends of Normandy Wildlife (of which I am a member) and BirdTrack (a collaborative online recording package from the British Trust for Ornithology, RSPB and BirdWatch Ireland) 15 Red listed birds, based on Birds of Conservation Concern4; 2015 (BoCC4), have been recorded from the A46 tetrad. These birds include: woodcock, cuckoo, starling, fieldfare, song thrush, mistle thrush, redwing, house sparrow, linnet, skylark, yellowhammer, lesser redpoll, wood warbler (not recorded for 5+ years), tree pipit (not recorded for 5+ years) and herring gull.

As well as these Red listed birds a further 18 species occurring on the Amber list (BoCC4) have been recorded from the tetrad, including mute swan, mallard, common sandpiper, black- headed gull, common gull, stock dove, tawny owl, swift, kingfisher,kestrel, house martin, willow warbler, dunnock, meadow pipit, bullfinch, reed bunting and greylag goose. Barn owl and red kite have been recorded hunting and possibly nesting on site A46. Skylark has been

recorded by myself nesting in a field adjoining site A47 and from personal observation great white egrets and grey heron’s forage on site A47 in winter.

A resident backing onto Pussey’s Copse and site A46 has reportedly seen a dormouse (European Protected Species) using a dormouse nest box in their garden (the description given to me seem unlikely to another small mammal specis) 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 and the surrounding woodlands and hedgerows.

Normandy and Flexford are important areas for breeding and foraging hedgehogs, which are in serious decline nationally. Hedgehogs are a Species of Principal Importance and predominantly rely on woodlands and hedgerows (a number of which are on or adjoin site A46 as previously stated) to forage, shelter and breed and use those areas and adjoining gardens as wildlife corridors. An increase in traffic and disturbance by people and pets will have a negative impact on the hedgehog population in Normandy and Flexford.

All the habitats within or adjoining the proposed development site of A46 and some of site A47 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, common toads, barn owls, skylarks, stag beetles, common lizards, grass snakes, adders, slow worms, badgers and bats.

The proposed development of site A46 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), 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).

Site A47 is a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (Little Flexford SNCI), which was selected for its botanical interest and for records of water voles within the stream that runs through the site, and the Flax Pond. Water voles are UK’s fastest declining mammal species and are a highly important local species and indicator of a healthy freshwater ecosystem.

Surrey Wildlife Trust have identified the Normandy and Flexford areas as a ‘Water Vole Alert Area’. The Flax Pond has anecdotal records of great crested newts (European Protected Species).

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 of the NPPF 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…..”.

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)". BOAs are set out by Surrey Nature Partnership.

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."

It is clear that the proposals for development in Normandy and Flexford directly conflict with these policies and I strongly object to these development proposals as Guildford Borough Council have failed to show how they will conserve and enhance biodiversity.

The effect from the proposed development on Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA).

I strongly believe that the Plan is unsound in relation to site A46 as the Habitats Regulations Assessment prepared for Guildford Borough Council does not take sufficient account of the impact that this huge proposed development specifically will have upon the 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 5km 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 5km away from a SPA will create disturbance to rare bird populations. As stated previously the TBH SPA is an internationally important habitat for three rare species of bird - the Dartford warbler, nightjar and woodlark. The latter two are ground nesting and therefore particularly susceptible to disturbance from people and animals.

The results of a survey in 2008 showed that more than 83% of visitors to the TBH SPA arrived by car and that 70% of those had come 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.

In order 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, and potentially create a health risk. This is already a problem on Normandy Common SNCI.

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.

There is currently little evidence to suggest that SANGs have any net gain benefit for biodiversity, as often they are used as open recreation sites for dog walkers rather than creation of and protection of habitats as mitigation for those lost through development of which the SANG is proposed for.

1. Development on Green Belt

According to the NPPF "the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence". 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 strongly believe that the land in both sites A46 and A47 makes an unparalleled contribution to the Green Belt which stretches from Guildford in the east to Ash and 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.

It will break up wildlife corridors and degrade habitats. The Government have indicated that Green Belt is supposed to be protected, but Guildford Borough Council 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). Guildford Borough Council have therefore totally ignored all policies on Biodiversity when proposing to inset these areas.

Site A46 was not previously proposed in an earlier consultation and is not appropriate development at this stage in the 2016 local plan consultation. In 2014’s consultation it was ‘safeguarded’. It was not removed from the Metropolitan Green Belt. And ‘Exceptional circumstances’ have not been demonstrated or approved by the inspectorate. In the Solihull ruling, a boundary cannot be drawn around sections of land and urbanised. This also includes site A47.

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 the site A46 proposal will impact on views from the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), during daylight hours and from light pollution during darkness.

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 ‘Exceptional Circumstances’ justifying inappropriate development on a site within Green Belt (NPPF).

1. Insufficient evidence on the need for new schools on Site A46 and therefore the justification for 1,100 homes with associated retail units and residential/care

There is no proven need for a secondary school and a primary school for site A46. 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 heeded 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.

**Christ's 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 and Flexford, 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 Surrey County Council has already approved expansions at the County School, Guildford and St Peters.

Normandy and Flexford’s ‘needs and priorities have not been decided by the resident’s’, NPPF 1 ‘provides a framework within which local people and their parish councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans reflecting their needs and priorities of their communities’.

Site A46 is an inappropriate use of a rural area for ‘town uses’.

Planning Policy and a developer (Taylor Wimpey) led building proposal (urban centre) have decided Normandy and Flexford’s ‘needs and priorities’ of which include 715 homes, 385 flats/apartments, 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 Wanborough Railway Station, 8 flats in Glazier’s Lane by new access, and 4,700 sq metres of retail which will permanently destroy Normandy and Flexford’s rural environment.

NPPF 155 states ‘early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations is essential’ This has clearly not happened. Evidence has indeed shown that at least 2 years ago documentation for site A46 was submitted on behalf of Taylor Wimpey to Guildford Borough Council Planning Policy. At this stage No ‘meaningful engagement’ was made or requested from the local people.

I strongly believe that Guildford Borough Council have breached the NPPF and are being led by a developer namely Taylor Wimpey. Interestingly, Taylor Wimpey have close associations with Normandy and Flexford through family members of the founding business directors of Taylor Woodrow.

1. Increased road traffic along a series of local roads that do not have the capacity to sustain this increase in This is both during the development with site traffic and post development with increase in vehicles due to the new schools, retail area, housing and care home.

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 Guildford Borough Council for this strategic site contains no scheduled improvements for Glaziers Lane (D60 classified road) and very few for Wanborough Hill and Westwood Lane (C16 classified road), which are rural lanes. The A323 Guildford/ Aldershot Road to the north of the site will also be affected, and very few improvements to that road are planned.

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.

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, including bats, birds, badgers and amphibians.
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 and Habitat of Principal Importance Traditional Orchard Habitat in Glaziers Lane will also be affected. The Normandy Traditional Community Orchard is home to a number of species and some of these are Notable Rare or Scarce species.

Another road where traffic will also be significantly increased is the A324. This borders the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and increased traffic and pollution will therefore have an adverse effect on the heathland and acid grassland.

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.

The potential combination of A3 road improvements and major site work on site A46 and A47 over the next 15 years would be catastrophic for Normandy and Flexford’s link up roads (namely Wanborough Hill and Westwood Lane C16, and Glazier’s Lane D60). The construction traffic, continual noise and pollution generated by the developer will be excessive. Planning Policy has not fully considered the location of the site and traffic impact that site A46 and A47 will have on this rural community.

Scenario 5 demonstrates that if Flexford and Normandy is fully developed approximately 800 traffic movements will occur every hour.

Research has shown that 5% of the population die from premature death caused by inadequate air quality from traffic pollution. This will lead to significant health issues, especially for residents who border the three sides of the proposed developments of site A46 and the railway embankment bordering the south, plus those residents in The Paddocks who border the proposed development of site A47. No regard has been given for the well-being of residents. I strongly believe this development is ‘unsustainable’.

1. Limited capacity of rail services serving Wanborough Station and also the current limited capacity for Wanborough Station to serve an increase in passengers from the proposed developments in Sites A46 and A47, due to platform size, no disabled access and limited car and cycle

Although Guildford Borough Council state that the proposed developments of sites A46 and A47 are sustainable due to the close proximity of rail services serving Wanborough Station, there is little public evidence to suggest that Network Rail or indeed South West Trains have been consulted on whether there are plans to improve Wanborough Station or indeed provide additional train services serving Wanborough Station in order to cope with an increase in passengers. There is currently no disabled access to the Guildford bound line. The current platform size is insufficient to cope with an increase in passengers and there is limited car and cycle spaces outside the station entrance.

1. Flooding issues on both proposed development sites A46 and A47 and also within the Normandy and Flexford areas, such as the approach to Wanborough Station itself.

As site A46 is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (Policy 1: Sustainable Development), Guildford Borough Council should have considered the Habitats Regulations (NPPF) ‘water stress’. This has not been considered. Guildford Borough Council’s Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) has excluded the land north of site A46, flood risk 3a and 3b (identified on the Environment Agency’s flood risk map). Loss of 3b an ‘effective flood-plain’ will severely impact on the surrounding areas on the SWMP.

The approach to the Wanborough Station is often flooded during often regular persistant or heavy rain to the extent that it is impassable by pedestrians and cyclists. I have not seen any evidence of flood improvement measures being proposed for this road. Surely this will have an impact on the increased usage of Wanborough Station and rail services if the proposed development in sites A46 and A47 go ahead.
Sites A46 and A47 are regularly flooded, particularly A47 which makes the very idea of using those sites for housing and schools, residential or care home and retail units as completely nonsensical as there is a serious risk to lives and damage to properties in those areas that regularly flood.

Although my comments relate to the proposed development sites A46 and A47 in Normandy and Flexford. I do have wider concerns over Guildford Borough Council’s Draft Local Plan.

The proposed ‘Growth’ indicated in this Draft Local Plan is based on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The SHMA is the evidence base which Guildford Borough Council housing targets are based on. The SHMA statistics are distorted by large numbers from University of Surrey (Guildford) and has disproportionately increased the ‘need’ for houses. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) downgraded Guildford’s population growth.

The confidential commercial model used to calculate the SHMA numbers cannot be checked (Guildford Borough Council do not hold the model), and this has been taken on trust which I strongly believe is not satisfactory. Indeed on the 24th May 2016, some Councillors raised these concerns regarding the SHMA produced by G.L. Hearn, (this is the most critical piece of evidence in the Draft Local Plan) but the majority vote indicated that the full council meeting was satisfied that the SHMA was ‘a professional document’.

I object to Policy E2.

I believe that all new office and research and development (use Class B1a and B1b) floor space should be within Guildford town centre.

I object to the policy of expanding the Research Park onto Blackwell Farm and do not believe there are exceptional circumstances to justify incursion into this permanent and high quality area of Green Belt. The proposal to expand the 65,000 sq m by 9,000 sq m (existing allocation) with an additional 35,000 sq m amounts to an increase of 67% of the Research Park which is not required.

Although, Guildford Borough Council refused the last planning application for proposed housing ‘new village’ development at Wisley Airfield, I remain concerned that this site still remains with the 2016 Guildford Borough Council Draft Local Plan as a potential site for development. I object to this site being developed as I strongly believe it will lead to the loss of biodiversity on the site and adjacent habitats, including the SNCI and have a negative impact on the SPA of Wisley and Ockham Commons. There would also be a serious impact on road infrastructure on both the A3/M25 Junction and local roads into Ockham.

I do hope that my opinions in this consultation are considered seriously.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
There are also the problems concerning infrastructure in the area which is already stretched. The main sewage system is already too small in diameter and would need considerable upgrade if any large scale development is made. This also applies to water supply, electricity and broadband which is already struggling to maintain an adequate service. The problems with road transport and the large number of heavy goods vehicles in the area are already well known by GBC. The removal of the plan for 50 homes A47 is also welcome as that area is prone to flooding and as such should not be developed as per national policy as well as the above reasons.

The housing which is required in the area are small developments of rental and truly affordable housing such as the cottages in Szarbo Crescent which which allow older residents to downsize, freeing larger housing and are also suitable as starter homes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/812  Respondent: 8833633 / Neil Seymour  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Having moved to the quiet hamlet of Normandy over 20 years ago and raised a family here I am objecting to the proposed local plans being put forward by Guildford Borough Council. I would make two critical points in objection to your plan:

1. Your plan to remove a considerable chunk of the village from the classification of the Green belt without demonstrating the 'exceptional circumstances' required to do so is unfathomable. Any impact on the Green belt is to be abhorred but to do this with no consideration to the impact on the local biodiversity and natural environment which have been highlighted as important in National, County and Borough council policies over the years is unacceptable. I cannot understand how a council that has supported the protection of the green belt is now so keen to destroy it whilst there are more appropriate alternative locations inside the borough that could be given up to development.

1. The road infrastructure within Normandy and the environs is already at capacity. The impact of building over 1,000 new homes and a school will double the size of the village and bring with it further problems with the associated peak time traffic. An already congested route into Guildford will become another logjam AND the associated pollution will have its impact on our natural environment. The feeder link to the Hogs Back (already difficult to traverse during peak times and an accident black spot in the winter) via Wanborough Hill will need complete redevelopment to open up the access. It will also cause further traffic to be forced through the village to avoid the constant snarl-ups that occur on the northbound A31 and A3 junction in Guildford at peak times. What is already a slow crawl into Guildford in the mornings will become a car park. Current infrastructure, such as the tunnel under the railway at Westwood lane, and the junction of the Aldershot road with Glaziers Lane and Hunts Hill road will not adequately handle the increased level of traffic your plan will bring. All the roads in the village will need substantial redevelopment if your plan goes ahead cusing yet further impact on the natural environment. Any thought that the majority of people will travel from Normandy into Guildford from Wanborough station is seriously deluded. The car park at Wanborough railway station does not have the capacity to handle more cars so will only be suitable for the small minority people who can walk there.

The plan to double the size of the village in one go is contrary to normal planning advice that limits acceptable growth by 10% because of the detrimental impact. From your plan I do not see that any proposed benefits will outweigh the overwhelming impact on our village and my family and I object most strongly to your plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Normandy Action Group

Normandy Action Group [NAG] was formed in 2004 as a formally constituted association established by Normandy residents who care about the village and wish to address independently any issues that affect the environment and amenity of the local community. Normandy Action Group draws its membership from the local community and works independently with the support and on behalf of residents. Our membership represents approximately 10% of Normandy and Flexford settlements’ households.

In the current consultation process NAG has held a series of public meetings and issued and distributed its regular printed newsletter plus many flyers to help residents understand the Local Plan process and the thrust of the overwhelming and often complex documentation presented in the ever-changing evidence base.

NAG Summary View

NAG believes that Guildford Borough Council [GBC] has promoted an obsession with process and deadlines in order to draw attention away from valid criticism of its pre-determination that can be seen within the evidence base. NAG believes that the basis of this plan was conceived in the period up to 2009 as the basis for a new local plan in 2010 but was deferred due to the then imminent general election. Many of the initial evidence documents were conceived in 2007 and have been hurriedly and poorly updated or have had new volumes added or addenda created to resolve problems for GBC where past evidence does not suit the current pre-determination embodied in the statement by the former lead councillor for the Local Plan, Cllr. Juneja, that this plan would “roll back the Green Belt”. This behaviour has been repeated in the current consultation with extremely late revealing of critical documents in a manner that militates against their evaluation as plausible evidence almost impossible. We believe this is a deliberate tactic by GBC to prevent proper consideration of them.

We believe the previous Regulation 18 consultation that drew 20,000 responses from 7,000 contributors demonstrated where their concerns were focussed, exposing widespread concern with the housing target represented by the OAN in the SHMAA and the determination to site 70% of housing in the Green Belt. Those responses have effectively been ignored. GBC planning officers reduced the analysis of those 20,000+ documents to a simple-minded two-page report on their impact on technical planning policy issues presented to the Joint Scrutiny Committee.

The new West Surrey SHMA is designed to prevent suitable examination in this round of consultation of its numbers and methodology. GL Hearn acting under the direction of GBC has produced a final SHMA that has been shown to be grossly inadequate, based as it is on inaccurate assessment of ONS figures. An analysis of the SHMA produced by NMSS on behalf of Guildford Residents Associations (of which NAG is a member) indicates technical shortcomings in the evaluation of population and economic estimates over the 15 year period and proposes an OAN of 510 dwellings per year. Although available under the NPPF, no restrictions are placed on the OAN in spite of 89% of the borough designated Green Belt, 44% AONB and about 75% within the 7Km mitigation zone of Thames Basin Heaths SPA.

693 houses per annum is excessive. It forces undue consideration of the agricultural land surrounding villages in the Green Belt. This is a relevant constraint under the NPPF but is being singularly ignored by this council in its plan setting. This number requires review and a significant downward adjustment towards the 322 that GBC fought so hard to establish in the High Court in 2010. There is a blatant disregard of ‘brownfield land’ being proposed for housing in Guildford town in contravention of national planning guidelines.

A plan is required, but a sensible and logical plan that flows from a consistent and stable evidence base endorsed by the residents of the whole borough, in which residents do not believe they are being cheated or conned, in which they harbour no suspicion of motives and from which they can believe this council supports their aspirations and harbours no malice to their lifestyles.
The Consultation Process

The consultation process was designed from the outset to curry a favourable image among the urban young, including UniS students, and the less advantaged residents of Guildford. The consultants engaged to design, implement and report on the community events were specialists in selling the ideas and planning concepts, not to listen seriously to the concerns and reasoned arguments of informed residents that thought the events were designed for them to express their views and have them listed to. GBC have spent £175,000 retaining planning barristers to advise best how to edge this divisive evidence base through a Regulation 19 examination.

Developers and landowners have been actively courted (e.g. G-Live event organised on the 6th May 2014). In contrast, local communities like Normandy and Flexford were offered a single event not even in the parish. It was claimed to have been advertised in the local press but diligent residents could find no evidence. The GBC planning policy department representatives and their consultant helpers outnumbered our residents. When asked questions they could not or were unwilling to answer, these representatives kept referring residents back to the GBC web site and the evidence base or claiming it was catered for under the NPPF guidance. All the way through it has been a ‘selling’ exercise, reinforced by GBC spending £75,000 retaining PR advisers to present a favourable picture of the Local Plan, even to the extent of claiming SANG is planned leisure space.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3736</th>
<th>Respondent: 8836129 / Roger Shapley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 site allocations in Normandy ward are reliant upon the land in each site being ‘inset’ from the Green Belt. In every case, there has been no attempt to bring forward the ‘exceptional circumstances’ required to change Green Belt boundaries as laid out by the NPPF. The NPPF and the accompanying NPPG is planning guidance, advisory during the Local Plan process but not planning law. Planning law is set in statute and in the courts. The law concerning ‘exceptional circumstances’ is well founded, whether the proposal is to extend or diminish the Green Belt and GBC have not addressed this requirement and presented their arguments to the “exceptional circumstances” required to re-draw Green Belt boundaries either when proposing “insetting” of settlements from the Green belt that are currently “washed over” by the Green Belt or removing land from the Green Belt for housing development.

In addition, all Site Allocation Policies for land in Normandy and Flexford are within the 5km buffer zone of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area [TBHSPA]. This makes all of them subject to the provision of SANG and there must be due regard to the Habitats Regulations (NPPF para 14 and 119)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/540</th>
<th>Respondent: 8836545 / Marian Sage</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 change that Normandy, Flexford and Walden Cottages should be inset from the Green Belt. There is evidence in past planning appeals (I will not quote numbers as many others will already have) the this land contributes to the openness of the Green Belt. The agricultural land between these settlements falls in the Environment Agency’s BMV (Best and Most Versatile) category, essential it is retained for the agricultural future of this country and suggesting the importance of Normandy and Flexford to the rural economy.

Policy P2 does nothing to acknowledge the importance of the Metropolitan Green Belt and the need for it to permanently protected. There is no assessment of the value of the Green Belt. It is a working environment where people live and work.

I object to the references to villages “now inset from the Green Belt”. This is untrue as GBC is proposing to “inset” these villages. No decision has been made by an Inspector therefore the villages remain in the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
8 Whilst some small scale developments are perhaps inevitable a development of this massive magnitude (in relation to the existing village) is totally unacceptable. Surely the burden for new housing should be spread equitably across GBC and not 'dumped' on the village of Normandy.

9 I am also concerned that this development is being driven by the large Property Developer who, more than likely, has the interests of the potential profit they can make from the development rather than the interests of Normandy residents. Is that also the case for GBC?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3106  Respondent: 8852769 / Gavin Grey  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposals for a massive development in Normandy of a secondary school, housing, shop and travellers pitch. I have numerous concerns but to more than double the size of the village and effectively tarmac one of the last remaining green spaces between west Guildford and Aldershot are uppermost in my mind. Ancient woodlands are at stake here. Once cut they're gone forever.

The area is currently Green Belt and yet it would seem the offer by a developer to build a school is almost akin to a bribe for the council to ignore this important designation. I would question the need for the school, as both King's College and Ash Manor are under capacity. I would also question the plans for such a massive expansion of housing stock in Guildford. The city wasn't designed for such numbers and the recent vehicle/pedestrian fatalities and accidents in the centre show it can't cope. Furthermore, the homes won't ease any housing shortages in the borough much as almost all the new residents will come from elsewhere in the south east, many I predict will work in or around London.

I understand the plot may be felt to offer sustainable living because of the proximity of the train line and station at Wanborough. However the parish has no pub, no post office, no restaurant or cafe, and the only shop sells karaoke equipment and I simply don't believe the majority of those attending any new school would either walk or catch the train. The increase in traffic to and from the school and to and from the new homes will generate tens of thousands of additional car journeys every week and these will add to an already incredibly congested road network in the area. I urge you and your colleagues to see the congestion at peak times on the main road through Wanborough. Sometimes the queue to get on to the Blackwater Valley Relief Road starts in Wanborough. In the opposite direction the queue to head in to Guildford can also tail back to Wanborough...and that's BEFORE any further expansion is permitted. Any mitigation is likely to amount to little more than tinkering around the edge and will have little effect. There is also the added concern of pollution and the likely breaking of EU guidelines on exhaust emissions through our village and wider parish.

I also have grave concerns about flooding. Normandy has a very high water table and floods regularly. These green spaces act as sponges. Even if the developers are able to mitigate flood concerns for that site, where will the water go except pose a problem elsewhere?

These points are not Nimbyism, but genuine concerns about the desecration of protected open space and a lovely village. In the past, blatant disregard for Green Belt land has ended up in the courts and I can see a similar path being pursued here if these plans are given the go ahead. If "exceptional circumstances" have to be at stake to allow this development then the plans fail to reach that threshold by a considerable margin.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
### Comment ID: pslp173/535  **Respondent:** 8857025 / Martin Sweeting  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly support the withdrawal of Policies A46 and A47, the former being the so-called ‘strategic site’ that would have added 1100 extra houses to the village that would have irretrievably destroyed the character of Normandy and Flexford and would have imposed an impossible burden on the local transport and other infrastructure. This area contributes significantly to the ‘openness’ of the Green Belt in this area, as well as being high grade agricultural land, and therefore should be fully protected for the future.

I object to the ‘insetting’ of the settlements at Flexford, Normandy, and Walden Cottages, as well as the Traveller site at Palm House Nurseries (Policy/Site A49) and the Travelling Show-people site at Whittles Drive (Policy/Site A50) as this would mean is that they were no longer part of the Green Belt and could in future be developed subject only to normal planning regulations. Both sites are rated “High Sensitivity” in the Sustainability Appraisal 2017 (Table 10.1).

In summary, the removal of sites from the Green Belt should only be done for exceptional circumstances, so I am pleased to see that the Guildford Borough Council has recognised this specifically with regard to the proposals for policies A46 & A47.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

### Comment ID: PSLPA16/3673  **Respondent:** 8858209 / Jason Lytton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to lodge my objections to the proposed plan to build a significant number of new homes and school on the above site.

**Protection of green belt. Environmental impact.**

The proposed plan to take Green Belt Land for development is objectionable to the majority of people living in our village and surrounding countryside. Green belt should be protected to the highest level, not for governments or local councils to ride roughshod over the original purpose of making such land protected. building such a large number of new homes in one place will cause irreparable harm to the precious countryside that we live in. The environmental impact off this proposed development would be irreversible and with nearby sites such as The Thames basin heaths special protection area which would be affected. The development would destroy important habitats that support the vitally important green infrastructure corridors that was the whole backbone of green belt creation. I feel that the council has not fully or properly assessed the ecological impact of such a development and therefore there should be a presumption against development. Surrey county council should uphold the principles the coalition Agreement in "maintaining the green belt, sites of special scientific interest and other environmental protections...."

**Need for a new secondary school.**

the proposed site of Normandy and Flexford for a new secondary school should be rejected as the need for such a school in that location has not been proven. Every neighbouring secondary school is under subscribed, with birth rates falling it seems foolish to build a new secondary school.

**Transport**
The proposals for development should be rejected as the existing road network would be unable to cope with such a large amount of new residential properties and school journeys. Minor road network improvements would not address such large scale development, significant expenditure and traffic planning would be required. None of the local roads have cycle paths, so sustainable travel plans would need significant expenditure. Traffic danger points would only be exasperated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3497  **Respondent:** 8858593 / John Marchant  **Agent:**

*Document:* Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Guildford Borough Council Local Plan**

**Ref sites A46 and A47**

We are writing to object to the proposed development on sites A46 and A47 in Normandy and Flexford.

It is our understanding that the proposed development in Normandy and Flexford will only go ahead if the need for a secondary school is proved. At this time the need for a secondary school remains unproven.

Data from local secondary schools suggests there is no need to provide further secondary school places given three out of the four closest secondary schools in the area are under subscribed (Ash Manor, Kings College, The Connaught).

Put simply until these schools are reported as over subscribed, there is no need to build a 7 form entry secondary school which in turn invalidates the proposed development (including housing developments) in sites A46 and A47.

Other factors that lead us to believe that sites in Normandy and Flexford are not suitable for development are:-

Local flooding - With the land being clay and former flax fields, it is no surprise that Normandy/Flexford suffers with flooding and surface water. Development in this area will only make the situation worse.

The road network - The road network in and around Normandy and Flexford is also very busy particularly during rush hours. The proposed development will bring a significant increase in the number of cars making traffic jams worse and will likely increase the number of road accidents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLP173/400  **Respondent:** 8860865 / David Reay  **Agent:** D & M Planning Limited (Jesse Chapman)

*Document:* Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**REPRESENTATIONS REGARDING GUILDFORD THE BOROUGH PROPOSED SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN: STRATEGY AND SITES JUNE 2017 CONSULTATION UNDER REGULATION 19 OF THE TOWN**
AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL PLANNING) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2012 RELATING TO
HALSEY COTTAGE GLAZIERS LANE NORMANDY GUILDFORD GU3 2DG

D&M Planning Limited has been instructed by Mr Reay to submit representations to Guildford Borough Council in connection with the Council’s document entitled Guildford The Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites June 2017 Consultation Under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 in objection to the rear of the above site being placed within Open Green Belt.

Accordingly, the following documentation is submitted:

Covering Statement with appendices;
This covering letter.

The representations are borne out of the changes to the Local Plan and specifically in the Council’s decrease in housing numbers from 13,860 to 12,426 additional homes by 2034 as set out within the spatial strategy on page 21 of the Local Plan.

As was explained at the last Agents’ Forum on 16 February 2017, given that the provision of housing within the Borough is going to be the main factor in alterations to the Local Plan, it is extremely difficult to disentangle the changes that have been set out to the original draft.

The Council did accept this argument.

Housing numbers

The Local Plan, at paragraph 2.18 says:

‘The SHMA is an assessment of peoples’ housing needs within our borough based on statistical evidence. The document provides us with our objectively assessed housing need. This detailed evidence is required to ensure that the new Local Plan is based on up-to-date and robust information. The West Surrey SHMA, which covers the administrative boundaries of Guildford Borough Council, Waverley Borough Council and Woking Borough Council, was published in October 2015 and the West Surrey SHMA: Guildford Addendum Report in 2017. Both have informed the number and type of homes we have decided to plan for over the lifetime of the Local Plan.’

Whilst the Council set out within its Local Plan that the figures within the SHMA are the most up-to-date housing figures, the SHMA is an untested document and should not automatically be seen as a proxy for a final housing requirement. Thus, the only way to properly assess whether the housing provision as suggested by the Council as being adequate to meet its demand is through the Local Plan process.

At this juncture, it is worth citing the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) where at Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 2a-004-20140306 (under the heading of Can local planning authorities apply constraints to the assessment of development needs?) it states:

‘The assessment of development needs is an objective assessment of need based on facts and unbiased evidence. Plan makers should not apply constraints to the overall assessment of need, such as limitations imposed by the supply of land for new development, historic under performance, viability, infrastructure or environmental constraints. However, these considerations will need to be addressed when bringing evidence bases together to identify specific policies within development plans.’

Accordingly, the figures set out within the SHMA should not be taken as being acceptable without proper assessment.

Green Belt

Amendments 1 – 8 (Normandy and Flexford)
It is submitted that there is no justification for the inclusion of the residential garden land to the west of Halsey Cottage to be located within the Green Belt.

The land further west is already designated as Metropolitan Green Belt and, as such, does not need to be made more robust and defensible as it is already afforded all of the statutory protection that comes with it being Green Belt.

The Local Plan advocates that the focus of development within the Borough be in and around the four main existing towns and settlements, and it therefore seems perverse that this area be placed within open Green Belt when the rest of Normandy is proposed to be removed from the Green Belt especially when:

a) the Council has to find sufficient land for 12,426 additional homes (and I again stress that this figure is untested and following the Waverley Local Plan Part 1 Hearing it became clear that both Waverley and Guildford will need to accommodate some of Woking’s housing under provision);

b) why the Council would wish to inhibit development taking place at one of the more sustainable locations within the Borough; and

c) to include land already within a settlement area which is acceptable for development when the Council is actually looking to release open Green Belt land and areas of land which are within specially designated areas, such as areas of outstanding Natural Beauty, land close to Special Protection Areas and so on.

Further, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012, at paragraph 85 says:

‘When defining boundaries, local planning authorities should:
- ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development;
- not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open;
- where necessary, identify in their plans areas of ‘safeguarded land’ between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period;
- make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development;
- satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period; and
- define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.’

Each of the above points are briefly discussed:

- The land in question is residential curtilage land with open Green Belt beyond and which is divided by a strong boundary treatment. As such, it is not necessary to keep this land permanently open.
- There is no requirement to safeguard this residential garden land from the open, agricultural fields beyond as the area in question is not significant in size and thus, cannot be viewed as a location where large amounts of development could come forward.
- As stated above, the land is not safeguarded land.
- Such is the Council’s requirement for new housing, it is submitted that it would not be correct for the Council to consider that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period; and altered at the end of the development plan period; and
- There are no defined physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent within the residential curtilage.

Paragraph 86 of the NPPF says that 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. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt.
Here, the Council is seeking to place one small element within the Green Belt rather than keeping the whole settlement within the Green Belt which is not in accordance with paragraph 86.

Furthermore, if the approach of the Council is to seek to protect the Grade II Listed Building by virtue of placing the curtilage land within Green Belt (at this point it is worth mentioning that a portion of the garden curtilage land of No. 38, to the south-east, is part of the historic curtilage of Halsey Cottage, (bought in around 1978) yet this land is proposed to be taken out of the Green Belt), this too is contrary to paragraph 86 of the NPPF and highlights a lack of confidence and robustness within the Council’s conservation and development management policies.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012 is very clear that there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development and, at paragraphs 14 and 15, say:

’At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.’

’Policies in Local Plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that it is clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay.’

The theme of the NPPF is, therefore, that areas that can accommodate sustainable development should not be inhibited, but be allowed to come forward when available.

I reiterate that the Council’s change in housing numbers has had a knock-on effect throughout the whole document and, as such, it is not possible to untangle the new wording of the Local Plan from the original draft.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  Location Plan (2).pdf (160 KB)

Comment ID:  PSLPA16/2089  Respondent:  8862625 / Raza Shah  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?  ( ), is Sound?  ( ), is Legally Compliant?  ( )

I wish to register my objections to the Local Plan 2016 and its impact to Normandy on several counts.

I Object on the following criteria:

GREEN BELT

Our Green Belt is precious. I understand it as what protects London from urban sprawl; it preserves air quality; it prevents flooding; it is the city’s playground.

It is for us to conserve and protect it. There are 5 legal purposes for Green Belt, and it meets them all:

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas
- To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
- To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Has GBC considered the local plans of neighbouring areas that are more suitable?

UNJUST EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES
The local plan proposes ~13860 new homes to be built on Green Belt land (compared with ~ 50 000 current homes in Guildford, so approx. equal to 18% of the existing homes in the borough) – a huge proportion. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires any change of Green Belt boundaries to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Unmet housing need is NOT an exceptional circumstance in law. No exceptional circumstances have been disclosed. So the Green Belt boundaries should NOT be changed.

I Object to GBC’s intention of building a large number of houses at the guidance of property developers and taking into account suitability of available brownfield land that can be sensibly reused. Surely its more sustainable to build on brownfield sites closer to the town centre where people can have shorter journeys to railway services and work places therefore reducing any impact on road traffic.

**HOUSING NUMBERS**

The housing numbers proposed are excessive for Normandy. This number is too high. It has not taken any account of the constraints that apply locally. It is based on a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) which the full council required to be amended by the then Lead Councilor for Planning and the Head of Planning. No amendment has taken place; those individuals are no longer in their posts. A new, revised, SHMA on a joint basis with Woking and Waverley has not yet been published and is not part of the evidence base. How can anyone comment on the proposed plan when the fundamental housing number is still so uncertain?

I also object to number of houses proposed and feel that required number of houses has been exaggerated over the years and the increase overlooked.

The environmental aspects of sustainability have not been considered in assessing the claimed benefits for Normandy for the large scale development proposed.

**SCHOOLS**

I object to the need of a new Secondary School in Normandy.

I have yet to see valid evidence that a new secondary school is needed in Normandy.

It has been stated that the local secondary schools are currently under subscribed meaning they have the capacity to take on more students, Local schools in Guildford County and St Peters have approved plans for expansion.

Surely it makes more sense to expand an existing school than to build a new one that is likely to be undersubscribed and have an impact to the local area, environment and increased volumes of traffic.

**BROWNFIELD AVAILABLE**

There is brownfield land available in Guildford town centre which is being earmarked for commercial development rather than for housing. This is enough to meet our real needs for affordable local homes. There are enough vacant commercial sites to cope with genuine business need, and we have enough retail capacity already, so urban brownfield/derelict land should be used for housing.

**WATER, DRAINAGE, FLOOD RISK, CONGESTION**

The current infrastructure including local drains, water supply, medical facilities and roads will not be able cope with the proposed number of new homes. Building this number of homes will lead to further flood risk here and downstream (along the Wey, Mole and Thames). The planned development on Green Belt is therefore unsustainable.

In conclusion, I must ask you to revise the housing number, and to amend the Local Plan to take advantage of brownfield land rather than green field sites in Normandy.

**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 live with my family (husband, 2 kids, dog and horse) on the Pirbright Road (A324) in Normandy.

The proposed plan to take Green Belt Land to build 1100 new homes on site 46/46 in a tiny village with an already overstretched road infrastructure has absolutely baffled me. The idea that a commercial developer can buy his way into the local plan without regard for travel infrastructure and environment is unbelievable.

Although there are many more reasons why this proposal is a bad idea (environment, flooding, an unnecessary secondary school), in this email I am focusing on traffic.

Traffic situation current:

Our road is Pirbright Road (A324 between Pirbright and Ash) and already at the moment it is a very busy road - in the last 10 year that we lived here we have seen the amount of traffic increase. Especially heavy traffic has increased with the arrival of the Henley Business Park. Pulling out of and driving into our drive is a scary moment every time, whether it is by car, bicycle or horse. The winding, treelined makes for bad visibility and cars are suddenly on your tail. We feel as if we are taking life in our hands every day we use the road.

Roads to and from the A31 and to and from Ash are even more busy and traffic jams are an almost daily occurrence.

Future traffic

The large development of housing in Aldershot will increase traffic through Normandy already. The idea of the owners of the 1100 Normandy homes being added to the direct car load on our and other Normandy area roads is scary. In the draft local plan there is no solution offered to these problems and with the rural nature of Normandy I can not see much scope for road improvements, let alone safer cycling.

More houses are needed, but more than doubling Normandy is in my opinion a very poorly thought out idea.

I sincerely hope that the plan gets rejected and a more sustainable solution, not driven by commerce, can be developed in co-operation with...
which you plan to build on is Green belt, and you cannot claim exceptional circumstances, there are none, as this whole project is totally commercially driven without proper consultation or even honestly notifying the residents of Normandy the scale of the building plans which you propose to do.

You were elected to represent the best interests of the people of Normandy which you are totally failing to do by even putting forward this horrendous plan.

The local roads will not be able to cope with the impact of the huge increase in the volume of traffic which this proposed plan will bring and it will totally disrupt the lives of all residents and destroy the character of the village of Normandy for ever.

I totally and strongly oppose your building plan for Normandy and ask you to reconsider.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2860</th>
<th>Respondent: 8878689 / E McShee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the use of this land as a SANG. These fields are used to raise cattle and there is already a Public Footpath across the fields.

I understand that the biodiversity of this land will be lost if it is made into a SANG – currently there are skylarks who use the disturbed ground (disturbed by the cattle) for nesting, without this land disturbance we will lose the skylarks which are on the red list of endangered birds. Egyptian Geese are also known to have nested on this site.

If this land is used for a SANG what will become of the farmer and his son who currently graze their cattle here – are they to be made ‘jobless’. We should be doing more to protect our Farmers and they land they farm for arable crops or livestock. As a country we need to provide more of our own food and not be importing from around the world.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1393</th>
<th>Respondent: 8880833 / W.P. Garson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford</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 write to register my objection to the draft Local Plan with regard to Normandy and Flexford.

The planned development is quite out of proportion and would lead to a massive increase in the population of this rural area and would radically change its character. It requires the destruction of green belt land which, I understand, should only be contemplated in exceptional circumstances. The need for additional housing is a perennial problem which has not been effectively addressed for a good many years. It is not exceptional.

The plan is in direct contravention of the concept of green belt land.
There is no need for a new secondary school in this area and its inclusion in the plan is puzzling unless it is being used in some way to justify the large population expansion.

Such a development will have a negative impact on the natural environment to the detriment of many species which are already under threat.

The local infrastructure is not adequate to sustain this plan. The traffic is already heavy in this area. The bridge over the railway in Glaziers Lane is already damaged, probably contributed to by the excessive number of heavy lorries which already use this route, and that in Westwood Lane forms a constriction to the flow of traffic.

This area is already subject to flooding, in places, at times of high rain fall; the proposed development can only aggravate this problem.

I do not believe that the ramifications and consequences of a development on this scale in this area, both in the process of its construction and in its impact on the communities involved once it is completed, have been adequately considered.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/166</th>
<th>Respondent: 8881249 / Kate Tate</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford</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 would like to express my unequivocal support for the removal from the latest Local Plan of sites A46 and A47-50. The infrastructure in the area - healthcare and wastewater and sewage systems and most particularly roads - would simply not be able to cope with this number of homes.

I would also like to most strongly object to the removal from the Green Belt of houses in Guildford Road, the northern end of Glaziers Lane, Flexford, Walden Cottages and Palm House Nurseries traveller site. Obviously there is huge pressure to build new homes but to ignore Green Belt status and destroy this area for ever would be a flagrant disregard of the council’s duty to its residents, both present and future.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/520</th>
<th>Respondent: 8887169 / Bryan &amp; Sue Starkey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford</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? ( )

Whilst as a resident of Normandy I applaud the decision to remove development of sites A46 and A47 from the Local Plan, I must object to the proposed removal of parts of Guildford Road, Glaziers Lane, Walden Cottages and Flexford from Green Belt.

The latter will facilitate development of these areas by relaxing the current restrictions on development.
The area in question is an important section of Green Belt since it contributes significantly to the openness of the current Green Belt. It will act as a boundary to prevent developments in Ash from coalescing with those from the Guildford direction (eg proposed Blackwell Farm and UOS development) to produce a continuous urban sprawl.

Surely this is not in line with GBC or government policy on Green Belt protection.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1262  **Respondent:** 8887297 / Ian C Milne  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I challenge the suggestion that Green Belt may be released for development if a secondary school is provided. Also, I strongly challenge the need for another secondary school to the west of the borough, when existing schools in this area are under subscribed by more than 700 places. Additionally, more places will become available at the new Technical College, Guildford County and St Peters Schools.

The road network in the area would not support the increased volume of traffic. The two railway bridges (under in Westwood Lane & over in Glaziers Lane) are particularly hazardous.

On the matter of 'sustainability' versus 'sensitivity', two of the key concepts that underpin the local plan, I make the following point. For the purposes of assessing 'sustainability' Normandy and Flexford have been treated as one settlement, whilst for 'sensitivity' they have been treated separately. This is inconsistent and inappropriate.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1610  **Respondent:** 8896673 / James Gooden  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

We are writing to object to Guildford Borough Council's Draft Local Plan. We believe Normandy is unsuited to the sort of expansion proposed. We are particularly concerned by the high levels of development proposed which completely disregard Green Belt protection.

It is clear that GBC has taken no account of one of the major purposes of the Green Belt which is the prevention of urban sprawl. It is important that the rural farming village of Normandy retains its green belt status. No account has been taken by GBC of the concept of "openness" and yet this is one of the main purposes of Green Belt, as evidenced by the Planning Inspectorate in recent appeal decisions (indicating they recognise that land contained in Normandy contributes to the openness of Green Belt).

**NEW SECONDARY SCHOOL**
We object to the proposal for the 1100 housing development on Land parcel A46 because there is no proven need for a new Secondary School. And without a school there is no need for the associated development plan.

Currently neighbouring Secondary Schools - Kings College and Park Barn - are under-utilised (the latter by 57%). The Head Teachers of Ash Manor School and Kings College have expressed a willingness to expand once they are full. They have the facilities to do this. Secondary Schools to the west of the Borough are under subscribed by 736. Another 480 places will be available at the new Technical Collage (2018) and there are approved expansions at Guildford County School and St Peters. The new Hoe Valley School will have 120 places available per year, 25 places this year not taken (no catchment area). Developments in teaching and learning (independent learning) mean that Secondary Schools could become obsolete in the near future. In addition there is a falling birth rate in Guildford.

Surrey County Council has failed to prove an undisputed need for a 7 Form Entry Secondary School as well as the availability of financing this to make it a reality.

With No Proven Need there can be -

No New Secondary School and Therefore No Housing Development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
In summary, all the items above point to the fact that the case for a secondary school in Normandy village has not been proven and should be rejected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp173/375  **Respondent:** 8901825 / Raymond Woolfson  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I support the removal from the plan of site A46, Normandy and Flexford Strategic Site.

I support the removal from the plan of site A47, land in Flexford.

I object that whilst removing A46 & A47 from the current plan, GBC failed to remove sites A49 and A50. Both these sites are tiny and isolated, and are completely surrounded by the green belt. No evidence of exceptional circumstances has been provided. The land of both is classified as highly sensitive green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp173/385  **Respondent:** 8906241 / Phelim Brady  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I fully support the withdrawal of Policies A46 and A47 from the plan. The proposal to build 1100 houses, flats etc on the green belt in Flexford and Normandy was madness and I'm glad you have seen sense.

However, I object to the so-called 'insetting' of the settlements at Flexford, Normandy and Walden Cottages as well as the Traveller site at Palm House Nurseries (Policy/Site A49 and the Travelling Show-people at Whittles Drive (Policy/Site A50).

I think the whole plan still lacks a coherent strategic approach. We should be increasing the density of housing in the town of Guildford and make better use of the large tracts of land which are at present given over to depots, retail and low value commercial activity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2234  **Respondent:** 8915073 / Alastair Lawson  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Please find my response to the GBC Local Plan 2016.
My objection to the Local Plan (LP) is based on the following points and is mainly targeted at the two main policies (Policy 46 and 47) that impact on me personally, my family, the local community but also other policies that effect the wider borough.
I am a parish councillor and have been involved in the parish response but this is very much my own and therefore may stray into occasional emotive language – which I am aware will make no difference but will make me feel better! Where possible I have listed the relevant Policy and made my comments against them.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  
My response to the GBC Local Plan 2016.pdf (627 KB)

---

Comment ID: pslp173/320  Respondent: 8916673 / R Atkins  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A46 (1100 homes and school)

Site A47 ( 50 homes)

I clearly support the removal of the above sites from the local plan because the developments would have meant the infrastructure would have been stretched to breaking point. All the amenities that currently provide a level of support would have been eroded. Roads, electricity supplies, healthcare facilities etc would have been harmed and the proposals would have seen living standards diminish.

Site - Removal from the green belt of homes in Guildford Road, northern end of Glaziers Lane, Flexford, Walden Cottages and Palm House Nurseries traveller site

I would like to object to the above removal of these sites from the green belt. The density of building would be far greater by this action. The countryside would be harmed and the green belt would lose its open feel and attractiveness.

I would also like to object to the proposals to add a significant number of homes within 10 miles of Normandy. Clearly the infrastructure would be unable to cope and significant investment needs to be made before this can even be considered. With Local Authority budgets being under considerable strain due to austerity measures this investment is unlikely to occur. The building of a large number of houses without the accompanying investment will see living standards fall considerably and result in a large exodus of businesses and jobs.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/470  Respondent: 8916769 / Andrene Aaronson  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Protection of the Green Belt should be the highest priority. I therefore support the removal of sites A46 and A47 from the plan: in addition to destroying the countryside, the sites would have irrevocably changed the nature of our village and appeared entirely unjustified, in particular bringing a secondary school into a rural community with no evidence of a
demand for the facility and insufficient infrastructure to accommodate. Normandy Parish already has traffic and flooding problems which have not been addressed, so residents have little confidence in the Council's ability to plan for and administer adequate infrastructure.

In contrast to the above site removal, I object to the insetting from Green Belt of the three most settled areas in Normandy and Flexford: there have been no exceptional circumstances cited to support this change and it will inevitably undermine protection of the countryside. Adjacent areas of Green Belt will in future be vulnerable to encroachment. The lack of evidence for exceptional circumstances makes this change unjustified.

Overall the plan will have contradictory effects in the local area: protection of the Green Belt on the one hand and increased vulnerability on the other.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/671</th>
<th>Respondent: 8919041 / Bill &amp; Gill Stanworth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford</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 have lived at [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998], Normandy for the last 23 years. Pirbright Road (the A324) is on the northern boundary of the village of Normandy, and borders Ash Ranges. 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 for the Parish Council, and in 2014 my wife and I received the Mayor’s Award for services to the Community. I also volunteer quite regularly for Surrey Wildlife Trust and have been an Honorary Member since 2014.

My family utilise the countryside as much as possible. We have had a dog for many years and love exploring the local footpaths and bridleways. We avoid the built-up areas as much as possible. I also cycle a fair amount. I go off road as much as possible to avoid vehicle pollution and to enjoy the countryside. I use the perimeter track on Ash Ranges and the Christmas Pie Ride often (we could do with more such cycle routes, particularly one avoiding Pirbright Road). Since I retired in 2004 I have had more time to explore my interest in wildlife and thoroughly enjoy finding and knowing more about wild plant and animal species, which currently abound in this area, (for example, I have identified over 700 different species of moth in our garden over the last 9 years). I help maintain Normandy’s Traditional Orchard (see Parish Council website) where I have seen and identified several notable species (including Song Thrush and Stag Beetle) and am trying to encourage more by careful management. One of the treasures of the Normandy/North Flexford area is that unlike the intensively farmed areas of parts of Wanborough it contains smaller fields with numerous hedges and woods some of which are ancient. Many of these areas, as pointed out by the Friends of Normandy Wildlife, are of conservation importance and contain rare and unusual species as documented by them. Moreover, many are of the opinion that valuing nature is not a choice but a necessity and GP’s would do well to recommend getting out into the countryside and imbibing nature. Since it is becoming clearer that man’s health and happiness is greatly enhanced by living in close proximity to such habitats, having such a special area so close to Ash/Aldershot and Guildford is of incalculable value and should be treasured amongst other sites that make Surrey such an amazingly diverse county.

The Proposed Submission Local Plan (the Plan) in relation to the settlements of Normandy and Flexford, in particular, Policy A46 seeks to create a large development including 1100 houses and a 7 Form entry secondary school this changing the character of this area into an urban like environment. In order to be able to implement this policy GBC have proposed
that these settlements are inset from the Green Belt. Green Belt is of huge importance for biodiversity and is also
important for wildlife by providing wildlife corridors between different areas. It is clear that prior to publication of the
draft Local Plan in April 2016, GBC considered the Green Belt of Normandy and Flexford to be inappropriate for
development (note the Red status it was given). Paragraph 4.3.12 of the National Planning Policy Framework states
"…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…"

The countryside between Normandy and Flexford demonstrates the open character of the settlements and makes a large
contribution towards the Openness of the Green Belt. I therefore 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". I object to Policies P2, and P3. 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".

I strongly object to 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 development is "unsustainable".

I believe the proposed development of site A46 will put more pressure on the nearby (within 1 km) hugely important Ash
Ranges which form part of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area; part of the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and
Chobham Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and which is also the Ash to Brookwood Heaths Site of Special Scientific
Interest (SSSI). It will be used more for recreational use and considerably more dogs will visit disturbing the very
sensitive wildlife there (e.g. rare plants, smooth snakes, sand lizards, many uncommon ground nesting birds etc).

Similarly the other seven Sites of Nature Conservation Interest in Normandy Parish are likely to be more heavily used
and biodiversity degraded. Obviously a SANG will help but I don’t believe it will have the desired effect. I am objecting
to site A46 because GBC have failed to recognise the significant impact that the proposed development would have
on this nature reserve.

I am appalled at the dreadful decline in wildlife in England in the last few decades. Through my interest in moths I have
discovered that in the Southern half of England the total counts of larger moths have decreased by 40% over a 40 year
period to 2007 (Butterfly Conservation) and is indicative of rapid loss of insect biodiversity in Britain (during the same
time the numbers in the North of Britain have remained the same). This has to have a considerable impact on other
wildlife and plants. Butterflies are also a key indicator of a healthy environment and 24 (over half) of the 42 species that
are resident or regular migrants to Surrey have declined in abundance and a shocking 4 species have gone extinct (in
Surrey) since the 1990’s (Butterflies of Surrey revisited, Surrey Wildlife Trust atlas, 2013). Other serious concerns for my
local area include the huge decline of the Hedgehog (5% loss per year). These are regularly seen by residents of
Normandy but are also often seen dead on the roads. Busier roads and more housing development will exacerbate this.

Similarly, the water voles was in the Normandy and Flexford area but I understand it is now even unsure if it is still in
Surrey. High density housing developments, busier roads, associated increased pollution and increased tidiness are likely
to make a lot of these declines worse. I therefore strongly object to large scale developments outside the current towns
such as A46 and A26 that will inevitably cause the continued decline of biodiversity. Instead more support (such as is
given by Surrey Wildlife Trust) should be given to land owners to improve habitats to arrest the decline in biodiversity.

In my opinion GBC have failed to adhere to the principals they have set out in Policy I4 for Biodiversity in respect
of Normandy and Flexford and therefore the Plan is “unsound”.

Evidence suggests that the inference that there is a need for a seven form entry secondary school at site A46 is incorrect.
GBC have relied upon the contention that there is such a need in order to prove that there are “exceptional circumstances”
to justify the amendment of Green Belt boundaries around Normandy and Flexford, and the Plan is therefore unsound
in this respect.
I object to the Transport Strategy as set out in Policy I2 because no provision has been made to address the many traffic problems which affect the roads around the proposed development at site A46 e.g. volume of traffic generated by the Wellesley development, Aldershot and the fact that the development at site A46 will add considerably more motorised vehicles to these already busy and in places dangerous roads, especially at peak times. There has not been any attempt to create additional bicycle routes and ones that are currently present are not being adequately maintained (the Christmas Pie ride was in an atrocious state when I used it last month – overgrown and muddy along a lot of stretches).

I strongly object to Policy A47 which includes a Site of Nature Conservation Interest because of it’s importance for plants, potential for Great Crested Newts (European Protected Species) 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. This animal if present in the area need every help it can get as it is in a dire state in Surrey.

In addition to my objections to the Plan in the Normandy and Flexford area I object to Policy A26 for similar reasons to site A46 (see above) in particular because it forms an important part of the Green Belt swath between Guildford and Ash/Aldershot.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/387  Respondent: 8919041 / Bill & Gill Stanworth  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The significant changes applying directly to Normandy and Flexford are:

1. a) The removal of site location A46;
2. b) the removal of site location A47, and
3. c) the amendment of the Green Belt Boundary (i) to exclude sites A46 and A47, and (ii) to include a plot of land to the south west of Flexford.

1) We are pleased that sites A46 and A47 have been removed from the Plan, because we were of the opinion that such developments did not meet the “Tests of Soundness” and were therefore inappropriate (and with regard to site A47 totally inconsistent with its partial designation as an SNCI). We felt that the insetting of the land concerned from the Green Belt was inconsistent with NPPF policy, and that it definitely contributes to the “openness of the Green Belt”.

2) The amendment of the Green Belt Boundary to exclude sites A46 and A47 follows logically from their removal from the Plan. It is very important that these two areas of land should remain washed over by the Green Belt, as they make an important contribution towards the prevention of urban sprawl stretching from the proposed increase in development to the south and east of Ash and Tongham (Policy A 29) (to the west) to Guildford (to the east), especially in the light of the proposed development at Blackwell Farm (Policy A26). The other amendment to the Green Belt boundaries around Normandy and Flexford to include a plot of land to the south west of Flexford, behind some properties on the north side of Green Lane East, makes less sense until one considers the fact that the majority of this plot of land, comprising a dilapidated bungalow and approximately 0.75 of an acre, is currently for sale. This amendment represents a further encroachment on the Green Belt to enable development without any evidence to show “exceptional circumstances”.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/497  Respondent: 8919873 / Amy Barklam  Agent: 

Document page number 936
Removal of Strategic Site

I object to the fact that there is no justification for the removal of the strategic site at Normandy over and above the removal of any other strategic site, and in particular site A35 – most notably on the grounds of sustainability.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3513</th>
<th>Respondent: 8928129 / St Mark's Church Wyke (Alison Craven)</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 in response to the local plan proposed with particular reference to the part concerning Normandy and Wyke, Ref. A46 map. As I understand it the proposals outlined are for a substantial increase in housing – an additional 1,100 houses, almost doubling the population of the village, and also the building of a secondary school within this site with 1500 places and 250 staff.

My concerns with this proposal are about the implications for our parish church which is part of the Church of England, which serves the entire village and not just the congregation. My comments below should be considered in the context that the church comes under the existing infrastructure in the village.

My concerns about the doubling of the population size and the additional transient population through the secondary school are these:

1. There is no area on the map for the allocation of additional grave space/ additional consecrated ground. The building area proposed runs straight up to the existing churchyard. There is little space left for burial in the existing churchyard and with an increase in population the demand will soon fill the existing space.

   *My request therefore is that space is made available adjacent to the church grounds to extend the churchyard.*

1. There is no area on the map for parking alongside the church which exists currently as off road parking, including disabled parking. I note that the housing comes right up to the road. We would therefore be losing parking space and with the increase in population and resulting increase in congregation size we would be looking for ground for a car park adjacent to the church off Westwood Lane.

   *My request therefore is that space is made available for parking close to the church off Westwood Lane.*

1. St Mark's Wyke serves the needs of the whole village in terms of baptisms, weddings and funerals whether or not people are members of the church. We provide support to the young, the vulnerable, the elderly, the sick and bereaved in the village as appropriate, again whether or not people are members of the church, because that is the nature of the Church of England. A substantial increase in the population will mean more baptisms, weddings and funerals, in addition to support for the secondary school, this has serious implications for staffing...
levels. With the population increase we would need an additional priest with housing, and additional
administrator support.

My request therefore is that provision is made financially towards the cost of additional staff including a priest and the
corresponding housing.

1. The church building is currently at capacity on a regular basis for services of worship, which include Wyke
Primary school services, the Remembrance Day Commemoration service, and major feast days. To
accommodate increase in numbers in the church arising from the population growth, St Mark's Wyke would be
looking for help with extending its existing building and adding amenity facilities such as disabled loos on site.

My request therefore is for financial assistance and land to extend the existing church building with added amenity
facilities.

1. The church hall accommodates local groups including a nursery, and it will not be sufficient in size to meet an
increase in population. We would be looking for financial assistance to extend the hall for the community. I note
that the plan indicates that housing will be built right up to the hall.

My request therefore is for financial assistance to extend the existing hall building.

Finally I reiterate a request previously made that there is an urgent need for sheltered housing for the elderly, and for retirement/ nursing homes in the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2842  Respondent: 8932129 / Karen Dunn  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I am writing to you in relation to the above proposed planning and my deep concerns about the suitability of the location
within our Village. As part of the Normandy community and having followed and attended various local meetings it is
now crystal clear that a site of such proposed size, location and suitability to our village is not appropriate.

I have read all the documents and for me to cover every point would be very time consuming. However, I would like to
reiterate what I believe are the key reasons to not proceed with such a plan.

Background to our village

I have lived 14 years in Normandy and when I arrived it took some time to get to know the area and neighbours. It is a
small tight group of people. As the years have gone by I can now see it is a self-contained village with no real amenities,
poor travel infrastructure. The one thing that is apparent is that it is a very special environment in terms of location,
history and natural beauty, abundant with wildlife and for those who live here is enough for them to want to stay and go
out of the village for everything they need.

To build up to 1200 homes, or anything above a couple of hundred within our village would destroy the environment,
lead to a nightmare with surrounding villages and the commuting of neighbouring areas that is already very heavy at peak
times and the roads are already unable to cope.
Reviewing your plans I believe the types of homes and other amenities you are proposing would in the short term placate the new dwellers, long term it would not suffice. They would be a group of homes stand alone and I truly believe would be very stand alone. As few shops within the plan and provision to increase the shops etc would not add any value to the existing community.

Below are my main concerns

**1200 homes: impact on existing village** in terms of traffic, which I believe there is no planning to create new roads. Very poor railway link (in fact deemed a few years ago as the most unsafe piece of railway line in south England).

**Impact of up to 1200 homes on our water management.** This is both from the effect of building on land which will push to water table which is already very high even higher causing flooding to nearby land and properties. Also an entire village sewage review would need to take place. I am sure you are fully aware of the badly maintained, old sewage system which is an existing problem.

**Type of housing. The type of housing and the people it is targeted for require large facilities on their doorstep.** For this amount of people, the plan would suit a location similar to Farnborough, Camberley with large superstores. Infact very similar to Horsham development that I have driven through recently. The size of the development in Horsham is smaller than 1200 homes at the moment and it is huge, this cannot happen to a small village like Normandy!

**Wildlife is abundant in this village** and to destroy precious green land is I’m sure as indicated in the plan not part of the current laws.

Having said the above and there are many more reasons as the Normandy Action Group and Normandy Parish council have outlined. I feel that the GBC process and timeline management has been arranged and implemented to rush and avoid full investigations and community input. The absolute icing on the cake is that the GBC plan is based on the requirement of a new secondary school. Insisting that it is required when all research and information gathered shows that we clearly do not need one. You have all the details so I don’t need to go through them. The area of Normandy does not need a school as all neighbouring schools have been and are predicted to be under subscribed. Bringing in pupils from further afield will have a devastating impact on the traffic and congestion and destroy our village.

I understand that there are many incorrect and misleading processes and information within your plan that are in fact illegal. I urge you to review your plan and consider fewer homes that our village can accommodate or look for other more appropriate sites.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2095  Respondent: 8933185 / Peter See  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Page 353 Normandy and Flexford

Objection -see pages 22-25 of this letter.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/675  Respondent: 8944929 / A Jefferies  Agent:

---

Section page number  Page 55 of 122    Document page number 939
I object to the fact that there is no clear justification for the removal of the strategic site at Normandy over site A35.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2293  
Respondent: 8947457 / Gerry Armstrong  
Agent:

---

I wish to object to Guildford Borough Council (GBC) Draft Borough Plan re Normandy - Site Allocation 46 and Site 47. Policies: S1, S2, P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, D1, D2, D3, D4, E1 through to E9, H1, H2, H3, H4, P12, P13, P14, A46 and A49

This is a disgraceful attempt by GBC to take a path of least resistance and impose a huge proportion of its over inflated housing target on a small vulnerable village community. It contemptuously ignores the fact that a development of this size would overwhelm and destroy this village, its intrinsic rural character, its arable heritage and would bulldoze over the lifestyle and wishes of the people of Normandy and Flexford.

No Council or Plan should ever have the power to destroy the environment of any community but that’s exactly what will happen if this proposal is allowed to go ahead. It should therefore be rejected.

The National Planning Policy Framework (155) states that, “Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods and organisations is essential”. This has not happened and I believe there is evidence available that proves that two years ago documentation for this A46 site was submitted on behalf of Taylor Wimpey developers. The people of Normandy and Flexford were not aware of or consulted at that stage.

This proposal is also driven by powerful, insatiable and profit loving developers, greedy for easy build greenfield sites and who do not care about the devastating impact that this development would have on Normandy and its surrounding communities, they are driven by money and have spotted a very lucrative opportunity. Offering to build a new school on this site (at their own expense) in return for planning permission for 1,300 new homes, the developers seem to have persuaded GBC that this site is viable!

GBC has not adequately appraised this site. A sound plan must be based on proper evidence and be 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, this has not been adequately carried out by GBC in a timely or transparent way. Vital evidence was missing at the full GBC meeting on 24 May. The Strategic Transport Report was NOT available to the councillors at this time yet they still approved the Draft Plan without being able to read this report. This is very poor practice.

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 and wrong. The A46 site is only 800 meters away from the TBHSPA. Normandy/Flexford is situated between the TBHSPA and the AONB and should remain washed over in the green belt. In recent correspondence Natural England disagrees with this development because it will impact on the wildlife and habitat in this area.

Already our roads in this area are at full capacity. There is serious traffic congestion and long delays on the A323 morning and evening and access to this new development by car or bus will compound the problem and bring longer delays. There are many other large scale developments already taking place in neighbouring Aldershot, Wayverly and
Rushmoor. Guildford and the other local authorities have a duty to co-operate in making their local plans work in harmony, but I do not believe that this has happened. Approximately 31,000 new homes (with cars) are already being built and proposed in these areas. There seems to be no joined-up thinking or planning between the boroughs into the combined affect that all this new development will have on the area. It will obviously place even greater strain on our already congested roads and infrastructure. This area is in serious danger of grinding to a complete standstill. A more sensible approach is required with a reduction in the number of houses being built or planned in the area.

It is not legitimate to take land out of the Green Belt (Site 46-47 GBC draft plan) so that 1,300 houses can be built against an unproven need for a secondary school. Our neighbouring secondary schools in Ash and Park Barn are currently undersubscribed. Kings Manor has 57% of its school places currently unoccupied and the birth rate has reduced in the last two years, so there is no need to build a new school in Normandy. Surrey County Council, in an official response to GBC (July 2014), 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.” GBC should listen to this advice.

Normandy is not a suitable location for a school and I reject the assertion that the designation of Normandy/Flexford as a ‘strategic site’ achieves “greater sustainability for our village,” it does not. It is Guildford Borough Councils unrealistic and unsustainable housing targets and developer pressures that are fuelling this proposal.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4248  Respondent: 8971137 / Woolf Bond Planning (Thomas Rumble)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

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: sang.png (330 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4249  Respondent: 8971137 / Woolf Bond Planning (Thomas Rumble)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Introduction

We refer to the above consultation paper and write on behalf of our client, Taylor Wimpey (Strategic) Ltd., setting out a number of comments upon the policies and proposals contained in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, including some made on Policy A46 (Land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford) which refers to a proposed site allocation comprising residential led mixed use development.

Our client has a controlling interest in the majority of the land between Normandy and Flexford proposed to be allocated under proposed Policy A46. We support the policy and can confirm that the site is deliverable in the form and timescales set out in the submission version of the Plan (see also the Housing Land Availability Assessment). However we do consider that the site allocation boundary should be revised to ensure the anticipated level of development can be delivered in full. This suggested revision is illustrated on the annotated version of the policy map using red hatching.
Such an amendment would result in a more effective site allocation, consistent with the boundaries defined by the revised Green Belt boundary. We also propose an amendment to the policy having regard to education provision as discussed below and an amendment to the timescales for delivery such that the site can deliver 1 year earlier.

Our representations relate to the following policies:

- Policy S2 (Borough Wide Strategy)
- Policy P2 (Green Belt)
- Policy A46 (Land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford)

Our representations are accompanied by the following:

- Duly Completed Response Forms
- Illustrative Masterplan CSA/2516/110/D
- Wyke SANG Location Plan

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2591  Respondent: 9029249 / Colin Shulver  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to voice my objection to the housing plans in the Normandy Area. 1,100 houses & an unneeded secondary school.

It is of great concern to everyone who lives in this area. It is also very obvious that there has been little to no research done as to the impact this will have on the local community & the infrastructure & services in our area. If there was such research then we would not be having to write to object to such plans. If you lived in this community then you would clearly understand that Normandy would not be able to cope with such a destructive concept.

Its a small community & a happy one. We do not wish to become an extension to Guildford. Its a village, not a borough. It currently has very struggling services & a larger community would not help. Just try getting an appointment at the local doctors surgery. You have to call up early in the morning to only find that there are no appointments available. How on earth would expanding the village help an already stretched service.

The disruption caused by the building of so many houses would be crippling to the roads & environment. These roads are simply not able to cope with the type & volume of construction vehicles required to carry out this sort of building work. The roads here are small residential lanes & have no room for expansion.

In Regards to the secondary school. This is simply not required in this area. It would also create more traffic coming into the community from people who do not live in this community. It would turn Normandy into a thoroughfare. Simply put, it would be a nightmare for people who live in this community.

Also, I can’t believe that anyone is thinking of building on the land in question. It is well known that this land is waterlogged. It floods regularly & is totally unsuitable for housing. Most people who live here are fully aware of this. If this is being ignored, then it is very irresponsible & potentially a health risk. I’m sure you must now be fully aware of this. Even this email is making you aware. Which also means that if construction was to go ahead and flooding was to happen..... and it would. You would now be legally liable & accountable.

Expansion of villages are inevitable. Everyone accepts this. But that normally means a few houses here and a few houses there. NOT total destruction of a fantastic village by people who are simply thinking about quotas & profit. By people who do not live here & do not care.
We will fight this & not stop fighting this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/170  **Respondent:** 10706849 / S J Savage  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I write to support the decision to remove site A46 and site A47 from the proposed plans.

This decision will mean that undue pressure is not placed upon the roads which are unable to cope at present with the morning and evening, work related, movement of traffic. Any increase of traffic in Westwood Lane should be discouraged because of children walking to school. Indeed the current speed limits are regularly exceeded and this aspect should be monitored and addressed as soon as possible.

Normandy also suffers from poor water pressure at times, flooding at others and any building upon fields would exacerbate the problems.

The doctors in the area are fully stretched and need no further increase of their work load.

A major concern is that the designated areas are on Greenbelt lands which were granted this status to protect boundaries, to provide access to countryside walks and to create a habitat for wildlife. The building on Greenbelt land should never be considered. It is detrimental to people and all living things.

I love living in semi-rural Normandy and do not want our lovely village spoiled for all the residents by the lowering of the standards of services by spreading them too thinly, and by the increasing of air pollution because of further traffic.

I trust that these concerns will be heard.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/618  **Respondent:** 10713505 / John Kinder  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Further to the points outlined in our Parish Council's response to the Guildford Borough Council's proposal, I add the following:

1. the infrastructure for such a development is simply not there in Normandy. We have no provision or utility shops and no post office. The only garage no longer sells petrol or diesel.

1. The existing sewage system is already overloaded as evinced by recent incidents in Glaziers Lane. Some parts of the village, including my own, are not even connected to the main drainage system but have to rely on cesspits or septic tanks which have to be emptied at regular intervals at vast expense.
3 Since the demise of Vokes Ltd and its successors there is no local industry to speak of and Normandy has turned into a dormitory village, and so where are all these extra people to find employment?

4. The village is in a damp environment and parts are subject to flooding which is not helped by lack of maintenance of drainage ditches. Surface water is not adequately catered for. I have previously written a very detailed description of the topography of the area, copies of which were sent to Guildford Borough Council (which I hope has not been mislaid) and our local Member of Parliament.

   1. It is difficult to obtain an appointment with a doctor at Glaziers Lane Surgery, an indication that that system is already overloaded.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/313  Respondent: 10750465 / Alison Dunn  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am delighted to see that both of the proposals for building multiple new homes on green belt land in Normandy have now been removed from the plan. I fully support this, as our local infrastructure was never going to cope with this level of expansion in the area.

I am concerned about the proposal to remove some homes in Normandy from the green belt as this means that there will be fewer restrictions in the future and I believe that this could have a longer term detrimental impact on the openness of the area.

Finally, give the number of new homes in the Guildford area I strongly feel that GBC must prioritise road improvements, as roads are already busy, with particular pinch points in Normandy at the junction of Frog Grove Lane and the A323, and the level crossing at Ash which causes major delays at times. I trust the council will include this in ongoing planning.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1741  Respondent: 10757537 / K.M. Bromley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the GBC Local Plan 2016, as it affects Normandy for the following reasons.

Extra pressure on existing roads in the parish, which will be unable to cope with the increased traffic.

Increased flood risk in adjacent areas. Concrete doesn’t absorb rainwater.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
As a resident of Normandy, I wholly support the withdrawal of Policies A46 and A47 (the former being the so-called ‘strategic site’ that would have added 1100 extra houses to the village, and the latter being a proposal to build on an SNCI), as these would inevitably have had a drastic effect in destroying the open and green character of our village. These proposals would have also placed a burden on our existing amenities of road and rail transport, for example: increased congestion at the already busy junction of the A31 with with Wanborough Hill/B3000, which is a nightmare at rush hour, with long queues and a frightening propensity for serious road traffic collisions; increased strain upon the limited car parking available at Wanborough Station, increased strain on the one ticket machine in operation at Wanborough Station, which often causes a long queue at peak times. Therefore, I am thankful the GBC has taken heed of the comments made by residents and the Parish Council in response to the previous version of the Local Plan, and taken Sites A46 and A47 out of this version of the Local Plan.

I also support the opening of a new rail station ‘Guildford West’, Site A59, to serve the Park Barn/Manor Park area, as I feel the extra traffic on the Ascot-Guildford South West Trains service this would cause would be justified by the resultant increase in sustainable mobility for residents of the West Guildford suburbs - who currently have little option other than a lengthy walk or to drive into the centre of town. The opening of such a station would also hopefully reduce the congestion around the A3 in the area of The Tesco Superstore/Royal Surrey County Hospital/Stag Hill/Guildford Business Park, where traffic often grinds to a standstill at peak times.

It is my view, in general, that the use of brownfield is sites a much better alternative to new development on Green Belt land. However, this is with proviso that such development should be first and foremost for residential ends, not commercial/retail purposes, as I feel it is of much greater importance to make Guildford a strong human community and a nice place to live, rather than a giant retail park where everyone has to drive into town on highly congested roads. Thus I support the regeneration of sites within Guildford proper (both in the Town Centre and the Urban Area), especially proposals such as sites A20 (community Hub), and A21 (allotments) because this will reinvigorate and enrich living spaces within the town, and provide housing and community amenities that are close to places of employment, thus reducing the strain on already very busy road and rail transport networks.

I would, however, also like to see the development in Guildford town accompanied by better provision of a sustainable transport network, particularly the development of safe cycle routes from the suburbs to the town centre, so as to get more people out of their cars and using less congestive forms of traffic, causing less emissions and promoting good public health. Therefore I support the proposal of Site A10, but would like to see even more plans for development in the field of sustainable transport/movement. This would tie in very well with the already established community endeavour The Guildford Bike Project, with its shop on Southway, which is already providing a much needed service of cheap and effective cycle sales and service, and only lacks a good network of cycle lanes for the residents of Westborough, and the rest of Guildford, to use said bicycles on.

Objections

I am pleased to see a reversion of the proposed Green Belt boundary changes, such that sites A46 and A47 will maintain their prior Green Belt status, and in acknowledgement of the key role these areas contribute to our village’s open character as well as the usefulness of this land for agricultural purposes. However, I am in agreement with the views of the Parish Council, and strongly object to the ‘insetting’ within Green Belt land of the three most settled areas of Normandy and Flexford. My objection has two key components: first, that no case has been made for grounds of ‘exceptional circumstances’ upon which to justify the removal of this land from the Green Belt, therefore the proposal attempts to set a precedent by which further development may not be needed to be justified upon such grounds either (thus opening the door to further attrition of the Green Belt through extensions to the settlement area on adjacent Green Belt land; second, the nature of the existing development within these three areas of most settlement contributes to the openness of the Green Belt land which characterises our village and should therefore remain, as a whole, ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt. This view has been expounded and supported by both the Parish Council and the
Planning Inspectors, who are in agreement that the ‘insetting’ of the aforementioned land will cause huge difficulties in sustaining this key openness which is so characteristic of, and beneficial to our village.

I also object to the insetting and making permanent of both the Traveller site at Palm House Nurseries (Site A49), and the Travelling Show-people site at Whittles Drive (Site A50), upon the same grounds as above. Both sites contribute to the openness of Green Belt land, and are rated as ‘High Sensitivity’ in the Sustainability Appraisal 2017, and the view of the Parish Council and myself is that such a classification is contrary to the Local Plan’s intention to inset these sites. This would set a precedent for unjustified insetting and gradual breaking up of the Green Belt land, a matter that surely must be carefully examined and justified on a case by case basis.

Concluding comments

As a young person who has lived all their life in Normandy, many claims about local development are often made on my behalf, such as the need for new homes for young professionals/families, and other services to support these. I recognise the presence of such needs within the community, however I feel strongly about the need for well thought out planning and sustainable development. A key part of this is my firm belief in the value of regenerating brownfield sites, especially within the urban context, so as to reinvigorate our towns and cities with a view to making them more liveable spaces, instead of just sterile retail parks with a shortage local housing. Providing for more residential space within Guildford is a sure way of relieving the pressure on our snarled up roadways. The flip side to this coin is to relieve pressure on Green Belt areas, which are of value in their own right, and in doing so preserve the quality of life for those living in villages which fall within the Green Belt outside of the larger town. I do not think that the solution to the lack of housing is to be found in building more housing developments in satellite villages, as this will only cause a negative knock on effect upon our already congested roadways, and will be extremely harmful to the open and green nature of the countryside which surrounds Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp173/236  **Respondent:** 10847585 / Sean Meharg  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Having studied the changes made to the Local Plan that effect my village (Normandy), I would like to make the following comments:

1. I am pleased that both Sites A46 and A47 have now been removed from the local plan and that you have taken heed of my objections, on the grounds of poor infrastructure, flood risk to existing properties etc. etc.
2. However, I am still concerned that it is proposed that Site A49 (Land to the Rear of Palm House Nurseries), which is behind my property, is to be removed from the Green Belt. In September 2014, I wrote giving my objections and they still remain. This is an extract from my email of 21st Sep 2014: “Site 91 – Land rear of Palm Nurseries, Normandy: The current planning conditions state this should be reinstated to its previous Greenfield condition and this should be enforced. If it is not, it will set a precedent to develop any other plots without following normal planning procedures. The lane leading to the plot is totally unsuitable for any kind of development.” If planning officers let this go through, it means that Green Belt status is meaningless, allowing anyone who takes possession of a Green Belt site to develop it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT TO YOUR PLANS FOR OUR VILLAGE AND ITS' SURROUNDINGS as it is:

- IT IS of DISPROPORTIONATE SCALE AND
- IT IS UNJUSTIFIED ATTACK ON THE RURAL GREEN BELT.
- Your plans also attack THE CLAM AND LOVELY ENVIROMENT OF THIS VILLAGE AND SURROUNDINGS!

These plans will destroy this village and its' local rural environment. In this misguided plan you are attempting to increase the size of this lovely village by more than 100%. I fail to understand your basis for such illegal decisions. Furthermore these plans do not objectively assess or protect the needs of Normandy residents.

The GBC has alternatives to locate the planned expansion to the other side of Guildford namely along Epsom road and west Horsley. The area there is of low quality Green belt land and it is on a strategic highway route [this will resolve the issues with Normandy where Glaziers lane is very crowed during rush hours as it is.], also this area is surrounded by existing development [unlike those around Normandy where it is rural and of natural beautiful environment]. The alternative area also almost self-contained [unlike around Normandy where there are no shops or anything! It is a truly rural area].

Also having examined your draft local plan for our area in Normandy and surroundings, the following points need to be addressed:

1- The intended expansion as advanced by your office in a green area such as Normandy and its surroundings will mean the removal of some of the green belt for Guildford and nearby towns and villages and it is neither legal nor acceptable;
2- The subject planning will increase the traffic loads on already congested roads, especially in peak times when to exist Glaziers lane can take up to 5 minutes due to the queues at the T junction with A323;
3- The roads in Normandy are already under strain and will not be able to cope with the new expected traffic load from so many houses;
4- The facilities in Normandy are already minimal for children so increasing the numbers means there will be no facilities available most of the time;
5- The surgery in Normandy is already being shared with another village and is at breaking point as it is not easy to get a doctor's appointment for a few weeks now so what will happen when all these houses are populated;
6- The school will also be unavailable to new children as there are very few places as it stands;
7- The air quality will deteriorate as a result of the increase traffic loads on the village roads;
8- In my opinion there are no exceptional circumstances which the Guildford planning office can use to infringe on the green belt;
9- Our Sewage and Electricity Services are already strained and we suffer from frequent electricity cuts so what will happen when the number of residents increases by such numbers!
10- Glaziers Lane presently is used by heavy goods vehicles and as a rat run to and from the A323 and the Hogs Back, damaging an already heavily used road. So what will happen when the number of cars and heavy vehicles increases as a result of the planned housing expansion?
11- Also please keep in mind, building so many houses on these green fields will subject our area and homes to flooding and we had some flooding last year!
12- The area has no post office, pub, petrol station, police outpost etc. How can you propose to increase the population without considering the effect on the locals who already pay very high local taxes.

Finally please remember this is a residential area with very limited resources to offer newcomers! Your plans will overstretch those few services already available to beyond breaking point.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4480</th>
<th>Respondent: 10867169 / Saskia Lawson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford</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? ( )

This is my objection to the local plan of 2016, and my plea you think very carefully about sights 46 & 47 of Normandy and Flexford.

Thanks for taking the time to read this, I’m sure you have had many objections and responses to the local plan but please do take this into consideration.

My name is Saskia, [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 I live in Normandy. I’ve lived here for the past 12 years.

In those 12 years I have attended 3 schools, one being Wyke Primary on my road, my secondary school Ash Manor and my college Farnborough Sixth Form.

I have also learnt to drive and set up my own business at home.

In those years I have never once felt isolated and I have never struggled to get in to OR physically get to my school. Travelling here was fine thankfully for buses and kind parents I wasn’t deprived. Ash isn’t really that far you know…. I understand why as there is 0 need for this school. Keith Witham has pointed out (what we already knew) and even discovered Kings in Guildford is 57% undersubscribed?! Cmon now. Kings is not far away. Pump some money saved from wasting on the ‘Normandy’ school and sort Kings out, its in a good area, easy to get to and even better its not on the greenbelt. Most of my friends attended that school and there is obviously not enough children in this area to fill up the school. Ash Manor where I studied is also undersubscribed, between those 2 schools you could fit a load of kids. I’m sure over the years these schools will grow AND both head masters have mentioned they are willing to make their schools bigger and create room for more children as the population grows. There is seriously no need to ruin the greenbelt and our fields for an un-needed school! I understand it would feel like a great accomplishment to set up a new school, it would look great for you guys, but seriously come walk through Normandy with me and then think about it. It’s a teeny weeny village with shocking roads and junctions, people speed down the roads and when they aren’t speeding they are sat in traffic from the traffic lights and Ash Station crossing. Add in the new school traffic and traffic from the new homes and well won’t that be a joy.

Can’t explain how often I am nearly hit as I pull out of Westwood Lane, its just not suitable for more cars. Out of most people in this village I am seriously FOR building new houses, I am 23 and still cannot leave home because there’s nowhere to live. But what I care more about is the village I grew up in and the carelessness of the developers. Our village floods regularly, my pet pig who lives in Westwood Lane could tell you how muddy it gets…

I’m pretty sure if you build over that flood plain the water that sits there will shift down onto my where we live, for selfish reasons yes that won’t be pleasant but I live on a main road, unless these cars turns inflatable like Chitty Chitty Bang Bang I don’t think it will work out great.
There is just so many reasons you should not build they completely out weigh everything else. I worry the want and need for this new school will blind everyone, we are all SO aware that we don’t need a school so why aren’t you?

As a young woman I have such little trust in politicians and councillors which is sad, I don’t think you’ll read these emails and I don’t think you care what mess will be left behind when you build these new houses.

This is a tiny village and it cannot take what you propose, please look into using other areas that provide stronger roads and will do less damage to our countryside.

If you read this all thank you. As silly as it sounds - PLEASE don’t do it!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/361  Respondent: 10868161 / Nicola Ford  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We live in Normandy and are writing about the proposed changes to the Local Plan.

Firstly we strongly support the recent removal of sites A46 and A47 from the Local Plan. As we commented during the last consultation last summer, the land is in the Green belt, overlooked by the Hogs Back AONB, and there are no exceptional circumstances to cause it to be removed from the Green Belt. Also the local infrastructure would not have been able to cope with providing the required utilities and roads for the development.

Secondly we need to object to the proposed inset of homes in Guildford road, and the northern end of Glaziers Lane, Normandy, Flexford, Walden cottages and Palm House Nurseries travellers site. If placed outside of the Green Belt, this would set a president for heavy development, which would ruin the openness of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2697  Respondent: 10873441 / Anthony Kennedy  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 in Normandy of approximately 1,100 homes as well as a secondary school and retail space contained in the GBC Local Plan 2016 on the following grounds:-

1. The development is on Green Belt farming land of outstanding beauty and there has been no sound reason put forward why this Green Belt need be used in Normandy. The proposal is developer lead and an easy solution to the GBC’s problem of building more houses in the area. There is other scruffy land in the area which would be more suitable for development but has not been put forward as it is not owned by the developer.

2. The proposed secondary school is not required in the area west of Guildford as there are sufficient places now, and in the future, even with development west of Guildford, in the present schools, Ash Manor and King’s College.

3. If any development takes place in the Normandy area the road infrastructure will require improvement prior to any new homes being completed otherwise gridlock will occur much more frequently than at present. A priority must be
bridge over the railway at Ash. The rail service to Guildford is also inadequate and a new station will be required at RSH as a priority. Sewage is also of concern as I understand that all the pipes in the Normandy are past their use by date.  
4. There is already little ‘open space’ between Guildford and Aldershot. This development in Normandy would be another ‘nail in the coffin’ for the open space.  

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  

Attached documents:

---

I object to the planned development of sites 46 & 47 within the GBC Local Plan. Please consider the following points below:-

1) **Provision of a Secondary School.**
   
   I can’t see any evidence from either the GBC or SCC that there is a requirement, all the surrounding schools are undersubscribed (Kings 57% undersubscribed and Ash Manor has spaces for an additional 110 places) – I am sure you have seen the detailed report compiled by Keith Witham which offers you a full breakdown of all the surrounding schools.
   
   Also I can’t believe all these children would travel to the school (as suggested) using the train hence yet another increase in traffic congestion at peak periods of the day within the village.
   
   **The case for a New Secondary School in Normandy has not been proven.**

2) **Transport & Roads.**
   
   This site is bounded by the D60 (Glaziers Lane), the C16 (Wanborough Hill and Westwood Lane) and the A323 (Guildford/Aldershot Road)
   
   I can’t see any evidence within the plan, or how these roads could be improved to accommodate the increase in traffic, the village would be gridlocked during most of the day.
   
   Both railway bridges within the village were never intended to handle this amount of traffic and would have real safety issues with lack of visibility and are potential accident hot spots.
   
   There would have to be sufficient road improvements e.g. provision of footpaths and street lighting to improve the overall safety of the road infrastructure.

3) **Environmental Issues.**
   
   Normandy and Flexford areas has a high water table and is a known area for flooding, and much of this site is water logged, with a number of local residents already experiencing sewage back flow in periods of high rainfall.
   
   My main concern is the impact on the wild life with a number of species habiting in this area including Hedgehogs, Dormice, Great Crested Newts, Barn Owls, Stag Beetles, Skylarks, Common Toads, Common Lizards, Grass Snakes, Adders, Slow worms, Badgers and Bats and the protection of a number of veteran and mature oaks and other trees across the proposed development site.
4) Doctors Surgery

There has been no mention of additional services to accommodate the additional 1100 houses, currently both surgeries Normandy and Fairlands are at full capacity, obtaining an appointment is currently a challenge and would become very difficult once this site has been developed.

I do hope that you take all my considerations seriously as this has a huge impact not only on the people of Normandy and Flexford but also all the surrounding villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3746  Respondent: 10952449 / Hugh Robertson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to register my strong objection to the developments in Normandy and Flexford proposed by the Draft Local Development Plan.

I have read the evidence offered both by the Parish Council (13 July 16) and the Normandy Action Group (July 16) in their objections, both submitted for your consideration. I agree with the content of these submissions.

In addition I would like to amplify my own personal reasons for objecting to the plan:

Overall

I wish to be clear that I am not opposed to all development; the numerous small developments that have been, and are currently being, implemented around Normandy are sympathetic to the character of the village and will create much needed new, and, sometimes, affordable housing. The use of brown-field sites such as the re-development of the former heavy recovery garage on Flexford Road, is particularly impressive.

I do object, however, to the planned ‘safeguarding’ proposal for large areas of land currently in use as farmland. The building of large numbers of homes on this land will significantly alter the area and change its character beyond recognition.

I would wish the planning committee to note my following specific concerns. I am aware this is not an exhaustive list and others have commented and included professional advice as to the lack of legitimacy of the plan (as mentioned above the NPC and NAG submissions are of particular note). I wish to add to these by highlighting those about which I have some personal knowledge:

Amenity Value

1. The area to the north of the Hog’s Back and its villages is currently semi-rural in character. This creates a very attractive environment that is enjoyed not only by the local residents but by many walkers, cyclists, riders and runners who pass through the area along its many footpaths including the very well trodden Christmas Pie Trail. I am a keen walker and runner and routinely encounter fellow enthusiasts for the open countryside. The feel of a footpath that runs though farmland or a wood is utterly different to one that skirts a large area of housing.

2. The original purpose of the Green Belt was to preserve this kind of amenity value and prevent the extension of
development that diminishes or removes the separate character of small communities. Guildford is a large and successful
city; its popularity is enhanced by the proximity of significant areas of rural and semi-rural land that have hitherto
successfully been protected by Green Belt status.

3. The view from the footpaths at top of the Hog’s Back (and indeed from drivers on the A31) looking north towards
Wanborough, Normandy, Flexford and Wyke is one of unbroken semi-rural land that culminates in Ash Ranges. Ash
Ranges will not be developed so a significant development in the Normandy area interrupting this vista would greatly
diminish this otherwise exceptional impression of the Guildford area and risk damage to the area’s overall appeal (ie
undermine the Guildford area’s attractiveness for business and living). It is this ‘openness’ that Green Belt protection is
intended to protect; additionally the majority of this view is part of the Surrey Hills’ Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
(AONB). To place a large urban development on its edge will dramatically undermine its sense of ‘completeness’ as an
all-too-rare a view of semi-rural England.

Wildlife

4. The proximity of Ash Ranges adds to the importance of the adjacent agricultural land covered by the proposed
changes to the Green Belt bounders. The Ash Range area is a SSSI made up of a mixture of lowland heath land, conifer
and broad-leaved woodland, mire, scrub and acid grassland supporting a wide range of fauna and flora. The majority of
the area is designated a Site of Special Scientific Interest and forms part of the European designated Thames Basin
Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). While these fauna are home on the heath land they also exploit the
surrounding areas of countryside so any development nearby could affect them (see para 64 of PPS9 circular 06/05 link).

1. In formal terms, the designation of Ash Ranges as part of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and
an SSSI places a special duty on the authorities to protect this land. I run on this land and see a reasonable
number of other users, especially dog walkers. The proposed housing development would dramatically increase
this use (being only a few hundred metres from its northern edge) without an alternative green space provision.
The proposed SANG is utterly inappropriate to address this pressure, being further away and smaller.

Agricultural Use

6. It is quite some time since I have worked in agriculture but even to my untrained eye the agricultural use
of the area in question is of both high quality and productive. The fields are well kept and used for both arable
and livestock. As well as being productive farmland (including ancient woodland) they contribute to the
greenness and openness of this part of the green belt and the rural feel and atmosphere; it is this kind of
agriculture that characterises this part of England and draws so many people to the area, both for recreation and
for living, ie the whole purpose of the Green Belt protection. Its destruction leaving other brown-filed sites
untouched does is not sensible or supportable.

Local Infrastructure

7. I have used both public and private transport during the twenty-seven years I have lived in Normandy. It
is my direct experience that both of these are under some considerable stain, especially at rush hour times.
Adding significant numbers of houses to the area cannot but make this worse. I understand the County Council
has modelled this and found the roads to be unsuitable for the increases in traffic that would result from 1000+
new houses, a school, retail and a care home.

8. I am not a hydrologist but as I ran across many miles of the countryside over the last couple of winters the
large areas of standing water that persisted, for weeks in some cases, lead me to think that the area also has a
significant part to play in holding water and thereby preventing even worse flooding elsewhere.

Basis for Development

1. The Planning Practice Guidance chapter on Protecting Green Belt Land, paragraph 80
Green Belt serves five purposes:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Four out of these five purposes are met by the Normandy Green Belt under threat (i.e., not historic – but even this is debatable with a number of building of historic significance, not to mention the ‘feel’ of an ancient small Surrey village that has grown quietly over centuries)

1. There has been no proper explanation of the rationale behind Guildford Borough Council’s housing quota, and the basis of the Local Plan indicating that Normandy needs many hundreds of new homes. The council itself admits it does have access to the underpinning methodology. This, I understand, is because the work was contracted to a company independent of the council, which in turn sub-contracted it to another. This company will not reveal the process it used to come to its conclusions. This lack of visibility of the criteria being used to make a significant and disruptive (and highly contested) local decision does not accord with open government and accountability. The evidence base and algorithms must be made available for scrutiny or the process might risk later challenge by judicial review.

1. The Council for the Protection of Rural England states that building on brown field can mean regeneration, while building on open fields is destructive and environmentally damaging in any circumstance, exacerbated in this instance by the proximity of the THBSPA, SSSI and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. For the developers leading this proposal large scale green field exploitation is more cost efficient than utilising brown field. It is for the planning process to test the significant non-financial disadvantages of green-belt destruction.

1. Normandy’s Site 368 is listed in the Local Plan as ‘safeguarded’ for this development of 1100 houses; it is not. ‘Safeguarded land’ is land that is not Green Belt; the land covered by the plan is, however, Green Belt and it has not been removed from the green belt. For removal to be approved it has to be proven that there are exceptional circumstances for the removal. These have not been demonstrated and no inspectorate has therefore approved this change from Green Belt.

1. The case for a ‘much needed secondary school’ is not proven as sufficient reason (i.e., ‘very special circumstances’) for removing Normandy’s Green Belt land. The Planning Practice Guidance chapter on Protecting Green Belt Land, paragraph 88 is clear:

> When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight 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.

Paragraph 89 is equally clear on the permitted exceptions:

> A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

- buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; or
- limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.

Were there a need for a school, that need is not deemed ‘a very special circumstance’ as required by planning law.

1. There also appears to be little evidence that Normandy needs such a school - certainly not at present. Ash Manor and Kings College are both undersubscribed. If other villages need school capacity then building separate from their homes and encouraging children to travel along roads with limited or no footpaths and lighting does not seem appropriate.

1. The plan also uses the school as part of remarkably circular argument: the only possible justifiable reason (disputed as above) to build on the Green Belt is the new school, which in turn leads permission for new houses, the only reason to build the school is for children from the new houses.....

Sustainability versus Sensitivity

1. Finally, two key concepts that underpin the local plan are an area's 'sustainability' and its 'sensitivity'. For the former assessment, Normandy and Flexford have been ranked as one settlement, while for the latter they have been ranked as two. This inconsistency serves those intent upon using this land; it means that all the sustainable assets have been aggregated to maximise their score, while the Green Belt 'sensitivity' of the open land between the two settlements is ignored when assessing them separately for their 'sensitivity'.

2. In summary, please strongly consider revising the Local Plan to fully exploit all possible Brownfield sites before any inroads are made into the irreplaceable Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
* Surrey County Council led the way in Green Belt policies, and can almost be said to have invented the Green Belt, in part to preserve wildlife. GBC’s unneeded encroachment into the Green Belt does the Surrey County Council no service and endangers a list of species.

* Since the UK has voted to leave the EU, our environment will no longer enjoy EU protections; we must therefore be all the more careful to conserve what is left of the Green Belt.

* I am most concerned about the deleterious effect of development on stag beetles and skylarks, but these are part of an ecosystem, and the whole must be preserved.

* Those homes will worsen light pollution, affecting the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

* It makes no sense to build in an area with surface water flooding. I looked at a house on the edge of this area when I bought in Normandy Parish, and sank to the ankle in the water in the lawn. If I wouldn’t buy a house in that area, why would the GBC want to buy 1100?

**TRANSPORT**

* At rush hour, the A323 already works at capacity; tailbacks are common during commute hours. A crash or a closed lane on the A3 (or other arteries brings) the A323 to a standstill. The vehicles from 1100 new homes will tip us into urban-style traffic chaos.

* Residents of this development will necessarily be commuters (no local job growth is expected); those who don’t go by road will ride the train. Wanborough Station has space to park 10 cars, and commensurate station facilities – it is inadequate to support the proposed development.

* GBC objected to burdening the A323 with the traffic from the nearly 4000 homes planned for the Wellesley Barracks when Rushmore Borough Council set out its Plan. The A323 (and other local roads) now must cope with their previous load and the objectionable-to-GBC traffic from Wellesley Barracks; why would it make sense to add the traffic from the proposed 1100 new homes?

* The proposed school will drive up traffic; residents’ children will in existing schools until the proposed secondary is completed, and will presumably stay there, as will their younger siblings. It will be half a generation, if ever, before the school is used by local children. Until then, students (if any, given the number of open school places nearby) will be coming in by road.

* Traffic flow changes in the pipeline, intended to keep traffic out of Guildford town centre, will also put extra load onto country lanes in Normandy; this doesn't seem to be reflected in the Local Plan.

**HEALTH (access to NHS services)**

* The Fairlands Practice is barely coping with Normandy residents as it is (due in part to new NHS financial restrictions). Staff there say they cannot accommodate the residents of 1100 new homes.

* Road conditions already mentioned may restrict the response time of ambulances and other EMTs.

**EDUCATION**

* This development is predicated upon the need for a secondary school in the area. There is no such need. To build a school on Green Belt is to make a sacrifice; we should only suffer that loss if there’s a greater need.

* Area schools are undersubscribed at present, some dramatically so (one secondary is only 43% filled).
* At least two of the nearest secondaries have room to expand and are happy to expand if needed.

* The new school is to have seven forms of entry, yet reports quote GBC as saying that number is a guess. **We cannot sacrifice Green Belt for a school when the need hasn’t been properly assessed.**

* Surrey County Council has already stated that Blackwell Farm is a more suitable venue for a school.

**Balanced Growth**

* With an Officially Assessed Need (OAN) of 690 homes per year, even accounting for the present backlog, the Local Plan as it stands now puts 100% of the responsibility for more than a year of the new housing burden of GBC onto Normandy, all in one blow. With 23 parishes in the borough, this is not balanced growth.

* With a growth rate of well under 1% for the UK, even accounting for the higher rate of growth in the southeast, asking Normandy to accept 100% growth – because the Local Plan doubles the village population – is not balanced, sensible growth.

* We all have a responsibility to help house both stationary and travelling residents; that’s a given, that’s just, and that’s the law. But with the new travellers’ sites added in the last few years and new homes in other parts of the village, **Normandy has already done its part, and more, to house new GBC residents;** Normandy cannot be designated as disposable countryside, the place where GBC can build anything it needs, even if it means disregarding the Green Belt. The burden should be shared by all parishes.

On these grounds, I object to the Local Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
As a resident of Normandy I am particularly concerned about this area. We chose to live here because it is a small village, as I am sure most of the other residents of the village did. The plan has Normandy as a huge development site which will double its size - how can that be right? And to include a secondary school in a village where the access is small country lanes? Although we have a station most people would travel by car due to the expense and unreliability of the trains, and the convenience of travelling door to door. Also there is very limited parking at the station, but even if people drove to it, that would still increase congestion in the roads. The roads to and from the village are already at more than peak capacity at peak times. School traffic would make it intolerable.

The land marked for development in Normandy is beautiful open countryside with ancient woodland, and is a haven for bats, foxes and deer. It should remain that way for future generations to enjoy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/537  Respondent: 11023713 / Yuanxing Zheng  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly support the withdrawal of Policies A46 and A47, the former being the so-called ‘strategic site’ that would have added 1100 extra houses to the village that would have irretrievably destroyed the character of Normandy and Flexford and would have imposed an impossible burden on the local transport and other infrastructure. This area contributes significantly to the ‘openness’ of the Green Belt in this area, as well as being high grade agricultural land, and therefore should be fully protected for the future.

I object to the ‘insetting’ of the settlements at Flexford, Normandy, and Walden Cottages, as well as the Traveller site at Palm House Nurseries (Policy/Site A49) and the Travelling Show-people site at Whittles Drive (Policy/Site A50) as this would mean is that they were no longer part of the Green Belt and could in future be developed subject only to normal planning regulations. Both sites are rated “High Sensitivity” in the Sustainability Appraisal 2017 (Table 10.1).

In summary, the removal of sites from the Green Belt should only be done for exceptional circumstances, so I am pleased to see that the Guildford Borough Council has recognised this specifically with regard to the proposals for policies A46 & A47.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2475  Respondent: 11046721 / Judith Shaw  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As residents of Normandy for over 30 years, we write to object to the GBC Local Plan 2016 for the following reasons:

- We see no justification or 'exceptional circumstances' for Site A46 to be released from the Green Belt. There has been no explanation why development has to be on this red sensitivity status site.
- The local roads are already overstretched and have been steadily deteriorating over many years. The development will increase pressure on the traffic from Normandy towards and across Guildford on the A3 and
other local roads, which is already a nightmare, resulting in longer and longer 'peak' hours at each end of the working day. Public transport never has been or will be an adequate substitute. The railway under and over bridges on Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane are a constraint on the flow of traffic and considered unsafe due to inadequate sightlines.

- There is no current need for a new secondary school in this area and may only be required if the development is permitted to proceed. At present, we are adequately served by the existing secondary schools whereas the primary schools are under tremendous pressure.
- Other amenities in the village would not be able to meet the increased need produced by the additional population.
- There has been no consistent application of considerations of sustainability and sensitivity as applied to Normandy and Flexford. They are treated as one settlement when assessing sustainability but treated separately for sensitivity.
- We have been seeing far fewer species of birds and small mammals over recent years and the proposed additional households means even more dogs and cats in the area, increasing predation of wildlife.

The plan is considered unrealistic and would result in the destruction of our rural environment and we wish our views to be taken into account.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2474  Respondent: 11063009 / Andy Shaw  Agent: 

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

As residents of Normandy for over 30 years, we write to object to the GBC Local Plan 2016 for the following reasons:

- We see no justification or 'exceptional circumstances' for Site A46 to be released from the Green Belt. There has been no explanation why development has to be on this red sensitivity status site.
- The local roads are already overstretched and have been steadily deteriorating over many years. The development will increase pressure on the traffic from Normandy towards and across Guildford on the A3 and other local roads, which is already a nightmare, resulting in longer and longer 'peak' hours at each end of the working day. Public transport never has been or will be an adequate substitute. The railway under and over bridges on Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane are a constraint on the flow of traffic and considered unsafe due to inadequate sightlines.
- There is no current need for a new secondary school in this area and may only be required if the development is permitted to proceed. At present, we are adequately served by the existing secondary schools whereas the primary schools are under tremendous pressure.
- Other amenities in the village would not be able to meet the increased need produced by the additional population.
- There has been no consistent application of considerations of sustainability and sensitivity as applied to Normandy and Flexford. They are treated as one settlement when assessing sustainability but treated separately for sensitivity.
- We have been seeing far fewer species of birds and small mammals over recent years and the proposed additional households means even more dogs and cats in the area, increasing predation of wildlife.

The plan is considered unrealistic and would result in the destruction of our rural environment and we wish our views to be taken into account.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
Despite the changes made to the latest plan I am confident that the 20,000 comments made on the previous plan will still be considered and not ignored.

This is especially important as:

- While the numbers of homes to be built has been reduced there is still no evidence to back-up how the figure has been agreed
- The need for Green Belt protection from over development, merging of villages remains – there should be no changes to this policy
- The requirement for infrastructure to be committed before building must be ratified

It was heartening to hear Mr Gove in a speech on 20 July, as Environment Secretary state he has 'no intention of weakening environmental protections put in place while in the EU'. He even said he wanted post-Brexit UK to be a ‘a setter of gold standards for protecting our natural world.’

My comments for the Regulation 19 Consultation are:

- Removal of sites Policies 46 / 47
- Change to the Green Belt coverage of Normandy and Flexford
- Infrastructure improvements
- Traveller sites in Normandy and Flexford

**Removal of sites Policies 46/47**

I am naturally pleased that common sense has prevailed – not to double the size of Normandy and Flexford by building 1,100 houses and a school in our precious Green Belt: it’s the wrong place, fed by country lanes, with dangerous railway bridges, is a floodplain and also… Green Belt!

So I support this changes to the plan.

I do hope that the GBC do not go back on this by allowing greedy developers in through the back-door to propose any level of development or to remove Green Belt cover in the future.

**Change to the Green Belt coverage of Normandy and Flexford**

I am not clear why GBC have ignored the policy of the Green Belt and seem keen to try to find ‘exceptional circumstances’ where it can to build its unsubstantiated housing target.

I object to the change in the plan to remove the Green Belt coverage in settlements in Normandy, Flexford and Walden Cottages marked on the maps in Appendix H. There is no evidence to prove why these random areas have been selected as all contribute, as do the settlement areas not selected, to the openness of the Green Belt and no ‘exceptional circumstances’ have been proved. This openness has in fact has been stated by the planning inspectorate in previous
planning appeals. The area around these selected settlements do also contribute to the rural economy. They also are close enough to the Surrey Hills ANOB given the geography of the land allowing views that fulfil the Green Belt obligations.

The area has already been identified as one of ‘high sensitivity’ yet that doesn’t seem to count when this insetting has been proposed. If this was allowed to happen then there will be pressure in the future to join up the resultant ‘urban islands’ into a wider urban area.

The Green Belt was created to prevent urban sprawl and should be permanently protected.

I also object to the statement under Green Belt Policy P2 (4.3.13) that claims Normandy and Flexford (and many other villages) are now inset from the Green Belt. Its in the Plan to do that very thing - so cannot be right. I also object to any of these villages being changed to be inset from the Green Belt.

**Infrastructure improvements**

With all the current development and proposed around the area – especially in the sacrificial lamb Ash – the pressure on roads, Doctors etc will only get worse.

It is vital that the infrastructure is agreed and implemented before any large scale development takes place.

The most key are LRN17 Puttenham Hill/A31, LRN24 A323/324 Junction and LNR21 Ash Railway Station flyover and I support the plans - although the ‘likely cost and funding source’ don’t appear to be very robust.

**Traveller Sites in Normandy and Flexford**

Like the settlement areas in Normandy, Flexford and Walden Cottages, the sites at Palm House Nurseries (Policy 49) and Whittles Drive (Policy A50) are proposed to be inset.

I object to this as it will remove the development restrictions in an area sensitive to residents in the village of Normandy and Flexford and no evidence has been provided for ‘exceptional circumstances’. I can foresee that it will result in even less respect for the planning law.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4170  **Respondent:** 12108513 / Caroline Wilberforce  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**Introduction**

On behalf of our client, Mr Kevin Soobadoo, we submit representations to the Guildford Borough Council Proposed Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19) consultation. Our representation relates to the proposed amendments to the Green Belt boundary at Flexford which affect our client’s property, ‘Westholme’, Green Lane East. A site location plan is attached (see Enc.1). Photos of the site and surroundings are attached (see Enc.2).

We are surprised by the removal of the site from the inset boundary as it had previously been included in the Preferred Options proposals map. Similarly, we are also concerned about the way in which the inset boundary for Flexford has been assessed in the Green Belt and Countryside Study (Volume IV).

Based on national planning policy, and the methodology used by the Council, we consider that the property should be removed from the Green Belt and be included within the revised inset boundary for Flexford.
National Planning Policy

We acknowledge that the Council has made clear reference to Section 9: Protecting the Green Belt (paragraphs 79-92) of the National Planning Policy Framework to assess the Green Belt. Paragraph 79 states that ‘the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence’.

The NPPF goes on to state that ‘Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances through the preparation or review of the Local Plan’ (paragraph 83). ‘When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries, local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development’ (paragraph 84).

In addition, paragraph 85 states that ‘when defining boundaries, local planning authorities should:

- Ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development;
- Not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open;
- Where necessary, identify in their plans areas of ‘safeguarded land’ between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period;
- Make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a local plan review which proposes the development;
- Satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period; and
- Define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to permanent.’

Critique of the Methodology

We consider that the bullet points highlighted bold under paragraph 85 (above) are most relevant to redefining the Green Belt boundary as the other four purposes relate to more strategic matters. However, the newly proposed western extension of the inset boundary (north of Green Lane East and west of Westwood Lane) fails to identify land that achieves these two key purposes. The alterations are therefore inconsistent with national policy as required under NPPF paragraph 182.

To demonstrate our concerns, we have analysed the robustness of the three stage methodology used to assess the contribution in which the open character of a village makes to the openness of the Green Belt.

Stage 1: Assessing the degree of openness within each village through analysis of village form, density and extent of existing developed land

We understand that the purpose of stage 1 was to map the detailed locations of developed and open areas and determine how they relate to the openness of the wider Green Belt. Through site survey and aerial imagery, it was identified that the Local Plan (2003) settlement boundary did not represent the entire village area and that development extending beyond the settlement boundary could be perceived as being part of the same village. It was considered appropriate to map the ‘extent of the perceived village area’ including areas of development located outside of the adopted Local Plan settlement boundary that were reasonably considered to be part of the same village.

However, having reviewed the stage 1 map for Flexford, we have identified that it fails to include ‘Westholme’ in the extent of the perceived village area. Given that all properties along (and accessed via) Green Lane East, except ‘Westholme’ have been included in stage 1, we consider that it would be inconsistent not to include it. As a result, we have categorised ‘Westholme’, as medium density development. This is based on there being several buildings within a medium scale garden plot and that the level of density is comparable to dwellings earmarked at 1G on the Stage 1 map for Flexford.
Our assessment of the level of development has been prepared using the density definitions detailed in paragraph 13.13 of the Green Belt and Countryside Study (Volume IV). We have created an amended stage 1 map to illustrate our interpretation of the perceived extent of the village area and edited the description under 1G (see Enc.3). We consider this to be a much more consistent approach.

Stage 2

The purpose of stage 2 was to survey the extent of defensible Green Belt boundaries within each village.

Paragraph 13.17 of the Green Belt and Countryside Study (Volume IV) states that ‘if land is physically enclosed by topography and/or vegetation there would be little opportunity to observe the land in question, and little opportunity to perceive how such land could significantly contribute to openness in Green Belt terms, thus limiting its opportunity to contribute to the openness of the area to any significant degree or attach any sense of importance’.

It continues by suggesting ‘that in these circumstances…the land will be unable to make an important contribution either literally or perceptually, and therefore can be argued as unnecessary in designation terms and could justifiably be excluded from the Green Belt in accordance with the NPPF’.

For a village to be potentially inset within the Green Belt, it would need to be demonstrated that recognisable, defensible and permanent Green Belt boundaries could be provided that would endure in the long term. Paragraph 13.19 states that ‘recommended boundaries include treebelts, woodlands and hedgerows…such features are clearly recognisable, and with regards to permanence will often be in place as long as, if not longer than, much built development’.

Having reviewed the map for stage 2, we note that the tree belt that makes up the northern boundary of ‘Westholme’ is illustrated. These are dense, coniferous trees and approximately 10m in height. However, the map fails to recognise the permanent hedgerow along the western boundary. To demonstrate this, we include on-the-ground photographs of both the western and northern boundary (see Enc.2).

This images provide appropriate evidence that the property has a permanent and recognisable, defensible boundary along the northern and western perimeter and is therefore in accordance with the way in which Green Belt boundaries should be defined under NPPF paragraph 85. There is therefore no reason why the revised inset boundary should not include ‘Westholme’ in defensible boundary terms.

We have also prepared an amended stage 2 map highlighting the hedgerow along the western boundary (see Enc.4).

Stage 3

We understand that the purpose of stage 3 was to assess the suitability of each village, as a whole, to be inset from the Green Belt. Whilst the village of Flexford is proposed to be inset from the Green Belt, the proposed inset boundary does not reflect the requirements of NPPF paragraph 85 as it continues to include land which is unnecessary to be kept permanently open and does not follow clear, defensible boundaries.

We therefore raise concern about the newly proposed boundary at section 3E illustrated on the map for stage 3. The map states that the village was considered suitable for inserting within the designated Green Belt due to ‘hedgerows and treebelts to the west of Westwood Lane between Green Lane East and the railway line’. However, if the revised boundary were to follow hedgerows and treebelts to the west of the village, then ‘Westholme’ should be incorporated into the inserting of the boundary. This is based on the defensible boundary along the northern and western boundary illustrated on map 2 (see Enc.4).

Furthermore, ‘Westholme’ does not contribute to the openness of the Green Belt. The reasons are as follows:

- The large, mature and dense conifer trees along the northern boundary prevents the land from contributing to the openness of the Green Belt to any significant degree or attach any sense of importance all year round (see Enc.2);
- The western side of the property is narrower than the eastern side. This means that there is less open land which contributes to the openness of the Green Belt (see Enc.2); and
• The land as a whole is surrounded by development - A temporary traveller pitch is located to the north of the property, ‘Tollerton’ is situated to the west and there is high density housing running along the eastern and southern boundaries. The property is not visible from the open part of the Green Belt to the north west (see Enc.2).

It is evident from our research that ‘Westholme’ is surrounded by a clear, defensible boundary and that it does not contribute to the openness of the Green Belt. With properties up to ‘Roffey’ on Green Lane East proposed for inclusion in the inset boundary, the inclusion of ‘Westholme’ would not result in an irregular anomaly protruding into the Green Belt. It would instead align with ‘Roffey’ to form a clearly defined and logical edge to the revised inset boundary.

We have prepared an amended version of the stage 3 map to illustrate this (see Enc.5).

Inclusion of ‘Westholme’ within Preferred Options Consultation

We have also reviewed the previous consultations and note that ‘Westholme’ was proposed to be inset from the Green Belt boundary in the Preferred Options version of the Plan. However, it no longer appears in the Submission Version of the Local Plan, presumably due to the removal of land to the north east of Green Lane East as a proposed site allocation for four traveller pitches.

However, the inclusion of land to the north east of Green Lane East should not have been a contributing factor in determining whether ‘Westholme’ be inset from the Green Belt. This demonstrates that the Council has reviewed the evidence base for Flexford, particularly the map at Stage 2, and concluded that there is a clear defensible boundary to the north of the site (refer to 2L – hedgerow between Westwood Lane and the railway) and does not contribute to the openness of the Green Belt.

Proposed amendments to policy wording

Following our review of the Submission Local Plan, our client is concerned that the Submission Local Plan is unsound for the following reasons:

The Green Belt and Countryside Study (Volume IV) fails to present the most appropriate strategy for a newly revised inset boundary at Flexford. The Proposals Map for Flexford is therefore not justified.

The newly revised inset boundary at Flexford fails to meet the criteria for defining Green Belt boundaries under NPPF paragraph 85. The Proposals Map for Flexford is therefore inconsistent with national policy.

We request the following amendments are made to the Local Plan:

Redefine the western extension of the Flexford inset boundary as shown on our version of the stage 3 map.

Amend the Proposals Map to accompany Policy P2 - Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
- Enc 2 - Westholme Photographic Study 2016 07_18.pdf (3.3 MB)
- Westholme Representations to Guildford Local Plan (including Enc1_3_4_5).pdf (6.2 MB)
I strongly object to the inclusion of the Normandy greenfield site(s) and its developer led proposal for the 1000 or so new properties.

Whist progress needs to be made, It is grossly unfair on the village to subject the residents( the people you represent) to the desecration of the villages current character.

As a newer member to the village, I have been overwhelmed by the beautiful - often under rated character of the village. So do not wish for a developer to lead Guildford down this one way street and ultimately Normandy to become an urban sprawling mass of houses as the planning floodgates are opened.

**Schooling**

I also object to the placement of a large secondary school in the village, it's extremely out of character for the area, I have a young baby who will eventually go to secondary school. Whereby a train or bus to an existing secondary school is, and will not be an issue for us.

**Road System**

I also object on the matter that the local road system is already saturated to capacity. I suspect many of the potential purchasers of the new homes will commute, with the likely hood of at least two cars per household. This is likely to subject the current and new residents to major traffic issues. Which the council will need to resolve at their expense rather then the developers (that certainly won't be cheaper then a new school).

The main roads are so narrow that a car generally can't pass a cycle without crossing the centre line on the main routes, which is almost impossible anyway when rush hour traffic ensues.

It is sometimes quicker for me to get to London Waterloo then drive a few miles down the road. Which is to say the least, incredible!
This is only going to be made much worse with more cars on the road and no significant overhaul to the infrastructure (who will pay for that?).

**Finally:**

These large scale (developer led) housing proposals are not what Guildford needs. I believe Guildford is quite different to other urban towns, and is locally unique due to its greater swathes of Greenbelt land which washes over the area. Why on Earth turn it into another urban mass of houses and destroy its identity forever more.

I am sure with additional effort and collaboration a better solution for all would prevail, not just because a developer is building a free school...

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/157  Respondent: 15062817 / Keith Liddell  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (Yes), is Sound? (Yes), is Legally Compliant? (Yes)

We fully agree with and support these proposed changes to the Local Plan being Normandy and Flexford Amendments 1, 2 and 3-8. We thank GBC for listening to our concerns regarding the 2016 version of the proposed Local Plan and reflecting them in these proposed changes.

Keith Liddell, S. Jane Liddell and Natasha Liddell, [response has been redacted due to a 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?**
Comment ID: PSLPA16/18  Respondent: 15083457 / David Stonebanks  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The plan you have to build new home in Normandy is totally ridicules.

There is no way ash and the surrounding roads could cope with the extra traffic.

This is green belt land and should not be touched. Many people moved to that area knowing it was green belt and they wanted to live out of a town.

Please register my strong objection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/218  Respondent: 15154209 / Lo (Chris Lenton)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We were very pleased to see that the Normandy development proposals listed as Site Allocations A46 and A47 have been removed from the Plan, so thank you for that. It was impossible to see how these could be adequately serviced by the existing infrastructure. Just the increased road traffic and flooding issues alone resulting from the finished project would have made life a misery for everyone affected by it.

We are however concerned about a couple of points in the new plan as follows:

- **Removal from Green Belt of homes in Guildford Road, Glaziers lane, Flexford, etc and the new traveller site** – this seems like a prelude to making the building of new homes on these areas easier in the future. My daughter and I regularly cycle and run around these areas and we are very concerned about any attempt to any shrinking of the green belt.

- **10,000 new homes within 10 mile radius of Normandy** – whilst we are obviously glad that the direct impact of developing over a 1,000 homes in Normandy has been removed, the indirect effect on traffic increases, etc will need to be properly catered for in the form of improvements in road infrastructure. For example the level crossing in Ash already causes significant delays but if the traffic levels are increased considerably then this could become completely unmanageable, with the backlog only partially being cleared in between trains. Are there any plans to cater for this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/254  Respondent: 15159201 / Hayley van Kasteren  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford
I am a resident of the village of Normandy with concerns of the proposed development in your local plan.

I live in Normandy with my husband & my 2 sons aged 4 & 1. My 4 year old son currently attends the local preschool & will attend Wyke the village school in September. My husband & I both work at Heathrow airport so regularly use the local motorways.

I believe the proposed development of the greenbelt land will have an extremely negative effect on our village. We live on Westwood lane which at peak times of the day is a very busy 'rat run' used by people driving from other areas to the hogs back. People drive at shocking speeds down our lane & the addition of extra houses & a secondary school will only make this worse. I do not think the roads in Normandy are designed for such a volume of traffic.

When I walk my son to preschool I do not feel safe due to the speed people drive & can imagine it will become such that residents cannot walk to school due to the volume of fast moving cars. It will simply be too dangerous for young children.

As well as this there will be building traffic for years to come while this development is taking place. This will become a totally different village to bring up our children in. My husband & I regularly drive to Heathrow airport at peak times & the traffic is absolutely horrendous as soon as we get to the top of Wanborough Hill. How will the hogs back & A3 cope with this extra volume of traffic?

This development will have a negative impact on wildlife due to building on greenbelt land as well as spoiling the look of the beautiful countryside.

There is not enough infrastructure in our village to cope with the extra residents. The primary school is not big enough, nor is the doctors & there are no shops or other facilities here.

As far as I am aware there is no need for an extra secondary school as there are enough spaces at other local schools. Families who move to Normandy do so knowing there is no secondary school in the village & that our children will most likely attend Ash Manor. So the proposed secondary school is not planned to serve existing residents but merely to serve the new estate.

If this development goes ahead it will be devastating for the residents of Normandy & we very much hope there is a better alternative than building in our protected greenbelt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4254  **Respondent:** 15159873 / Martin Smith  **Agent:** Vail Williams LLP (Jane Terry)

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

---

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.

<documents 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.pdf (337 KB)
I write with great concern in respect of the huge proposed Taylor Wimpey 'housing estate' on the fields between Glaziers Lane & Westwood Lane.

I've lived in the village for just over 20 years and seen many changes which I believe everyone has embraced. However I have grave concerns over many matters that would occur if the 1100 houses, secondary school and shops were built.

- Currently I travel to Guildford on the A31, and I can see from my house that from 7am – 9.30am there are extremely long delays, with at least one accident per week on the A31 or A3. A journey of 15 minutes on a Saturday can take between 45 minutes to 1 1/2 hours in the week. With approximately another say 700 vehicles on this road, the journey would be horrendous.

- The Aldershot/Guildford road really does not have the capacity to take anymore traffic as this is also solid with commuters.

- Two real concerns are the 'One Way Railway Bridge' in Westwood Lane, which is extremely dangerous as it is (with the residents of Beech Lane unable to see anything travelling up Westwood Lane to the Hogs Back), and the very small Bridge at Wanborough Station (which has a left hand kink as you cross the bridge), there are numerous near misses with traffic overtaking either side of the bridge, which slow drivers, horses, cyclists or motorbikes are using the road, and large lorries appearing at the brow of the hill.

- The Village would turn into a Building Site for at least 10 years with huge amount of large lorries using Glaziers Lane, as they are unable to go through the bridge at Westwood Lane.

- The area that has been chosen is beautiful, we use the footpath 'The Avenue' regularly for our dog walks. There are much less attractive areas which would be more suitable to site a housing development.

- The majority of the locals moved to Normandy so they could enjoy the rolling countryside, peaceful environment, and a village life. If we wanted to live in a large urbanised area we would have looked at a different location. Sad many people feel they would need to up sticks and move due to a large building company wanting our lovely green belt.

- Why would we need a new school, when Kings College and Ash Manor are under subscribed? Just because Cllr Spooner says that a Secondary School 'TRUMPS' planning! Is this really fair?

- How will our small village roads cope with this? A St Peter's bus travels up Culls Road every morning, does a loop round Christmas Pie and travels back down Glaziers Lane. During the Winter when several neighbours had some building works going on, and some residents leave their vehicles in the road which they are entitled to do. The Bus just drove all over the grass verges, and left huge ruts in them!! We like to keep our properties looking nice and just one bus caused this destruction, for months. The road is not wide enough to cope with a double decker bus, and I can only see more of this happening with extra traffic in the village.

- Another concern is the parking for the station, currently people park in Culls Road, and the Paddocks due to double yellows round at the Station and £2 a day charge. This will only increase, people like to park as near to the Station as possible!

We would like to stay a village, not ASHWYKEFLEXFORD&NORMANDY merged..

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am writing in response to the new Local Plan for Guildford.

I **strongly object** to these extensive plans for development, particularly with regard to the 1,100 houses and seven form entry secondary school proposed for site A46, in Normandy.

My husband and I moved to Normandy just under two and a half years ago, following my retirement. We were delighted to find this area, described by the estate agents as semi-rural, where we could escape the hectic lives we have lead in London and enjoy the countryside, whilst retaining good links to all necessary amenities. We have been even more delighted since moving here to find a strong village community, with a focus of activities centred around the village hall. We enjoy the variety of wildlife that visits our garden and the fact that we can go on local countryside walks.

However, it is not purely for selfish reasons that I object to the local plan. The following are reasons why I think the proposed development in Normandy should not go ahead:

1. The need for a new secondary school has not been proven. I understand that neighbouring schools are currently grossly undersubscribed and that both Ash Manor and King's College are happy to expand, should the future need arise. This would be a far less costly solution.

1. Local roads could not possibly cope with the increased volume of traffic. Both Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane are in fact 'lanes' and not built for a large volume of traffic. Westwood Lane contains a railway bridge, where the road is only wide enough for one car and the height is restricted (e.g. a double-decker bus would not be able to pass under the bridge). We live on Guildford Road (A323). During both morning and evening rush hours, there are high volumes of traffic, in both directions, making it extremely difficult to leave our drive, or cross the road on foot. At times the traffic can become stationary in either direction. This problem is increased whenever there is a problem on the A31, A3 or A331. This is an incredibly frequent occurrence! There have been a number of accidents on the road between the Fairlands roundabout and Ash, within the last two years. These include more than one fatality and at least one involving a primary school pupil, walking to school.

1. The A46 site is on greenbelt land, a concept which Surrey County Council was instrumental in creating as a means of preventing urban sprawl from linking up towns. In this case Guildford and Aldershot. In addition, this land is **not** safeguarded.

1. This area is home to a wide variety of wildlife, including many protected species: hedgehogs, newts, bats, dormice, snakes to mention a few. Their natural habitats would inevitably be destroyed by this level of development. Additionally it would lead to light pollution that would be seen from the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

1. Many parts of the village are already subject to flooding. This development can only exacerbate the problem. There are also areas where the sewers are unable to cope and have overflowed onto residents' gardens.

1. No consideration has been given to the health care of an increased number of residents. It is already extremely difficult to get an appointment at the local surgeries.

1. The area includes a number of Grade 2 listed houses. Surely increased traffic volumes will undermine the strength of their foundations.

To summarise: I consider that if this plan for development in Normandy goes ahead, along with extensive developments also planned for Ash, Tongham and Ash Green, it will be an utter tragedy for generations to come. Once our countryside and wildlife have been destroyed, there is no way back.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
I strongly object to these extensive plans for development, particularly with regard to the 1,100 houses and seven form entry secondary school proposed for site A46, in Normandy.

My husband and I moved to Normandy just under two and a half years ago, following my retirement. We were delighted to find this area, described by the estate agents as semi-rural, where we could escape the hectic lives we have lead in London and enjoy the countryside, whilst retaining good links to all necessary amenities. We have been even more delighted since moving here to find a strong village community, with a focus of activities centred around the village hall. We enjoy the variety of wildlife that visits our garden and the fact that we can go on local countryside walks.

However, it is not purely for selfish reasons that I object to the local plan. The following are reasons why I think the proposed development in Normandy should not go ahead:

1. The need for a new secondary school has not been proven. I understand that neighbouring schools are currently grossly undersubscribed and that both Ash Manor and King's College are happy to expand, should the future need arise. This would be a far less costly solution.

1. Local roads could not possibly cope with the increased volume of traffic. Both Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane are in fact 'lanes' and not built for a large volume of traffic. Westwood Lane contains a railway bridge, where the road is only wide enough for one car and the height is restricted (e.g. a double-decker bus would not be able to pass under the bridge). We live on Guildford Road (A323). During both morning and evening rush hours, there are high volumes of traffic, in both directions, making it extremely difficult to leave our drive, or cross the road on foot. At times the traffic can become stationary in either direction. This problem is increased whenever there is a problem on the A31, A3 or A331. This is an incredibly frequent occurrence! There have been a number of accidents on the road between the Fairlands roundabout and Ash, within the last two years. These include more than one fatality and at least one involving a primary school pupil, walking to school.

1. The A46 site is on greenbelt land, a concept which Surrey County Council was instrumental in creating as a means of preventing urban sprawl from linking up this case Guildford and Aldershot. In addition, this land is not safeguarded.

1. This area is home to a wide variety of wildlife, including many protected species: hedgehogs, newts, bats, dormice, snakes to mention a few. Their natural habitats would inevitably be destroyed by this level of development. Additionally it would lead to light pollution that would be seen from the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

1. Many parts of the village are already subject to flood. This development can only exacerbate the problem. There are also areas where the sewers are unable to cope and have overflowed onto residents' gardens.

1. No consideration has been given to the health care of an increased number of. It is already extremely difficult to get an appointment at the local surgeries.

1. The area includes a number of Grade 2 listed houses. Surely increased traffic volumes will undermine the strength of their foundations.

To summarise: consider that if this plan for development in Normandy goes ahead, along with extensive developments also planned for Ash, Tongham and Ash Green, it will be an utter tragedy for generations to come. Once our countryside and wildlife have been destroyed, there is no way back.
I have the following concerns.

1. There is significant concern in the community that flooding could become more likely as a result of the proposed development. I would find it unacceptable for any proposed development to increase flood risk to existing properties. I would expect the council to place an onus on the developer to fund all additional works to mitigate the effect of the development and ensure an improvement in the water handling capacity of the local land and water management infrastructure.

2. Having attended the community meetings about the proposed development I have seen no clear evidence to suggest that the village of Normandy is in need of a secondary school. I have been provided with evidence to suggest that there is already excess capacity for schooling places within the borough of Guildford and therefore the premise to build a new school on the suggested site is purely a proposal of convenience to enable development on this piece of green belt land. This is quite wrong and should not be allowed.

3. No other consideration or proposal has been provided as an alternative to build on alternate brownfield sites within the borough of Guildford. I would like to know if the borough council has decided not to follow this course of action due to a lack of resource within the planning department to manage the corresponding increase in the number of developments that an exercise such as a brownfield site development plan could create. In my mind tearing up greenbelt due to a lack of resource within the local authority is nothing short of a morally criminal act.

4. I am registered visually impaired and use a guide dog as mobility aid. I am dependent on my hearing to make a safety choice when crossing the road. The roads in the village are already so busy that I find crossing the road a complex, frightening and protracted experience. The additional traffic created by an additional 1100 homes is likely in my view to make crossing the road from Walden cottages at Westwood Lane and Guildford Road at Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane impossibly dangerous without the provision of pelican or toucan crossings. The proposed increase traffic at Wanborough station is also likely to make crossing the wide road entrance to the station impossibly dangerous. Please investigate and inform me if the Equality Act 2010 places an obligation on the planning authority to ensure that any proposed development does not substantially disadvantage a disabled person such as myself or other persons within my community. The impact of not being able to cross the road independently would increase my dependence on my carer, it would reduce my ability to seek employment and engage in society.
I am astounded that you can contemplate such a massive building programme on green belt land. Normandy is a small comfortable village and your proposals would completely change this with a dramatic fall in the quality of life and house values.

Over these last 40 years the traffic has grown beyond measure, meaning that it sometimes takes up to 15 minutes just to get out of Nightingale Rd. Every day there are long queues on the A31 heading East. The planned development would dramatically worsen this situation.

It must not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/531  Respondent: 15270753 / Robert & Judy Hatfield  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We wish to respond to Guildford Borough Council’s consultation on changes to the Local Plan.

We would like to support the removal of site A46 (1100 homes and school) on land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford, and the removal of site A47 (50 homes to the east of the Paddocks, Flexford). If these ever went ahead, there would be total overload on:

- Roads - extra traffic
- Waste water - drainage would not be able to cope, causing flooding - which has already happened in the past many times
- Electricity
- Health care would also be drastically overloaded

This area is Green Belt, which should not be tampered with.

We want to strongly object to the removal from the Green Belt of certain homes in Guildford Road, Glazier’s Lane, Flexford, Walden Cottages, Palm House Nursery, and Whittles Drive traveller sites.

If the Green Belt status was removed, development may progress at a much higher rate. These areas contribute to keeping the Green Belt areas more open and beautiful.

Although we do not agree with all the extra homes proposed in a 10-mile radius of Normandy, if these do go ahead, then Guildford Borough Council should plan ahead and ensure that suitable changes are made to the infrastructure: for instance a road bridge and footbridge should definitely be built at Ash Station (LRN21) as traffic jams are already a frequent occurrence.

We would like all these points we have made to be taken into consideration, and acted upon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/737  Respondent: 15279937 / Adam Hampton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

+Objection to planned construction within Normandy village

I, Adam Hampton, formally object to the construction of homes and businesses within the village of Normandy as propositioned by the plans that were made available earlier this year by Guildford borough council.

It is of my opinion that many points of contention have been consistently overlooked and ignored by the council when submission of planning for construction at the Normandy site was proposed; such points of contention I will outline below in a structured manner. My objections, along with most other objections from people in the area, can be divided into three main areas of concern, social, ecological and economical.

When looking at the proposition in a social aspect a number of key concerns are raised. How will the residents of this new development move during daily transit? How will the residents integrate into the current utilities infrastructure, namely the surgery? And will the new developments integrate into the existing character of the village, in style, layout and number?

Firstly, while it is a noble to assume that the residents and visitors of the 1000+ unit development will be making full use of the Wanborough rail transport links to Guildford and ash, to do so would be naïve on part of the borough and the developers. Assuming each unit will have on average of 2 residents, and assuming that those 2 residents do not share a car, as most do not. There will be a minimum of 2000+ new vehicles utilising the existing road infrastructure in addition to the many hundreds, if not thousands that do each day. If you also take into account the proposed school building and assume it is of mode size as outlined by government survey, there will be between 501-1000 pupils who will also need to be transported to the building. Adding, in the best case scenario, 500 more cars to the area every morning and evening. Currently the majority of traffic is transient, this would not be so if the development were allowed to go ahead. 2500 cars, at best, utilising the current road infrastructure at the rush hours of the morning and evening at the same time would be chaos, and in my opinion is enough argument already to prevent such a development from taking place.

Secondly, all of the new residents will be likely making use of the current surgery in Glazier’s lane, should the proposed development be allowed to take place. The current ability of existing residents to make appointments is already hindered by long wait times and lack of appointment places. Appointments have to consistently be made great lengths of time in advance, removing any sort of emergency response capacity of the surgery. It is self-explanatory that addition of yet more people to a problem already caused by lack of space will further hinder the services of the surgery, both for existing residents and future.

Thirdly, due to the nature and size of the development, integration with the surrounding area is highly limited and if not, improbable. It would incorrect to call this a housing development when its size greatly exceeds the size of the village as it currently is, and would be more appropriately titled a ‘village’ development. Its size would be essentially usurping the existing residents and character of the village and moving the centre of the village away from where it was once situated. If current development styles from sites in ash vale are to be taken as the industry standard, the house styles will not be in keeping of those currently in the village. The number of houses and the size of the plot will virtually guarantee that the houses cannot be of a size or shape similar to those that currently occupy the village proper.

From an ecological perspective, the development would be most damaging. We must ask a number of key questions when considering the development in this way. Will the development protect the existing wildlife and if so, to what degree? If damage is to be made, what forms will it likely take and what will be the further reaching impacts of the development on the surrounding ecology? Will any damage be transient or permanent?

To address the first question, no, there are no obvious provisions made to protect the existing wildlife. Any developments made, will be on Greenfield sites and as such will completely eradicate forever, any and all ecology that exited on the site and could exist there. Considering that the site is surrounded by ancient woodland, any wildlife on the site will be well established and flourishing in their niche and to disrupt this would be highly damaging. Increased urban presence will give rise to more urban dependant species such as foxes, urbanised pigeons and rats, which will outcompete the more sensitive countryside wildlife for food and territory, reducing the already limited biodiversity. It is astounding to think that in this age of renewable technology and sustainable planning, a green-field development is being even considered and preservation of natural spaces and wildlife has taken a back seat.
Pollution from the site will likely be of light and noise forms, and these will over reach far beyond the boundaries of the development site itself. While also damaging the quiet and dark nature of the village as a whole, in a broader sense it will drive away swathes of fauna that need these aspects to thrive. Established nocturnal species of owls and badgers will be effected and driven away. More sensitive creatures such as deer will retreat further into the valley and less often be seen. In all changing the natural character of the area irreversibly.

It goes without saying that the majority of these changes will be permanent in nature. Of course there will be some recovery from more bold species of flora and fauna that can adapt to overcome the changes but there are many that will not and will move away indefinitely. All forms of pollution will increase, as is expected with an increase in population, and this will also be a permanent change.

Economically there will be very little net gain, those that are shopping at the few proposed shops will bring very little money to the area and the majority will still look elsewhere to more well stocked areas in Aldershot and Guildford for their groceries and day to day supplies.

As with any increase in population there will also be an increase in crime, a statistic that is highly correlated and can be avoided by relocation of the development to places with a less established community and local area.

In closing, such infilling developments and especially that which has been proposed at Normandy village are inappropriate and inadequate solutions to housing around the Guildford area. Any sentiments that I have expressed are not of the NIMBY (not in my back yard) disposition, but are of hard facts that will definitively change the character of the village for the worse, and will remove sites of such appeal and nature from the surrey hills area forever. It is not in the locals’ best interests to have such a site be constructed in the heart of our village and overtake the village as it is with its scale. It would be much more sensitive to the local area to develop along roads and byways, and to let any development happen naturally, rather than setting down what is essentially a whole new village within the existing one. I urge that this development be halted in its current state and searches be made for sites of more suitable character. I understand the need for housing in a growing population but this planning application grossly oversteps what is necessary and should be reconsidered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/780</th>
<th>Respondent: 15280737 / Miller Developments (David Milloy)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

In our earlier submission we set out our concern that the Council has not taken a meaningful approach to developing alternatives and options; nor assessed them against evidence or applied a sustainability appraisal in a logical manner - despite one of the requirements for the preparation stage of the Plan is to develop alternatives and options and appraising them through sustainability appraisal and against evidence. This remains our view, however our concern on this is now heightened in light of the removal of sites such as A46 (Normandy and Flexford). Whilst we disagreed with this allocation (and therefore welcome its removal), we note that it was in an even earlier version of the Plan as a safeguarded site, thereby at least providing an identified alternative during the Plan period. Its complete removal leads to further concerns about the almost complete lack of any identified alternatives during the Plan period. Given the likelihood of a number of remaining strategic sites facing deliverability issues (due to infrastructure challenges) during the Plan period, it seems highly deficient to exacerbate the approach of not having the flexibility of other, more deliverable sites that could be brought forward in such circumstances.

As we previously set out, we remain concerned that the Council has not demonstrated due regard for other strategies and relevant matters, including the local transport plan and transport facilities and services. It is evident from the shortcomings on infrastructure requirements, particularly in relation to the strategic sites, that the Council has not taken a
joined up approach on these matters, which runs contrary to Section 19 (2), Regulation 10 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/756  Respondent: 15284385 / T.W. Turnill  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Submission Local Plan – Normandy

I wish to OBJECT most forcibly with the proposed development in Normandy between Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane. My reasons for objection are as follows:- Inadequate Infrastructure, especially the lack of suitable roads; flooding and Sewage problems leading to Health considerations; The Spurious “Need for a Secondary School”; The Impact on the Environment; The use of Red notated agricultural land Not safeguarded, and in the Green Belt for building 1100 houses; The lack of local consultation with GBC to discuss the desires of the Village, in line with the Governments declared policy of the need to ensure that the village actually WANTS the extra housing. I will expand on each.

1. Inadequate Infrastructure.

I refer primarily to the effect 1100 extra houses, each with a probable two cars, will have on the local traffic situation, which is already creaking. Both Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane are country roads, each having dangerous bridges associated with the railway line. These roads are on the borders of the planned development, while the northern edge is bordered by the A323, which is already extremely busy at peak times. The addition of a 1100 pupil Secondary School on that road will increase the traffic intolerably, when taken in addition to the cars from the new development trying to reach Guildford or Aldershot.

Whenever there is an accident on the Hogs Back or A3, traffic tries to exit via Wanborough Hill to use either of the two lanes, neither of which is capable or designed to take that volume of traffic. Anyone who tries to access the A31 at peak traffic times from either the Puttenham or Wanborough directions will know how long the queues are, and the potential for accidents for traffic leaving the A31 at the Puttenham turn off. This could severely jeopardise Emergency traffic trying to access the new development, whose road structure might well be not capable of allowing Fire and Ambulance vehicles to attend an emergency, especially during peak traffic times.

1. Flooding and associated Sewage Problems.

Parts of Normandy, especially at the southern edge of the proposed development and in the area next to the Hoe stream, 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. One property has already been flooded 5 times in the past year, and the 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 proposed development area at present allows natural drainage through the soil and trees; if this area is concreted over, the resultant run off of surface water would overwhelm the present system, causing even more flooding in the local area. I am not convinced that an underground tank to take excess water and release it in a controlled fashion would be able to cope with the increased amount of water which forecasters say we must expect with climate warming.

1. The “Need” for a Secondary School
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.

1. Environmental Impact

The village of Normandy lies within an area of outstanding natural beauty close to the Surrey Hills to the South and the Army Heathland to the North. It provides a welcome rural break between the towns of Aldershot and Guildford, and is in designated Green Belt. It features a wide range of wild life, including many endangered and protected species, and the addition of 1100 households, with their associated cats, would decimate much of the wild life that lives here. In addition, the replacement of the present agricultural land with housing would remove a valuable habitat for all the wild creatures that have come to rely on the peaceful nature of the area.

1. The use of non-safeguarded Agricultural Land for Building.

The area proposed for building 1100 houses is 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.

1. Legal aspects.

Guildford Borough Council, unlike the other Surrey Councils, insists that there is a requirement for double the number of houses in this area compared with theirs. That estimate was provided by a firm which refuses to disclose how it came to that conclusion on the grounds of “commercial sensitivity”. Thus, the Council has no way of verifying how accurate this estimate is, or what assumptions were used in coming to this figure. It is imperative that this arbitrary figure be challenged, and another firm used who will be transparent in the assumptions it makes, so that a proper estimate can be used.

In summary, and in view of the points I have made above, I would be grateful if you would log my strong objections to the proposal to build 1100 houses between Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane in the village of Normandy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1186</th>
<th>Respondent: 15284385 / T.W. Turnill</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 wish to OBJECT most forcibly with the proposed development in Normandy between Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane. My reasons for objection are as follows:- Inadequate Infrastructure, especially the lack of suitable roads; flooding and Sewage problems leading to Health considerations; The Spurious "Need for a Secondary School"; The Impact on the Environment; The use of Red notated agricultural land Not safeguarded, and in the Green Belt for building 1100 houses; The lack of local consultation with GBC to discuss the desires of the Village, in line with the Governments declared policy of the need to ensure that the village actually WANTS the extra housing. I will expand on each.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
While I am extremely happy to see that Sites A46 and A47 have been removed from the local plan, I am concerned about the removal of Green Belt status for some of Guildford Road and Glaziers Lane. This removal would allow development out of keeping with the rest of the village, and encourage developers to re-apply for greater development on Sites A46 and A47.

Because of the danger of this, I wish to OBJECT most forcibly to any future major development in Normandy. My reasons for objection are as follows:-

1. **Inadequate Infrastructure.**

   The local traffic situation is already creaking. Both Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane are country roads, each having dangerous bridges associated with the railway line. These roads are on the borders of the previously planned development, while the northern edge is bordered by the A323, which is already extremely busy at peak times. The effect of the planned addition of 10,000 new homes within a ten mile radius of Normandy on that road will increase the traffic intolerably, for those cars trying to reach Guildford or Aldershot.

   Whenever there is an accident on the Hogs Back or A3, traffic tries to exit via Wanborough Hill to use either of the two lanes, neither of which is capable or designed to take that volume of traffic. Anyone who tries to access the A31 at peak traffic times from either the Puttenham or Wanborough directions will know how long the queues are, and the potential for accidents for traffic leaving the A31 at the Puttenham turn off. This could severely jeopardise Emergency traffic trying to access the local villages.

2. **Flooding and associated Sewage Problems.**

   Parts of Normandy, especially at the southern edge of the previously proposed development and in the area next to the Hoe stream, 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 previously proposed development. One property has already been flooded 5 times in the past years, and the 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 previously proposed development area at present allows natural drainage through the soil and trees; if this area were to be concreted over, the resultant run off of surface water would overwhelm the present system, causing even more flooding in the local area. I am not convinced that an underground tank to take excess water and release it in a controlled fashion would be able to cope with the increased amount of water which forecasters say we must expect with climate warming.

3. **Environmental Impact**

   The village of Normandy lies within an area of outstanding natural beauty close to the Surrey Hills to the South, and the Army Heathland to the North. It provides a welcome rural break between the towns of Aldershot and Guildford, and is in designated Green Belt. It features a wide range of wild life, including many endangered and protected species, and the previously proposed addition of 1100 households, with their associated cats, would decimate much of the wild life that lives here. In addition, the replacement of the present agricultural land with housing would remove a valuable habitat for all the wild creatures that have come to rely on the peaceful nature of the area.

4. **The use of non-safeguarded Agricultural Land for Building.**

   The area that was proposed for building 1100 houses is 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: PSLPA16/828  Respondent: 15299169 / Laurel Kitchen  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am a resident of Normandy village and I feel compelled to write to you with my objections to the proposed development in our village.

I object strongly to the building proposal as we are a small village with a mixed demographic in ages we do not have the requirement for a secondary school in our village and for at least the next 11 years the majority of pupils would be required to commute into the site. This would put both the rail transport and the roads (which are single traffic roads) under immense pressure. In conjunction to this to walk either way on Glaziers Lane or Westwood Lane there is not a continuous pavement if you walk from the station to the new entrance on to the proposed site you need to cross Glaziers Lane 3 times, this without the aid of any crossing patrol, to meet these requirements you would then hold up traffic travelling from Worplesdon, Wood Street and Pirbright travelling towards the Hogs Back. There are other secondary schools in this area with the capacity and traffic links to accommodate these pupils.

In addition to this I object as the size of the housing development as it is disproportionate to the size of our village doubling its population without giving any thought to the quality of anyone's life. This is a purely for profit development. It does not take into consideration the transport issues that another 2,000 adults and 1500 secondary pupils will cause. The expansion of the road network is not possible and the stress on the 2 bridges for the railway one which is single file traffic only would bring both noise, pollution and congestion. We also have close links to the Thames Basin Heath Protection Area and a development of this magnitude will cause damage to the wildlife we work hard to preserve.

I also object as I feel that our health provision in this area would be totally inadequate. We have a doctor's surgery at Manor Fruit Farm which would be unable to deal with another 2,000 residents at its current size and there is no thought to enlarge the site. Also our A&E department and other facilities at The Royal Surrey Hospital would need enlargement to cope with this size influx. Neither of these points have been provided for with any cash provision.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/926  Respondent: 15314977 / Magaret Cook  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write to vote against the Westwood lane, Normandy, Guildford plan.

The road is too busy, it leads to the Hogs back which has plenty of problems without extra traffic added.

Secondly the railway bridge is too narrow to cope with more cars.
Thirdly, when it rains we have a flood problem in various parts of Normandy. Please withdraw the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/929  Respondent: 15315105 / P.M. Baker  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Dear Council members. I have lived in Normandy for thirty years, it is a lovely village community and the fact that it is surrounded by green belt has kept the people close and friendly with each other, it is in other words a typical English village, with a village school, doctors and village hall. The roads are narrow and twisty and classified as lanes with pavements mostly only on one side of the lane.

Your proposed plans, to drop into the centre of the village a "small town", doubling the size of the village with over a thousand houses and a fifteen hundred pupil secondary school have absolutely shocked and horrified the people of Normandy.

The proposed site A46 is classified as green belt and the effects such a development would have on the village are catastrophic. The roads are struggling to cope with rush hour traffic now and both junctions onto the A323 are often congested and prone to minor accidents. The increased volume into such a tiny area would have a huge impact on the lives and environment of everyone in the village. The need for a secondary school has not been proven with plenty of available spaces in other schools in the surrounding area and the impact on these existing schools, reducing their intake of pupils and therefore funding, would have a very detrimental knock on effect.

This plan for Normandy is madness, and we wish you to reject it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/395  Respondent: 15328705 / Robin Jones  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The revised local plan shows a practical evaluation of the needs for building development in the Guildford area and the best possible areas for such development. The exclusion of sites A46 and A47 in the village of Normandy has my full support. The infrastructure of Normandy, with its C and D roads is at capacity. Major investment in bridge changes; road widening and new pavements; new roundabouts and traffic lights; improved waste and surface water disposal; a new sewage disposal system; better street lighting and a larger doctor's surgery must all be dealt with, in part or in total before any new developments could be considered. When these important investments have been made I would support, as would many villagers, small developments in selected areas, but we could never support the mass development of a large housing complex on green belt land which would destroy forever a beautiful part of rural England.
1. Objection to proposal to inset Normandy and Flexford from the Green Belt

We object to the insetting of Normandy and Flexford from the Green Belt on the grounds that these areas do contribute to 'openness of the Green Belt'.

According to the NPPF "the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence". 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". We 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. It will break up wildlife corridors and degrade habitats. 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.

Removing large areas of the Green Belt cannot possibly be considered 'sustainable'. FNW totally oppose the Insetting of the Green Belt encompassing and surrounding Normandy and Flexford.

1. Concluding comments

It is evident from our knowledge of the proposed development site that the area covered by the Plan for Normandy and Flexford is of major importance for biodiversity and wildlife. Normandy Parish is one of the most wildlife rich districts in Guildford, comprising seven SNCIs, many additional UK BAP Priority sites, together with areas of ancient woodland. A significant part of the environmentally internationally important TBH SPA is within the Normandy Parish.

The natural environment in Normandy and Flexford will be irreparably damaged if replaced by houses with small gardens, schools, shops and playing fields. There will inevitably be a significant net loss of Biodiversity, an impoverished natural environment and significantly reduced wildlife species in and around the area. Although the ancient woodlands will remain on site A46, their ecology will be in a degraded state due to damage to the trees and the life they support from roaming cats, dogs and people (by trampling, picking and uprooting plants, creating fires, foraging, light pollution, noise pollution, air pollution effects on lichens, fungi, invasions from gardens of non-native plants etc.) (see The Woodland Trust article specifically on this subject entitled: Impacts of nearby developments on ancient woodland - addendum by...
Luci Ryan, December 2012). Individual trees outside of the ancient woodlands could similarly be damaged.

A46 removes over 67ha of land rich in species of both animals and plants and offsets it with a SANG of probably 21ha, the minimum required. SANGS are for mixed use, and can never be as species rich as the land covered by A46, neither can small gardens and playing fields, so there would be a net loss of approximately 46ha of invaluable species rich land. There will be an additional loss of over Sha from A47, making a total loss of species rich land in Normandy and Flexford of Slha. The proximity of the housing development to the TBH SPA, and the size and likely condition of the proposed SANG, means that there will be an increase of dog walkers using the TBH SPA which will damage the fragile environment of this internationally important site and have a deleterious effect, particularly on rare ground nesting birds.

It is obvious that in putting forward this plan, GBC have completely ignored their own Policy 14 on the need to maintain Biodiversity and likewise ignored the NPPF and the UK BAP project with regard to biodiversity and habitat protection.

It is therefore our contention that the proposed development is unsustainable in that it does not meet the conditions set out in the NPPF (see 2.1 above). It contravenes the Framework in that the effect of Policies A46 and A47 will be to lead to the loss of irreplaceable habitats and decimation of populations of wildlife species.

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 Local Plan as there were no exceptional circumstances justified to remove this area from the green belt. Also the developments were excessive and the local infrastructure would not have been able to cope.

However, there are still a number of additional homes being built within the vicinity of Normandy which will put increased pressure on the road infrastructure.

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 a cut through from the A31 with a single track under the railways bridge.
4. The junction of Wanborough Hill, the B3000 and the A3 is already really bad.

The GBC need to ensure that appropriate infrastructure is put in place to ensure the roads can cope with the additional population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1255  Respondent: 15383425 / Christine Fordham  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The lack of need for a secondary school

According to Mr Spooner, a hospital or a school overcomes greenbelt protection however there is no legal evidence to support this statement. Also, the need for a new secondary school has not been proven with regard to existing pupils. There are many schools in the Guildford area that are able to accommodate for an increased demand in pupils and it seems unnecessary to build a school in a rural, mostly greenbelt area when there is no pressing demands for a school to be built.

I hope that you take these points on board and listen to what the local people have to say about the matter.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/447  Respondent: 15407649 / Hywel Davies  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please find this letter / email supporting the removal of the above sites and that in my view any future planning will have a detrimental impact on the infrastructure being able to cope with such developments, i.e.: -

• Roads with increase in local traffic and the environmental damage - noise, pollution etc,
• Pressure on local amenities such as health centres / hospitals.
• Negative impact on Green Belt land.
Increased pressure on domestic services such as the national grid, gas suppliers, sewage treatment etc.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

We are writing to object to Guildford Borough Council's Draft Local Plan. We believe Normandy is unsuited to the sort of expansion proposed. We are particularly concerned by the high levels of development proposed which completely disregard Green Belt protection.

It is clear that GBC has taken no account of one of the major purposes of the Green Belt which is the prevention of urban sprawl. It is important that the rural farming village of Normandy retains its green belt status. No account has been taken by GBC of the concept of "openness" and yet this is one of the main purposes of Green Belt, as evidenced by the Planning Inspectorate in recent appeal decisions (indicating they recognise that land contained in Normandy contributes to the openness of Green Belt).

NEW SECONDARY SCHOOL

We object to the proposal for the 1100 housing development on Land parcel A46 because there is no proven need for a new Secondary School. And without a school there is no need for the associated development plan.

Currently neighbouring Secondary Schools - Kings College and Park Barn - are under-utilised (the latter by 57%). The Head Teachers of Ash Manor School and Kings College have expressed a willingness to expand once they are full. They have the facilities to do this. Secondary Schools to the west of the Borough are under subscribed by 736. Another 480 places will be available at the new Technical Collage (2018) and there are approved expansions at Guildford County School and St Peters. The new Hoe Valley School will have 120 places available per year, 25 places this year not taken (no catchment area). Developments in teaching and learning (independent learning) mean that Secondary Schools could become obsolete in the near future. In addition there is a falling birth rate in Guildford.

Surrey County Council has failed to prove an undisputed need for a 7 Form Entry Secondary School as well as the availability of financing this to make it a reality.

With No Proven Need there can be -

No New Secondary School and Therefore No Housing Development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Due to excess traffic my wife nearly lost her life at crossroads at end of Glaziers lane where it joins Aldershot road. The car which hit her was doing in excess of speed limit

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/532  Respondent: 15456705 / M Wicks  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

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 support with regard to the removal of the site A46 (1,100 homes and school on land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford), and site A47 (50 homes on the land to the east of the Paddocks, Flexford). I feel that the infrastructure, particularly the road network, would not be able to cope with the addition of such large developments. Living on the Guildford Road I already witness first hand the current congestion created at particular times of the day, along with that due to the railway crossing at Ash and have concerns over the current quotas of new housing being built in the immediate surrounding areas on the road network between Aldershot and Guildford. Surely other solutions should be looked at further and seriously when it comes to the council meeting its needs for the development of new housing, including the re-use of already developed land, infill on undeveloped parcels of land within urbanised areas, or Brown land sites. New building should definitely not be taking place on Green Belt land.

I would also like to object to the removal of homes in the areas of the Guildford Road, the northern end of Glaziers Lane, Flexford, the Waldon Cottages and the Palm House Nurseries traveller site. As I have been informed, placing these sites outside of the Green Belt could in theory enable development and give a much greater success for future planning applications. This I am most opposed to as it too as it gives potential to encroach on an ever threatened and decreasing Green Belt, an important natural divide between the urbanisation of Aldershot, Hampshire and Guildford, Surrey.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/478  Respondent: 15460801 / Melanie Williams  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to support the removal of Site A46 from the GBC Local Plan due to;
• The change of the exceptional circumstances that were used in the previous plan to justify the development of this site.
• This land is Greenbelt land
• The minor roads that surround the site
• The demand that would be placed on our Doctors surgery

I wish to support the removal of Site A47 from the GBC Local Plan due to;
• The site continuing to meet the criteria of a Site of Nature & Conservation Interest (SNCI)
• The land is Greenbelt and should remain protected as per the above status for current and future generations
• To prevent settlement sprawl
I wish to object to the removal of greenbelt status of the:
• Homes in Guildford Road,
• Land at the Northern end of Glaziers Lane,
• Land in Flexford
• Walden Cottages
• Palm House Nurseries Traveler Site

I appeal to GBC to consider the environmental impact and improve existing infrastructure ahead of committing to future construction developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1954  Respondent: 15462497 / Liberty Lawson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to respond to the GBC Local Plan 2016

I am 17 and have been living in Normandy for most of my life.

I love it here and really don’t want our village to double in size.

The idea of having a secondary school seems unnecessary as I managed to get to Ash Manor ok and am now going to Farnborough 6th form

The thought of having more cars on the already busy roads seems madness to me.

I am just learning to drive and the roads couldn’t cope with hundreds more.

I love Normandy and Flexford because its green and open.

So I object to the Local Plan as its proposes twice as many houses in this village for no obvious reason.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1964  Respondent: 15462913 / Anne Concanen  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

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 building development in Normandy for the following reasons.

• The proposed release of green belt land for building will mean a dense housing development totally out of keeping with the Village of Normandy and the existing rural environment. I have seen no assessments of the
effect that development will have on the Green Belt or have been given any reason why this particular area of
Green Belt has been considered for release.
• Any benefit provided by the scale of development would be negated by the damage done to the environment. Supposed benefits such as a new school would not be necessary without the housing and surely the existing children in the village should be allowed to explore their green space. Dense development will also destroy large areas which are valuable habitats for wildlife.
• The area under consideration is on heavy clay and there have been serious flooding problems. To cover this space with concrete seems to go against all that has been learnt about building developments and flooding.
• No attention seems to have been paid to the transport infrastructure of the area. At the North end, Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane lead to the only crossing of the A31 and giving access to the A3. Already roads leading to Guildford, Farnham and Aldershot are gridlocked during the rush hours. A large number of extra people travelling during these time would be insupportable. In addition, travelling would be more dangerous with greater traffic jams and accidents more likely.

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 plan to build new houses around the Normandy and Flexford area. To my knowledge the main reason this housing plan is even being considered is that there is supposedly a need for a new school. Not only has there already been development of a new school in Mayford – which is inside the catchment area – but all the local schools' head teachers have indicated that there is no need for a new school. In fact the school that is nearest to the announced site, the primary school Ash Manor is under-subscribed. Therefore the new school would only be filled – and probably only partially filled at that – by the new residents of the supposed housing plan. This means that there are absolutely no exceptional circumstances due to a necessity for a school.

As Normandy is located squarely inside the Green Belt, it is surrounded by Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty as well as Sites of Special Scientific Interest. The areas specifically affected by the housing proposal consists of pastures, farmland, hedgerows, trees and grasslands. These support a wide variety of wildlife which keeps biodiversity high and the surrounding environment fertile. The Green Belt was established to reduce urban sprawl to have areas with clear air and natural beauty. It is explicitly stated that it requires exceptional circumstances to build on the Green Belt and, as I have previously explained, there are no exceptional circumstances in this situation.

The final point that has been brought up in an attempt to justify this housing plan is that more people are necessary to make Normandy a thriving village community. It already is a thriving community. We have a primary school, a nursery school, a surgery, a pharmacy. Attempting to triple the number of residents will only worsen community as it is simply creating an urban environment in a community based around its countryside. Adding to the numbers will increase traffic to unbearable levels; the Hog's Back already has terrible congestion in rush hour, and as the railway line severely limits the way new roads could be introduced between Glazier's Land and Westwood Lane, there will be no way to alleviate any of the traffic.

My final point is that the only way you have to fund these proposed plans is using public funds. The tax payers money should not be wasted on a housing plan that uses its own “potential” benefits to attempt to justify itself.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2312  Respondent: 15484129 / Annette Wright  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to raise my concerns about the proposed development in Normandy.

Firstly, I would like to say that I am not objecting to the development per se. My family and I live directly adjoining the land in question and can see that there would be benefits to some development in the area, in particular more local amenities such as a convenience store, pub and post office facility. A reasonable number of new houses would not be objectionable to a lot of people within the village but 1,100 plus schools, nursing homes, retails units, travelling show people pitches, etc risks overwhelming the established community.

I am sure that you will receive many more detailed and more eloquently written objections regarding the inadequate infrastructure in terms of flood risks (of which we already suffer), traffic congestion, pressures on local GP services and the detrimental effect on wildlife, all of which are valid concerns and I am sure you will consider very carefully.
As a family we have young children and are aware of the difficulty of getting into a 'good' school in Guildford. We initially did believe that there was a need for another secondary school in the area, knowing many families who have not been able to get their first choice and have subsequently been offered schools a good distance away. However, we have now learnt through our excellent County Councillor, Keith Witham, that 3 of our local secondary schools - Ash Manor, Kings College and The Connaught school, are actually significantly undersubscribed. Surely it would be better to invest in bringing these schools up to a decent standard so that local people would choose to send their children there, rather than building another large school that appears to be unnecessary? Kings, in particular, would be just as accessible from the proposed Blackwell Farm development as Normandy.

I am concerned that the layout of the development will not encourage new residents to integrate into the established village society that many have worked hard to build up. The village has raised funds and campaigned hard over the years to build the village hall, to get fitness equipment and children's play areas put into the local parks. Residents in the new estate will have no need to leave their enclave, not even to send their children to the already established primary school (what will happen to Wyke school if the plans for the primary and secondary schools are approved?).

I was also rather concerned to note that the area next to our property, which is a known flood zone, now appears to have increased in size. Previously the flood risk area was located alongside the stream or drainage ditch at the far side of the field. It is now shown as encroaching onto our property due to re-landscaping of the area. This would obviously have significant implications for us in terms of insurance and re-sale, not to mention increasing the problems that we already face with overflowing drains from the main road and the back-flow onto our property.

I would like to think that, as an organisation who work on behalf of the local population, you will listen very carefully to the issues raised during this consultation period.

Best wishes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2738  Respondent: 15571489 / Kimberly Tyler  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My objection is based on the following points:

1. **Greenbelt: This area is protected Greenbelt land and there is not supposed to be any development taking place here. This land is protected and this is an undisputed fact.** This should not be changed in any way just because an over-zealous development company are interested in making as much money as possible. A decision in favour of this development will be to the absolute detriment of the citizens that actually have to live with the consequences.

2. **Impact on Residents: This will be a 100% increase in the number of homes in this area.** The reason most of the current residents moved out here in the country is because we want to live in a rural setting. This development will destroy that and goes against everything the citizens of this area want. You will be hard pressed to find one local citizen who actually thinks this plan is a good idea. This proposal has been extremely stressful for residents and will continue to be until this draft is denied.

3. **Wildlife: There are a number of protected wild animals currently living on the proposed area** including deer, foxes, hedgehogs, pheasants, various birds including great spotted and green woodpeckers, adders, doormice, frogs and toads. The development will without a doubt destroy their ecosystems and drive them from the area or perhaps even kill them. We have a family of three deer living in the adjoining forest next to our house and this year the female gave birth to a fawn. We have really enjoyed seeing them in the fields and my daughter
considers them part of her family as well. If this development were to happen, the most heart-breaking effect from this will be the detrimental impact this will have on the wildlife of this area.

1. **Traffic Issues:** The impact on traffic will cause major delays on Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane. The infrastructure simply cannot cope with the huge volumes of cars from the extra houses that they want to build. No highway improvements can be made to help cope with this. We have unfortunately already had two motorist fatalities, as well as countless pets getting killed, on this road and this is not something that we want to have happen again. Glaziers Lane is a very narrow road and there’s no way it can be widened. Cars already travel at a high rate of speed down the lane anyway, so I cannot imagine the impact thousands of more homes will have on this lane. I am a mother of a young daughter and I’m already afraid to let her play in the front yard, due to the traffic on this road. Please do not allow this development company to jeopardize the safety of citizens in this area.

2. **Secondary school?** A secondary school appears to have been offered by the developers. But why? **There is currently no existing 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 developers have portrayed that they have a solid plan because they are offering a school, but a school is not even needed, so what is the point of this? There is no logic in this. Additionally, 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.

3. **Light pollution:** The development and lights will affect the views from Surrey Hills Area of Natural Beauty.

4. **Need?** With Brexit, migration will likely fall, so this will reduce the demand for housing. Brownfield sites should be built on first.

5. **Flooding and drainage:** 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. After perusing the developer Taylor-Wimpey’s social media page, I am not convinced that they will be able to cope with any drainage, flooding, or general construction issues. Please see below for screenshots of what has been posted by their very own customers on Taylor-Wimpey’s public social media page. This is only a small sampling of the complaints – please feel free to visit Taylor-Wimpey’s Facebook page, Trustpilot, and BBC Watchdog for the full impact of how this company operates. Please find some of the customer feedback below.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3146  **Respondent:** 15572705 / Kate Dann  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the scale of the proposed building expansion on green belt land in Normandy, labelled A46 /A47 on the strategic plan.

As a resident of Normandy for more than 40 years I treasure the rural aspect that harbours ancient woodlands, protected species, charitable enterprises and provides an oasis of calm traditional countryside that serves the 3 sizeable towns that surround it– Guildford, Farnham and Aldershot. The footpaths and woods are well used by walkers who use the short train journey from the above towns to reach and enjoy open countryside.

I do recognise the need for the provision of more varied housing, not only to fulfil the needs of the strategic plan but also to keep the village vitalised, but this should not be at the expense of the preservation of our green belt and the swamping of the existing village and residents. We do not need an extensive retail space as there are several in the area plus small
supermarkets. We already provide space for fairground storage and travellers’ accommodation, more of which are included in the plan which seems excessive.

The proposed development would more than double the housing stock in the village. Once this land is built on it will forever change the environment and character of the area and we will be left with one big urban sprawl. We should protect the spaces we have and look to infill in already developed areas or build small contained developments that will enhance the environment instead of destroying it.

- The infrastructure cannot support this plan in any way. The village is sandwiched between the A31 and A323, two small country lanes, Wanborough Hill and Glaziers Lane connect these 2 roads. They also also serve the A3 and provide an access route to the M25, Blackwater Valley Route and M3. If anything unusual happens on these roads, such as road works, accidents, floods, the whole village becomes gridlocked as traffic attempts to find alternative routes. So a large part of my objection is based on the fact that our roads could not support the traffic from another 1000+ houses, and there seems little scope for altering these in any significant way.
- The proposed land for the development is green belt land. It is proposed that by building a secondary school this would override the protection that this status offers it. There is no proof that a school is needed in this area as the local schools are NOT fully subscribed. Incoming students from outside the area would create more traffic on already overcrowded roads. There is an argument that the train station would provide a good transport link for both commuters and students but the cost of train tickets, especially for a family with more that 1 child, are prohibitive.
- I have no technical knowledge but from walking the footpaths, woods and fields for the last 40 years I know how soggy and wet the ground all around is, even in the summer time. This does not bode well for the developments. How will the ground water round the buildings be dispersed and how will the environment be affected by the extra ground works that will be needed to service the needs of the housing. Will you be building houses that in the future will be white elephants as they could be uninsurable or unsustainable due to flood/water threat.
- A final point is the disruption that such sustained building would make on the area for several years, with heavy works vehicles that would put additional strain on small country lanes and overcrowded local roads and cause distress and inconvenience to the local community should the development as proposed go ahead.

To sum up I believe that this development as proposed is led not by the need of the community, either local or wider, but by greed of a few developers.

The council should try a more imaginative and sustainable plan and I object to the plan as proposed.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Overall, I do not accept GBC’s suggestion that we have *exceptional circumstances* that require the compulsory change of land designation in Normandy and Flexford from Greenbelt land to Residential.

I also do not accept the suggestion that we need more schools and that these should be built again on Greenbelt land in Normandy; I understand that based on our current population of the local areas we have spare capacity within the education system.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2904  **Respondent:** 15579617 / Nicola Wilson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

We are **objecting** to the proposed Normandy Development plans. We outline our concerns over the proposed developments at Normandy and Flexford. Our concerns are:

1. Flooding at Little Flexford, earmarked for a proposed development of 50 properties (including flats) will increase and will be detrimental to the current local properties’. Dropping 1100 homes in this rural area is a recipe for chaos for roads along with the extra amenities’ to cope with such an influx of dwellings on plains that flood in heavy downpours.

2. Surely its more appropriate to build more homes around Guildford with close ties to Guildford rather than dumping families in one area where they will be forced to travel back and forth on already gridlocked roads which barely cope with the amount of traffic flow we currently experience.

3. 7 temporary pitches already at Palm Nurseries, 2 traveller sites (one of which is already for entertaining travellers) at Cobbets Hill Road and Whittles Drive.

4. Grade 3 arable and pastoral land, in the last 6 years 2000 square kilometres of such land has been lost to developments at the loss of local farmers’ income.

5. Increase in light pollution next to ancient woodland and visible from Surrey Hills AONB.

6. A large number of homes will be boxed in by a single lane railway bridge, at the junctions of A323 at Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane. Thus also compounding the traffic congestion in the surrounding road and communities and increasing the number of traffic accidents. Our local roads and “A” roads are grinding to a halt at peak times with massively increased exhaust pollution of NoX and CO2, this will increase even further if the proposed homes and a huge secondary school (with daily drop offs and pick ups) if developed. NoX and CO2are dangerous to the elderly and children who live here already.

7. The proposal of building a 1500 pupil secondary school in Normandy is beyond belief when King’s College at Park Barn and Ash Manor are undersubscribed. St Peter’s at Chertsey and Guildford County School are planning to be expanding in the near future. There is no legal evidence to back up Cllr Spooner’s comment that a hospital or school “trumps” greenbelt planning policy nor does it provide “exceptional circumstance” to remove Normandy’s Green Belt from the Metropolitan Green Belt. There is no need for a further secondary school.

8. Ignoring past verdicts of previous planning inspectors regarding green fields’ contribution to the “openness” of the Green Belt.

9. We understand that developers are hoarding brown field sites which can provide 650,000 homes and there are further brown field sites available for another million homes. Building on Green Belt land in Normandy and Flexford will be overdevelopment and wreck our green fields. Brownfield sites means regeneration rather than building on open fields which is destructive and disastrous to our environment.
9. Use should be made of redundant, energy hungry offices in Guildford, by turning them into much needed housing.

10. Breaking of election promises was highlighted and reprinted in The Times on 25th April 2016, “We will always protect the Green Belt and make sure planning decisions are made by local people.” The green belt will not be protected if the developments at Normandy and Flexford go ahead.

11. Overdevelopment here in Normandy and Flexford will be a tremendous strain on an already overworked and stretched GP practice here at Glaziers Lane and Fairlands – we already have to wait over 3 weeks to see a GP for 7 minutes or less.

12. The Council do not appear to have any balanced plan as to how to build extra housing in a thoughtful and sensitive way.

13. The irony of this all, it took over 2 years for GBC planning department and the Millers at Little Flexford to agree on the demolition and rebuild of a property that was of suitable size and height that is sympathetic to the Green Belt. GBC have earmarked two flood ridden paddocks at Little Flexford for developing 50 homes. This is the icing on the cake.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2927  Respondent: 15581857 / Anthony Hillard  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have lived in Normandy for 11 years. Before that I lived in Worplesdon for 45 years and was a partner in the Fairlands medical practice. The practice area included Normandy (and beyond) and I was therefore very familiar with the village long before I moved here. A few years before I retired I was the lead partner in building the branch surgery and pharmacy in Glaziers Lane.

I object very strongly to the draft plan and make the following comments.

1. There seems to be no evidence whatever for the need for a new secondary school, here or elsewhere to the west of Guildford. From what I have read and heard the existing schools are not at all full and are capable of expansion if need be. Therefore if the school is not needed there can be no case for building all (or indeed any) of the houses which will at least double the population of the village and change its character for ever. Although it is obviously easier for GBC to deal with a few large-scale developers in order to build the target number of new houses, thereby destroying large areas of green belt, there has to be a way of allowing small local developments in Normandy and elsewhere.

1. I am confused as to the linking of Normandy and Flexford as if they are two separate places. This may suit planning ideas but in reality they both make up Normandy. I have never met a patient or anyone else who tells me that they live in Flexford. To add to the confusion Wanborough station is in the Flexford end of Normandy and was renamed in the late 19th century at the request of Mr Gladstone who lived for while in Wanborough Manor and his many political visitors were confused by its original name.

1. If this development were to take place the increase in traffic would be horrendous, not least the construction traffic over at least several years. The proposed site is bounded on the N by the A323 from which there would be no access without the demolition of a house, or several. On the E there is Glaziers Lane, a D road, from which there could be some access, and on the W, Westwood Lane, a C road with space for access. Both have
significant hazards to traffic which would be very expensive to improve. The hump railway bridge in Glaziers Lane is narrow, two cars can just about pass each other, but nothing bigger. Westwood Lane has a bridge under the railway which is narrower still with a chicane and traffic is “managed” by priority arrows which are often ignored or misunderstood. (I write from regular experience). But no-one has been killed recently so it probably won't change. The height restriction excludes tall lorries and double-decker buses.

1. When permission was given recently for 16 units just off Westwood Lane there were serious concerns about the adequacy of the drains and there were accounts of houses nearby with sewage overflowing into their property after heavy rain. It seems probable that massive expenditure on the drainage system may be needed to service a large new development. I'm sure that members of the local Flood Forum will offer informed comment on this.

1. I am aware of serious environmental and legal issues and am content to leave these to experts for comment.

1. I note that a pub is included in the proposed amenities together with shops. The developer ought to be aware that there used to be two pubs in Normandy and three very nearby in Ash. One in Ash survives.

1. I am not aware that any consideration has been given to the medical care of the 3000+ extra population. The building in Glaziers Lane which my practice built would need considerable enlargement (intruding the car park) and the co-operation of GBC's planners to do this. Or maybe relocation to the new development with easy access for all the population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I need to object to the proposal in the Local Plan to build 1,100 new homes and a secondary school in the Normandy and Flexford area (site 368).

My main concern if this construction goes ahead, is that a pleasant rural community will become an urban sprawl. This area is part of Surrey Hills Area of Natural Beauty, but the wonderful views looking up to, and down from the Hogs Back will disappear. The wildlife will also disappear as the building work destroys the hedgerows and grasslands which form their natural habitat. The numbers of small mammals, birds and bees will all be heavily reduced. Wildlife in the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area will likewise be severely affected as it is just one kilometre away in Ash and Pirbright. My second cause for concern is the lack of suitable infrastructure to cope with a development of this magnitude. The roads bordering the site will not cope with the extra traffic which will definitely be generated. Westwood Lane on the west is only a C road, while Glaziers Lane on the east is just an unclassified D road. Both roads have railway bridges which limit the traffic flow. These roads are already very busy, especially during rush hour. The addition of heavy lorries initially to build the development, followed by thousands of cars driven by users of the development, will soon cause gridlock.

So to summarise, please do not let a beautiful rural area, which is a haven to wildlife, become a heavily congested urban sprawl, just because it is a convenient place to build the majority of houses demanded by government.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
My wife and I would like to communicate our support for the removal of site A46 and A47 for 1,150 homes from the local plan. We believe that the local infrastructure and particularly the road system would not be able to support such a development.

When we moved to this area it was largely because of the surrounding open spaces and countryside. We therefore object to the removal from the green belt of homes in Guildford road, the northern end of Glaziers lane, Flexford, Walden Cottages and Palm House Nursaries traveller site as it would lead to much higher density developments and spoil the character of the local area. The gradual erosion of the green belt to developers trying to make a fast buck is something we expect our local politicians to defend us from.

We understand the requirement for some local house development and, speaking as residents who's homes access directly on to Guildford road, we believe that road improvements are already needed. The ridiculous queues caused by the level crossing at Ash station are not acceptable and if more homes are developed it would bring rush hour traffic to a standstill and we would become prisoners in our homes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1) Unnecessary Secondary School in Normandy:

Both King's College and Ash Manor Secondary Schools are significantly under-subscribed. The existing headmasters are looking to the council to allocate extra funds to improve their existing schools. Not build new ones.

It is highly unlikely that 1100 new homes + existing Normandy homes will produce enough pupils for this new school + the environment effects of additional traffic on the already poor roads.

2) Fairground Pitches:

We already have an encampment for Fairground people, which I believe has at least 200 people living there on the edge of Normandy. This is "our fair share" within Guildford Borough. Plus we already have at least 3-4 Mobile home sites also.

3) Retail Space:

I have been a Normandy resident since 1961. For whatever reason, the existing villagers have let 10 retail business / post offices fail over the years. People just shop at supermarkets / retail parks or online.

4) Traffic Chaos:

Traffic in Normandy is frequently chaotic due to cars diverting from the A31 and A331 when there are incidents. They'll go along the A323 or Westwood Lane (to the A323). Coupled with difficult access to Wyke Primary School (which has doubled in size in the last 5 years), the impact of a 1,500 student is simply unimaginable. This would completely blight the lives of everyone in the village, with Gridlock.
5) Infrastructure - Sewage & Drainage Issues:

The sewage system in Normandy has been problematic since Orchard Close / Orchard Way was developed in 1960. Combined with Culls Road / Christmas Pie area, it is totally inadequate. What on earth would the infrastructure cost of such a basic need for hygiene & sanitation be?

The problem is compounded by a high water-table which over the years has eventually led to a Flood Forum, chaired by our MP, Jonathan Lord being set up. Logically, any increase in housing stock & other buildings will have a catastrophic effect on drainage capacity.

6) Infrastructure - Railway Bridges

The 2 railway bridges (Glaziers Lane & Westwood Lane) have been identified as problematic by Network Rail for over a decade. In particular, the bridge in Westwood Lane is a death-trap with an awkward exit from Beech Lane, and an awkward "road kink" in the design of the bridge which has caught people out with catastrophic effect.

TO SUM UP:

I thoroughly refute the proposal for what I consider to be gross over-development of Normandy, given all its infrastructure inadequacies of roads / bridges / sewage & drainage. Also, it is totally unacceptable to house any further fairground families. The village has more than its fair share. Instead, I propose that we continue at a similar rate of in-filling of about 150 residential properties over the lifetime of the plan (15 years), which must include some badly-needed starter homes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The infrastructure cannot support this plan in any way. The village is sandwiched between the A31 and A323, two small country lanes, Wanborough Hill and Glaziers Lane connect these 2 roads. They also also serve the A3 and provide an access route to the M25, Blackwater Valley Route and M3. If anything unusual happens on these roads, such as road works, accidents, floods, the whole village becomes gridlocked as traffic attempts to find alternative routes. So a large part of my objection is based on the fact that our roads could not support the traffic from another 1000+ houses, and there seems little scope for altering these in any significant way.

The proposed land for the development is green belt land. It is proposed that by building a secondary school this would override the protection that this status offers it. There is no proof that a school is needed in this area as the local schools are NOT fully subscribed. Incoming students from outside the area would create more traffic on already overcrowded roads. There is an argument that the train station would provide a good transport link for both commuters and students but the cost of train tickets, especially for a family with more than one child, are prohibitive.

I have no technical knowledge but from walking the footpaths, woods and fields for the last 40 years I know how soggy and wet the ground all around is, even in the summer time. This does not bode well for the developments. How will the ground water round the buildings be dispersed and how will the environment be affected by the extra ground works that will be needed to service the needs of the housing. Will you be building houses that in the future will be white elephants as they could be uninsurable or unsustainable due to flood/water threat.

A final point is the disruption that such sustained building would make on the area for several years, with heavy works vehicles that would put additional strain on small country lanes and overcrowded local roads and cause distress and inconvenience to the local community should the development as proposed go ahead.

To sum up I believe that this development as proposed is led not by the need of the community, either local or wider, but by greed of a few developers.

The council should try a more imaginative and sustainable plan and I object to the plan as proposed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3729  Respondent: 15619201 / Michael Conoley Associates (James Deverill)  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This representation reviews the Guildford borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites document, currently out to consultation, and details our comments on particular draft policies. It also suggests an alternative site, for which we are the agent, which we believe is suitable for delivering much needed additional housing within the borough. The site proposed is land east of Glaziers Lane, Normandy, Guildford, Surrey GU3 2EB.

... It is considered that the site detailed previously is more suitable for delivering much needed additional housing within the borough than some allocated sites within the draft Local Plan. This site is within a very sustainable location, available for development and deliverable within 1-5 years.

The site has been assessed previously by the Council and it was concluded that if sufficient housing land cannot be found in the urban areas and village settlements, this site is potentially suitable for residential development.
The position of the site, adjacent to the Flexford settlement boundary, ensures much needed additional housing could be provided in a sustainable location with only a modest indentation into the existing Green Belt.

The site is more appropriate for residential development in landscaping and ecological terms than other sites allocated within the draft Local Plan for Normandy and Flexford.

The site is in a sustainable location adjacent to Wanborough Station and on bus and cycle routes. The site has easy highways access on to the A31 Hogs Back.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:** [MCA Representations 2016 submission Glaziers Lane.pdf](#) (450 KB)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4560</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 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 representation reviews the Guildford borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites document, currently out to consultation, and details our comments on particular draft policies. It also suggests an alternative site, for which we are the agent, which we believe is suitable for delivering much needed additional housing within the borough. The site proposed is land east of Glaziers Lane, Normandy, Guildford, Surrey GU3 2EB.

... It is considered that the site detailed previously is more suitable for delivering much needed additional housing within the borough than some allocated sites within the draft Local Plan. This site is within a very sustainable location, available for development and deliverable within 1-5 years.

The site has been assessed previously by the Council and it was concluded that if sufficient housing land cannot be found in the urban areas and village settlements, this site is potentially suitable for residential development.

The position of the site, adjacent to the Flexford settlement boundary, ensures much needed additional housing could be provided in a sustainable location with only a modest indentation into the existing Green Belt.

The site is more appropriate for residential development in landscaping and ecological terms than other sites allocated within the draft Local Plan for Normandy and Flexford.

The site is in a sustainable location adjacent to Wanborough Station and on bus and cycle routes. The site has easy highways access on to the A31 Hogs Back.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4040</th>
<th>Respondent: 15650145 / Paul Iverson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

Guildford Borough Council Local Plan sites A46 and A47
I am writing to protest against the suggested large scale housing developments in Flexford and Normandy. The present population of Normandy at the 2011 census was 2981 and the proposed large scale developments double the population. I believe Normandy would no longer be a village and would become a commuter suburb of Guildford without its own identity.

I think the proposal to build over 1,000 houses will ultimately prove to be an embarrassing mistake that will incur substantial costs to rectify. I understand you require supporting rationale and while my thoughts may be similar to other Normandy residents, this is only because we share the same opinions.

My first concern is the proposal to build a secondary school as I don’t believe there is a need. I understand other secondary schools in the local area have spare capacity and are willing to expand, should future needs require greater capacity. Under capacity schools don’t appear to be a good use of limited funds and I’m not convinced they would provide the best education for the children. I understand schools work on local catchment areas but parents request places for their children based upon good school reputation, facilities, safety and a whole range of other criteria.

Linked to the provision of a new school would be the access and additional traffic on the local roads. Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lanes are both “lanes” and are fairly narrow “c” category with a railway line crossing either over or under the road. Westwood Lane has a low bridge with a height restriction that cannot accommodate double decker buses or high sided lorries. Traffic is also limited to one vehicle at a time and traffic accidents affecting rail bridges have a detrimental effect on rail traffic.

Glaziers Lane has a road bridge over the railway with a bend on its apex where you cannot see vehicles approaching until either of you reach the top. Increasing traffic volumes will increase the likelihood of road traffic accidents and again these could affect the Reading to Gatwick railway line. I believe this railway bridge has just been repaired after cracking caused by heavy vehicles travelling over it.

I assume the roads would need to be widened and upgraded to accommodate the increased traffic, I don’t know whether this would be possible where the railway crosses the roads or whether this just creates pinch points.

The Guildford Road to the North of the proposed site is currently busy and there is already congestion if there is an accident on either the A31 Hogs Back or the A3. There is also congestion where parents take their children to school by car and when road works are necessary. Adding a secondary school, let alone 1,100 houses will cause daily congestion, further road traffic accidents and serious injuries. Recently a motorcyclist lost his life near to the church hall where flowers and candles are a constant memorial.

I work for a local insurance company that pays millions of pound per year following serious flooding and the Normandy site already has issues without a substantial new development. The soil doesn’t drain well and there is already a stream that runs East/West across the site. I know through my work that new housing has ensuing, bathrooms and downstairs toilets. I also know that concrete foundations, access roads and paved driveways add to surface water run off that will overload the existing drainage and sewerage systems. This is already a local problem but should the flooding deteriorate, this could affect property prices and the availability of affordable insurance. Whether residents would seek compensation from the Council for their financial losses would depend upon individual circumstances.

The water supply and drainage services would need to be upgraded as would the electric supplies as most of Normandy has overhead power lines. We are subject to frequent power cuts during stormy weather and while the developments planned would probably have underground cabling the electricity supply would still be unreliable unless the rest of the village overhead lines were replaced. To upgrade the electricity supply by underground cabling would be a very major and costly project.

I am no expert on the local wildlife although I understand Normandy is situated in the Green Belt with ancient woodland and grassland areas within the village boundaries. Surveys have revealed a diverse ecology and a large scale development would destroy many species as well as removing vital “green corridors” needed by the animals. I am told that both A46 and A47 sites have populations of hedgehogs, foxes, badgers, water voles, little owls, yellow hammers, sparrow hawks, fieldfaires, 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. Only last night I watched a couple of bats flying and feeding in my back garden.
I also understand Normandy Common and Normandy Pond are designated as SNCI areas so it would be irresponsible and irreversible if we were to lose our fauna and flora. It would also remove part of our green and pleasant land where villagers enjoy walking, relaxing and unwinding after a busy and stressful day at work.

I acknowledge the need to build more housing to meet the need of the population and am not against utilising brown-fill sites or very small scale developments. However, I must object strongly to the large scale developments planned for Normandy and Flexford for the reasons already given. It is simply not the right location for a development anywhere near this size.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/539 Respondent: 17205537 / Sarah Dyason Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write to support the removal of site A46 and A47 from the local plan, as I believe the infrastructure would be unable to cope with these developments, and that you would be building on green belt land, which also brings me to my objection to the removal from Green Belt the homes on Guildford Road northern end of Glaziers Lane, Flexford, Walden Cottages and Palm House Nurseries traveller site being placed outside the green belt, these areas contribute to the ‘openness of the Green Belt’ in our area of Normandy.

The views from the Hogs Back are outstanding and the Green Belt is vital for this to continue for future generations. I moved back to Normandy in 2016, as it was unchanged from my childhood years and I would like my children to have the countryside around them.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/115 Respondent: 17247105 / Brian & Sandra Grainger Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

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 peased that Normandy wifi not add further to this problem.
This year alone we have seen the chaos with our local roads created 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: pslp173/141  Respondent: 17275713 / Mandy Blackmore  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to support the removal of A46 and A47 from the local plan, because having lived in Normandy for 12+ years, I don't believe that the roads, sewage and power could deal with 1150 more houses. In the past few years, we have seen an increase in traffic and road problems, we have power cuts sometimes for days at a time and the area suffers flooding.

We moved here so that we could experience a slightly less hectic life with green fields and village atmosphere, but slowly bit by bit that is being lost with the closing of 2 village pubs and the threat of our green belt being bulldozed over. Stupidly we had assumed that being in green belt would offer us a level of protection from future developments.......

Whilst writing I would also like to say how bewildering it is to find random patches of land taken over by the travelling community without any recrimination.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/143  Respondent: 17275745 / Islam Kovaci  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I oppose object building homes on Guildford road. Northern end of Glaziers lane. Flexford. Walden cottages and palm house nurseries traveller site.

I also want to see the removal of site A46 - 1100 homes and school.

Removal of site A47 - 50 homes

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/259  Respondent: 17302017 / Neil Jones  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/784</th>
<th>Respondent: 17328609 / Mike Dean</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford</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><strong>Removal of sites A46 and A47</strong> – I support the removal of these two sites from the plan. This is Green Belt land and in any event the local infrastructure in terms of roads, sewage, flooding and other utilities cannot possibly cope with this development.</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: pslp173/362</th>
<th>Respondent: 17350433 / Pat Perrin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford</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 have lived in Normandy since 1976 having relocated from Kent. We eventually chose Normandy for all that it had to offer our family namely a beautiful rural setting surround by relatively open country side with nearby Guilford offering everything in the way of shopping, historical interest, leisure activities and good rail links into London.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fully support:-</td>
<td>Removal of site A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx 1100 housing units and large senior school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I wholeheartedly rejoice that this totally unacceptable proposal has been removed from the plan. The proposal to change open fields currently designated Green Belt and increase Normandy's population and housing density by over 100% and the unproven need for a secondary school to be situated in Normandy was grossly inappropriate. Normandy residents are already suffering from higher than expected traffic congestion with large double length lorries using Glaziers Lane (GL) to access the A31 and any traffic diversions when lanes on said A31 are closed, a very frequent occurrence. GL and Westwood Lane (WL) are country roads not designed to take this heavy traffic use without adding to what is already a problem for residents.

Another issue is the burden this proposal would have made on our oversubscribed primary school, our already overstretched GP practice (long waiting times for an appointment, up to 3 weeks and lack of any infrastructure to support major changes.

removal of site A47

50 residential housing units

I have lived in the Paddocks since newly built in 1976 and was delighted to hear that this inappropriate proposal was removed from the plan. The only access the to the new development would have been through the Paddocks which would have resulted in the possibility of a possible 100 additional vehicles entering/ leaving the Paddocks several times a day. Our exit road is already down to one lane caused by cars parked all day by users of the railway station. To exit The Paddocks is already a blind spot, especially to the right and most of my comments in A46 also apply.

Strongly object:

To All proposals to allow housing to built outside of the Green belt on land in and around Normandy and surrounding villages. Green Belt is there to ensure urbanisation linking one town to another with GBC local plan seemingly favouring that the vast majority would be to the west of Guildford. All of these proposal have a deeply detrimental effect on local villages, transport, health services, schools and more. The current infrastructure is just not in place to support this level of housing density.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/363  **Respondent:** 17350465 / Christopher Holton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Removal of site A46 and Site A47

I wish to register my support for the removal of these sites owing to the inability of the infrastructure to cope with developments of this magnitude, and the fact that this is Green Belt land.

Removal from the Green Belt of homes in Guildford Road, northern end of Glaziers lane, Flexford, Walden Cottages, and Palm House Nurseries traveller site:

I object to this as placing these homes outside of the Green Belt could enable development within these areas at a much higher density and will give greater success for future planning applications.

I also wish to object to the proposal for 10,000 homes in the Normandy Area again due to the inability of the infrastructure to cope.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/766  Respondent: 17405505 / Brian Middleton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to any further Traveller sites in our village and our village is already [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: pslp173/442  Respondent: 17412769 / Pauline Levy  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Removal of site A46 - 1,100 homes and school (land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford)

Removal of site A47 - 50 homes (land to the east of the Paddock, Flexford)

Wish to support removal of these sites due to the possible pressure on the infrastructure, i.e. roads and other amenities. Change in status of homes in that area from Green Belt and the effect of the appearance of the open countryside of this area. Can we afford to put further stress on these facilities!

To increase the impending possibility of further development in the general area would put intolerable density on the Guildford Road which is already an unpleasant necessity and surely detrimental to mental wellbeing and physical health. At a time when the general feeling is beginning to give more weight to these subjects and to learn that these effects are costly to the nation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/445  Respondent: 17412961 / Sandra Marshall  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I fully appreciate the necessity for building new houses particularly affordable ones and am in favour of small developments distributed fairly over the county.
However I object to the numbers proposed for Normandy, Ash and the addition of Blackwell Farm. The inability of local roads to be able to cope with the increase in traffic and the resulting pollution threatening young children and those in frail health would be a daily hazard to local residents and would further exceed safe EU limits for Nitrous Oxide.

In addition we would need further parking at Ash and Normandy railway stations for which there is no facility to expand. As a result there would be an explosion of anti-social street parking.

I object to the threat to the Hogs Back area which has been designated an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the jeopardy to the Green Belt by this latest Guildford Plan and the danger of urban sprawl from Guildford to Normandy and beyond.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/468  Respondent: 17417569 / Sue Atkins  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

**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 (1100 homes and school) and site A47 (50 homes) from the draft local plan. My reasons for the support of their removal is the infrastructure would have been unable to support the level of building on this scale.

Removal of the green belt of homes in Guildford Road, northern end of Glaziers Lane, Flexford, Walden Cottages and Palm House Nurseries. I would like to object to the removal of these areas from the green belt on the basis that development will be far greater if this removal occurred. The openness of the green belt would be destroyed by this proposal.

I would also like to object to a large number of properties being built in close proximity to Normandy. The current infrastructure is unable to cope with this demand.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/479  Respondent: 17419553 / Tamsyn de Oliveira  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I am firstly in support of the removal of Site A46 and Site A47. I support their removal due to the inability of the current infrastructure to cope with developments of this magnitude - due to the effect on roads, waste, sewage, flooding electric and gas supply as well as access to healthcare having not been properly assessed.

I was also disappointed to learn that you simply wish to remove certain areas from the Green Belt. These areas are Guildford Road, Northern End of Glaziers Lane, Flexford, Walden Cottages & Palm House Nurseries. This is not acceptable. This will lead to a much higher density of development within this area as well as an increase in applications. I am surprised that on the one hand applications are correctly refused as they are in the green belt, but on the other hand - that the council can just amend the Green Belt line ‘to suit’, without providing any justification or special circumstances as
required by their applicants. There are other sites out of the green belt that the council must look at using as an alternative. The Green Belt was created for a purpose - and will lose all importance if we can just amend it to suit our needs.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/481  **Respondent:** 17419681 / Chris Smith-Keary  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Firstly may I say thank you for your consideration of Site A46 and the removal of 1100 homes and school from this area. As a resident of Normandy this decision is much appreciated as it would have had a massive impact on what is a small village.

I am also all too aware of the need to provide housing throughout the country and our area must, like others, take it’s share of the responsibility. The proposal of 10,000 homes within a 10 mile radius of Normandy still sounds a lot but spread out over some 300 square miles is somewhat more palatable.

I would, as a resident of Normandy like to make a couple of suggestions for changes to the existing infrastructure as these homes start to come on line.

The first is Ash Station. For some reason when a train comes the barriers seem to be down for a huge amount of time before the appearance of any train. This presumably is a health and safety regulation but at peak times the knock on affect is to cause traffic to queue back past the junction of the A323 and A324 and further down each of these roads. With the proposed additional housing in the area and the corresponding increase of traffic this can only get worse and is an issue that I feel needs to be addressed whilst proposals are being put forward.

The second area is Puttenham Hill and the turning to the Farnham bound side of the A31. Over the years there have been various attempts to ease the congestion at this junction, sadly none of which have succeeded. Again, as with Ash station, the increasing volume of traffic with the proposed development would indicate that this junction is only going to get worse and the queues even longer.

The third area cyclists. This area has an ever increasing volume of cyclists on what can only be termed narrow roads. These roads are obviously pleasant to cycle on and cars, lorries, buses and cyclists need to get along so that all may enjoy the roads. If the proposal for extra homes is to go ahead it would be helpful to incorporate plans before any building takes place of a suitable system where vehicles and cyclists can co exist without safety being compromised. I am no planner but could we not be a centre of excellence for such provision? Use the fact for advertising our County?

Thank you again for your time in reading this letter. I know that backs are against the wall in terms of finance (tell me I am a teacher!) but we have an opportunity to do good on a very large scale. Let’s not squander the opportunity.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/527  **Respondent:** 17432641 / Guy Richardson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Normandy and Flexford

---

Section page number 121 of 122  Document page number 1005
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like you to note my support for the removal of sites A46 an A47. I do not believe that the infrastructure in the area could support these developments. Additional this is green belt land that should be protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. We support the removal of A46 from the Local Plan. We had objected to the inclusion of the site in the previous version of the Local Plan because of the significant loss of biodiversity if it went ahead, and the effect on the Thames Heaths Basin Special Protection Area.

2. We support the removal of A47 from the Local Plan. We had objected to the inclusion of the site in the previous version of the Local Plan because part of the site is an SNCI.

3. We object to the lack of traffic infrastructure improvements in Normandy. With almost 10,000 new homes being built in the west of Guildford, including additional homes in site A29, without these improvements there will be severe congestion on our roads. It is known that the pollution resulting from traffic congestion has serious consequences for both animal and human health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Total records: 144.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Peaslake
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4193</th>
<th>Respondent: 8563233 / Shere Parish Council (Joy Millett)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Peaslake</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>

The term ‘Identified Boundary of the Village’ is misleading, as it fails to clarify the significance for infill development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
No representations received for this section.
No representations received for this section.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Pirbright Barracks
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

This letter and the accompanying completed consultation questionnaire and comments form comprises the formal written submissions made on behalf of our client, The National Rifle Association (NRA), in response to the content of the Council’s Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites (herein referred to as LP1).

Before responding further on LP1 however, we would take this opportunity to once again provide the Council with some general background about our client, the NRA and the Bisley Camp itself. We trust this will provide helpful context to the comments made in this response.

General Background

As set out in the NRA’s response to the Draft Local Plan (the DLP) in September 2014, Bisley Camp comprises an overall area of 79ha. The Camp is the internationally recognised home of world target shooting, owned and operated by the NRA. The NRA is a registered charity with a Royal Charter and serves 30,000 target shooting members and affiliates in the UK. The facilities on Bisley Camp serves the largest range complex in Europe that includes 11 rifle ranges providing targets at distances of up to 1,200 yards, and the UK’s finest and largest clay pigeon shooting complex. Camp facilities include retail premises; visitor and staff accommodation; club houses and catering outlets; storage, service, production and office buildings; museum and armouries.

Bisley Camp hosts a year-round programme of competitions and events that each attract up to 2,500 competitors including many from overseas. The Camp is also the home of the other two major UK target shooting organisations, the Clay Pigeon Shooting Association and National Small Bore Shooting Association; and the ranges are extensively used for training by the armed forces, the police and other organisations.

Shooting is a major sport in the UK with over 600,000 regular participants contributing £2 billion to the UK economy (GVA); Bisley Camp is by far the largest target shooting complex in Europe and has the highest profile and richest history in the eyes of the international shooting community - most shooters have heard of “Bisley”, many aspire to visit Bisley, and tens of thousands shoot at Bisley every year.

Conclusions

The NRA are disappointed by the failure to identify and include the developed area at Bisley Camp as a major previously developed site and thereafter for the developed area to be removed from the Green Belt. Whilst in the earlier DLP Bisley Camp was proposed to remain within the Green Belt it had correctly been identified as a major previously developed site. The NRA therefore consider that LP1 no longer provides the same recognition and support for Bisley Camp and this in turn is to the detriment of the NRA’s own interests and that of the Borough’s.

The NRA are also concerned by the omission within LP1 of the former site specific policy allocation (Policy 83) that was proposed as part of the DLP. This appears to be to the further detriment of the NRA’s existing and future reasonable aspirations to preserve and enhance the facilities on offer. Within the emerging new local plan the NRA consider there remains the need to specifically support the NRA and Bisley Camp as a whole as a significant local employer, tourist, leisure and recreational provider and a nationally (and internationally) recognised facility.

The NRA acknowledge that Bisley Camp must continue to be correctly governed by appropriate national and local plan policies. However, it is considered the apparent failure to acknowledge the developed area of Bisley Camp as a major developed site and the subsequent retention of the site within the Green Belt will result in unnecessary policy restraints in
addition to other development management policies that can sufficiently be used to restrict any inappropriate
development from taking place, i.e. heritage and conservation protection, biodiversity and ecology protection policies,
etc.

On behalf of the NRA we therefore respectfully request the comments made in this written submission be fully taken into
account and appropriate supportive amendments be made before the Submission of the new local plan is undertaken.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

Total records: 1.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Pirbright Institute

No representations received for this section.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Puttenham
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2290</th>
<th>Respondent: 15281985 / Puttenham Parish Council (Wendy Hazzard)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Puttenham</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? ( )**

Whilst Puttenham has a very small part to play in the Guildford plan we are aware that any increase in house building and infrastructure will bring an increase in traffic to our area. We hope that the officers involved will take this into consideration. However, we feel that the need for further dwellings are desperately needed and the reality is that we will all have to shoulder this responsibility. As a village we have seen all our smaller dwellings converted into large ones so our only criticism is the percentage of low cost homes and we are at present consulting with our residents via the neighbourhood plan. The parish council feels that a much larger proportion of all new building should be low cost, especially for the rental market.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

Total records: 1.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Ripley
### Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/576</th>
<th>Respondent: 8597761 / Mrs Pippa Fleming</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</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 insetting of Ripley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/4146</th>
<th>Respondent: 8717921 / Helen Jefferies</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</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 insetting of Ripley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/3903</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 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</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>Ripley has had many houses built anymore will change this lovely village to a town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/4523</th>
<th>Respondent: 8741377 / Lisanne Mealing</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</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 have lived in the Ripley area for over 20 years, we have a wonderful community that has absorbed small individual pockets of development - this use of brownfield land is acceptable development and its scale increases the chances of sustainability. Please do not ruin the future for our communities and villages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</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: PSLPA16/617  Respondent: 8773313 / Susie Harkness  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The threat that the Local Plan poses to my village of Ockham and the subsequent detrimental impact on its property.

The horrific impact such development would have on transport bearing in mind the narrow unlit lanes which are dangerous enough already. This would increase the volume of car traffic to an estimated 4000 additional cars plus wider vehicles like buses resulting in congestion both in the villages and the A3 and M25. There are no cycling paths and few pavements which would further compromise the safety of cyclists and pedestrians.

There is a lack of public transport and Horsley and Effingham stations are full to capacity already as are the station carparks.

There is insufficient consideration given to the environmental and ecological value of the site.

Air pollution in many parts of the borough is in excess of EU permitted levels, especially at the M25/A3 junction.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/49  Respondent: 8791521 / Richard McClean  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have followed the recent development plan in some detail. I was therefore very surprised when Ripley was proposed to be removed from the Green belt and the latest proposal to Build Some 400 houses near Burnt Common. Why is it that after so many hours of work has been put into to the major plan that this new proposal suddenly is put foreward?

I have lived in the Ripley area for many years and have seen it,s development which have I believe generally been very sympathetic to the Green Belt. However you will know that the infrastructure is already incapable of handling further major housing developments. Anyone who tries to commute find schools ,let alone park a car at our stations knows only too well of the problem.

I believe there are sufficient brown field sites in the Guildford area for several hundred houses and I do not include the Wisley proposal now "put back on in the plan" if this is true why are you not using these sites.? I am against the Wisley proposal from it,s Cayman Islands Owner and to remove Ripley from a green belt status is quite unacceptable. Is this a political decision from no 10 ? if it is many of us will despair of the democratic process but will continue to fight for Ripley to remain in the Green Belt.

Finally I would like to know why Wisley has been put back into the plan ,and why the committee feels it appropriate to remove Ripley's status. I would like to see the minutes of the meeting that took this decision, that probably would be too much to hope for.
I had expected better of the council I voted for and am profoundly disappointed with this latest proposal that you have slipped in.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/610  Respondent: 8827137 / Ellwood Art (Paul Steventon)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objection to the Local Plan

As a resident and small business owner in Ripley I strongly object to the Local Plan.

My business is located in a village and I object to this plan as it will destroy the last remaining villages between Woking and Guildford, and especially one with such historic importance to the County of Surrey.

I object to the erosion of the Green Belt in this area generally and I specifically object to the removal of Ripley and Send from it. Maintaining what little countryside we have left is imperative.

I object to the amount of development proposed for this small area of a large Borough.

I object to the lack of consideration given to the infrastructure, roads, schools and general practitioners, all of which are already under serious pressure.

I object that the Garlick’s Acrh site was added at a very late stage and that there was no consolation in it being added.

I object that the Send Hill and Winds Ridge land was added at a very late stage and that there was no consolation in it being added.

I object to the lack of evidence provided to show that the number of houses needed is in fact the case.

I object to industrial development being proposed for this area when the industrial area of Slyfields still has areas that can be developed and are suitable for such development.

I object to the housing development being proposed.

I trust that the strength of the objections all around heeded.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3239  Respondent: 8899617 / Claire Nix  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I have lived in the village of Ripley for the last twenty one years and whole heartedly object to the scale and location of sites for development in the Proposed Local Plan. I attended the Extraordinary Council Meeting on 24th May and thought that the members of public who addressed the meeting made a series of very compelling points which were not given sufficient credence by representatives of the Council.

We cannot all be experts on planning law but we can all now what it is like to live in the area and share our deep commitment to preserving the quality of our environment for future generations. Observing the meeting on 24th May it felt that the experiences and concerns of current residents are not being properly heeded and respected.

Over the last couple of years it has become increasingly difficult to make car journeys around the area and the proposed scale of development which I understand will add around 25% of housing to the borough, will only add to the burden on existing residents. I regularly make journeys onto the M25 for access to Buckinghamshire and Berkshire and up the A3 to London. There are frequently extensive queues to access the A3 from Ripley and coming back into the village in the evening we are often in a queue of traffic. For the last year I have also been taking my son to Woking station for access to the Waterloo train and collecting him in the evening. The journey regularly takes around 45 minutes each way with the volume of traffic at 8am and 6pm. Although there are some plans to enhance the highways there are in no way sufficient to respond to the proposed increase in houses and the improvements in public transport proposed with additional stations in Guildford will have no value at all for Ripley residents. Indeed we have recently seen a cut back in bus services.

Newark Road and the Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley face daily congestion. The proposed developments in the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and only accommodate one vehicle at a time. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

I also have concerns that insufficient focus is given to the implications of developments on a cross borough basis. I know from proposed developments in Woking there are likely to be even greater pressures on the trunk roads into West Byfleet and Woking and think that insufficient thought is given to the knock on effects of developments on residents.

I set out below my objection to specific policies and matters within the Guildford Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3333  Respondent: 8899617 / Claire Nix   Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (  ), is Sound? (  ), is Legally Compliant? (  )

Guildford Borough Local Plan (June 2016) – My Objections

Having lived in Ripley for 20 years I would like to object to the scale and location of sites for development in the Proposed Local Plan on the grounds of preserving the quality of our environment for future generations.
Over the last couple of years it has become increasingly difficult to make car journeys around the area and the proposed scale of development which will add around 25% of housing to the borough, will only add to the burden on existing residents. There are already frequent extensive queues to access the A3 from Ripley and coming back into the village in the evening we are often in a queue of traffic. Although there are some plans to enhance the highways there are in no way sufficient to respond to the proposed increase in houses and the improvements in public transport proposed with additional stations in Guildford will have no value at all for Ripley residents. Indeed we have recently seen a cut back in bus services.

Newark Road and the Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley face daily congestion. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and only accommodate one vehicle at a time. 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. Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular activity, and particularly at weekends many cyclists pass through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I totally object to the disproportionate amount of development that is at the moment in the Draft local Plan.... In the Ockham Horsley Ripley area ... We all came here to live in a rural area and these plans will make it into a totally urban area.... And ruin our village communities.

I object to this Plan which proposes that over 70 per cent of new housing be built within the Protected Green Belt. There is ample brownfield land in Urban areas without using precious protected Green Belt Land and destroying historic rural villages and agricultural land.

I object to the housing number of 683 houses per year from West Surrey Strategic Market Housing Assessment (SHMA) as far too high.

I object to the totally disproportionate allocation of housing in this particular part of the Borough. - over 23 per cent of the Plans new housing is in area of Ockham, Ripley, Send and the Horsleys... This are at present has only 0.3 per cent of the population of Guildford Borough This would be the greatest example of disruption to the Green Belt in the whole country if this development goes ahead.

Please take out all these enormous developments from the Local Plan in this area and think about keeping our villages and the Green Belt in tact...

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2503  Respondent: 8917025 / Fiona Cheese  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

map I totally object to the disproportionate amount of development that is at the moment in the Draft local Plan.... In the Ockham Horsley Ripley area ... We all came here to live in a rural area and these plans will make it into a totally urban area.... And ruin our village communities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3041  Respondent: 8923969 / Stephen Newt  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Removal of Ripley from Green Belt. Ripley is possibly the most strategically places of all the villages in the Guildford area in relation to the purposes of the Green Belt which is as mentioned to prevent Urban sprawl. It was recognised that urban sprawl develops along arterial routes which we have already seen along the Kingston by-pass all the way into Esher. Ripley is the only remaining separate village along the A3 artery between London and Guildford. Reducing the protection of this village and its surrounding area would be the greatest act of destruction to the Green Belt which a plan could bring. Ripley has been a main contributor through its openness to the purposes of the Green Belt but recently Guildford Council has appeared to try to undermine this by allowing so much development in the village. A dozen sites of multiple housing have already been allowed in the past few years. Any further development would destroy this historic village going back to Norman times in less than a generation.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4205  Respondent: 8944929 / A Jefferies  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley
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 Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4255  Respondent: 8971137 / Woolf Bond Planning (Thomas Rumble)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Suggested Residential Opportunity at Former Highlands Nurseries, Portsmouth Road, Ripley

My client controls land at the former Highlands Nurseries, Portsmouth Road, Ripley site extending to approximately 1ha. The attached Location Plan shows the extent of the site and context of the surrounding area. In addition, a satellite view of the site is provided below.

The site comprises vacant land previously used for nursery purposes, located in the Green Belt. It is not presently in any private or publicly beneficial use. It forms a field contained on its western side by existing vegetation and on its northern and southern sides by residential properties fronting onto Portsmouth Road. It benefits from an existing vehicular access direct onto Portsmouth Road and lies between the settlements of Ripley and Send Marsh. The site is located entirely in Flood Zone 1 and unlike much of Ripley Parish is not located in the Conservation Area or in close proximity to any listed buildings.

Proposals

These representations are accompanied by the following drawings:

- Location Plan
- Site Plan
- Typical Street Scene.

The proposed scheme includes 7 no. affordable dwellings as part of the overall 20 no. dwellings proposed. The illustrative mix underpinning the proposed site plan comprises:

- 2 no. 1 bedroom affordable maisonettes;
- 2 1 bedroom affordable apartments;
- 3 2 bedroom affordable apartments;
- 6 3 bedroom market semi-detached houses;
• 1 3 bedroom market detached house; &
• 6 4 bedroom market detached houses.

The above housing mix enables the provision of a high proportion of the site to come forward as affordable accommodation, whilst providing a mix of housing sizes, tenures and types such that a mixed community could form.

The layout plan shows 20 no. dwellings proposed in a verdant landscaped setting. The use of the existing access point enables the retention of the existing trees on the site's frontage adjacent to Portsmouth Road. As illustrated further landscaping can be introduced throughout the development and in particular on the site's boundaries.

The layout illustrates frontage development that follows the existing building line defined by Thirlestane to the north and Broom House to the south. In this respect, the scheme forms infill development that would read as frontage development located beyond existing trees when viewed from Portsmouth Road. Moving further west, the scheme becomes one of a more conventional low density residential estate, with all dwellings benefiting from generous amenity space and parking provision.

The street scenes provided show the proposed dwellings to comprise two storey development with no rooms in the roofspace, consistent with the prevailing scale in this part of the village. In addition, pitched roofs, gabled features and a variety of materials are proposed so to provide a traditional design and add architectural variety to the development.

The site is well contained and is bound by existing residential development. I therefore write to offer the site as a potential allocation for a residential scheme within the emerging Local Plan.

Summary

In summary, the proposed site represents an opportunity to provide a low density housing development on a self-contained site bound by existing residential development. In addition, a substantial affordable housing provision can be achieved.

We would welcome the opportunity to enter into dialogue with the steering group in order to further discuss a possible role for our client's land an allocation within the Local Plan.

Should you have any queries in the interim please do not hesitate to contact me using the details provided.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: Highlands Nursery - Coloured Site Plan.pdf (1.2 MB)
 sdfdsfsdfsdfsdf.png (259 KB)
 Highlands Nursery - Street Scene.pdf (1.2 MB)
 16-P1258-LP (Location Plan) 10.02.16.pdf (52 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1371  Respondent: 9081089 / William D Barker OBE  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Ripley Village where I have lived for over twenty years will have this village swamped with houses and other surrounding villages similarly blighted, the countryside will have been pillaged and the greenbelt, only to be built on in exceptional circumstances, raped. I totally object to the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1993</th>
<th>Respondent: 9323361 / Paul Holden</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to removal of Ripley from 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: PSLPA16/3257</th>
<th>Respondent: 10643073 / C Prowse</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I must object to the local plan for the following reasons:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Traveller Site at Valentines Farm in Ripley. The Council and local residents have spent a lot of time, effort and in the councils case taxpayers money objecting to this development through its many applications and appeals. Nothing has changed except you have included in the local plan. The site is still on the greenbelt. To suddenly include it in the local plan is tantamount to admitting that all the money and effort spent before was a waste. The site should be returned to open fields when the temporary permission ends. To include it extends the village boundary into greenbelt and green belt must be protected not just for us but for future generations. It is what makes this area of surrey such a pleasant area to live in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Developments around Send, Ripley, Ockham and the Horsleys represent over 20% of the housing proposed in the local plan. It is a heavy burden to place on villages that represent 0.3% of the population of the borough. It seems grossly unfair and looks like political bias.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every morning the A3 is solid from the the M25 to the services heading north. The proposed entry slip at Burnt common will only make this worse. It is naive and short sighted to propose the number of new houses in this area with no additional infrastructure. If the council is serious about this plan new bus routes and train stations should be proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valentines Traveller site and the Wisley Airfield site have seen a large number of objections over a number of years from local residents. To include both in the local plan, ignoring the objections from local residents is outrageous and disrespectful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A local plan should be representatives of all residents of the borough I feel that this plan is not and should be rejected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/473</th>
<th>Respondent: 10646753 / Jenny Mackenzie</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to all erosion of the Green Belt - especially RIPLEY

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/117   Respondent: 10655361 / M Trevill   Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am opposed to the recent changes made to the above local plan.

I live on Ripley High Street and find that at certain times it takes a long time before I can cross the High Street. If these local plan changes go ahead our village will be endangered by a HUGE increase in traffic.

At Garlicks Arch, for instance, the increase in housing and inclusion of travellers’ plots plus storage facilities is likely to cause massive amounts of large vehicle movements through this village.

A further concern is that waste management facilities to the strategic industrial sites potentially at Burnt Common. This is all unnecessary and does not provide local residents with enough info for a proper consultation.

I object to the site A35 [former Wisley Airfield] increase to 95.9 hectares. This would be likely to cause more congestion and pollution. Nitrous oxide levels are already above safe levels THIS IS VERY SERIOUS AND DANGEROUS for people and for wildlife.

There are now 60 houses suggested at the A42 Tannery Lane site [instead of the 40 on the original plan]: MORE CARS on the local roads. Our local lanes/roads cannot take any more traffic.

Please reconsider and do not take us for fools. Scrap these plans PLEASE,

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/104   Respondent: 10692833 / Elizabeth Cope   Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to voice my concern over the ridiculous proposals in the Local Plan.

I object wholeheartedly about the disproportionate size of various sites in our village setting. I have lived here for 25 years when Ripley was a village. We have tried hard to keep it that way but the development has been gradually increasing.

One of my main objections is to the traffic and congestion. I live on the Portsmouth Road and these days I can hardly get out of my driveway due to the continual stream of traffic. A lot of this comes through the village because there is
problem on the M25 (most days) or the A3. The proposed on/off junction for the A3 will not rectify this. The A3 is a car park everyday. I work at the school in the village and the traffic at the junction in the village is chaotic, with huge lorries trundling through all day. There is also limited parking. Therefore I object on these grounds.

I am also objecting because there is no infra structure for all this development. When White Hart Court was built on they had to install another electric substation as the existing one could not cope. The area is prone to flash flooding, the drains cannot cope. I have photographic evidence of our driveway and land adjacent being flooded, and of the surrounding roads particularly Rose Lane, Ripley Lane and Ockham Road.

I strongly object to Ripley, Send and Clandon being removed from the Green Belt. These villages will just become a suburb of Guildford and be concreted over within a few years. No thought has gone into this at all. There is NO reason to do this and once it is done it will be too late to change it.

The roads in our villages, particularly Rose Lane and Ripley Lane are in a very poor state. Full of potholes that get repeatedly filled in then appear again. I am objecting to this plan as I feel the roads cannot sustain the amount of extra traffic and are not wide enough to cope with larger and heavier vehicles. Many have no footpaths or cycle lanes or any lighting at all.

We do not have the public transport system to cope with the extra housing. There are few buses and no local station within walking distance. There are not enough school places or medical facilities. Most people will have to rely on cars to get about so I object to Wisley Airfield site and Garlicks Arch particularly for this reason.

I doubt that anyone from Guildford Borough Council lives in this area and therefore could not care less but they should. This is an ill thought out plan that is just a knee jerk reaction to fulfilling the required housing quota. Local people will fight this tooth and nail and we will not let the developers win.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
How does the council; who were elected in good faith to uphold our green belt and charming villages; presume to over-ride people’s wishes.

I object strongly to all proposed developments.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/103  **Respondent:** 10798977 / Ian Brooks  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

**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.

Whilst I recognise that each Borough has a responsibility to provide housing I object to the way that the plans have become biased against the north east of the Borough. This has been achieved as a result of the removal of site A46 from the Plan (1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts 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 miles of Ripley, most of them on Green Belt. This is **grossly unfair** on an already overcrowded part of the Borough.

Equally importantly, the north east of the Borough is not a major source of employment and does not have good transport links, public or otherwise. It is therefore inevitably that already congested road infrastructure will become even more crowded with resultant environmental issues — something which will effect existing and new residents alike.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3945  **Respondent:** 10828737 / Claire Dawson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Again we are faced with proposals that appear to have been put forward with little thought and imagination and with no respect or regard for the environment or the people and wildlife who live within it. I am shocked and saddened at the radical proposals put forward that would effectively destroy residents quality of life. Recently a medical appointment in Woking was missed as I could not drive into Woking from Ripley village within 35minutes? I can only guess as to the traffic situation on the local narrow lanes and roads should this large scale development take place?

I moved to Ripley village in the borough of Guildford to enjoy the character of this charming village and beautiful surrounding countryside, believing it would be protected as promised by its green belt status. If local government believe these are good proposals, I really need to think about packing my bags.

Ripley village has recently seen a fair amount of housing development (most has been sensible and measured, in keeping in character, smaller scale housing on re-used sites. I have supported these projects and believe that it is sufficient for local needs and do not support any larger scale building proposals in Ripley village for the moment (if we are to retain the essence of the character).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3907</th>
<th>Respondent: 10845537 / Chloe Moore</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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:
- increased traffic that would be cause in which a village such as Ripley already cannot sustain its current demand without long tailback and
- dangerous size vehicles manoeuvring in roads that has little or no pedestrian path way due to increased traffic
- lack of parking in the village for the present day users let alone if more were to be housed
- the use of countryside areas for which the area is so well know to build more properties

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3912</th>
<th>Respondent: 10845569 / Stu Edwards</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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:
- increased traffic that would be cause in which a village such as Ripley already cannot sustain its current demand without long tailback and
- dangerous size vehicles manoeuvring in roads that has little or no pedestrian path way due to increased traffic
- lack of parking in the village for the present day users let alone if more were to be housed
- the use of countryside areas for which the area is so well know to build more properties

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/68</th>
<th>Respondent: 10865793 / Clare Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 above Plan. I live in the beautiful village of Ripley and have done for the past 12 years and I love it. This Plan will destroy the village and really affect my Life.
I strongly object to the erosion of the green belt - I chose to live in Ripley because of the Green Belt it is in and the views and country life I enjoy.

I strongly object to the removal of Ripley from Green Belt.

I strongly object to the disproportionate amount of houses in one area of Guildford Borough - It’s a disgrace.

I strongly object to the very short consultation period especially as it’s during the Holiday period. The inclusion of new sites with less than 2 weeks notice is also a disgrace.

I have not seen any evidence for the alleged need for this incredible amount of houses you are proposing.

I strongly object to the lack of any new schools and there is a lack of spaces as it is - very ill thought through….

I strongly object to the lack of any new GP Practices - it’s hard enough as it is to get an appointment at the moment.

I hope you will consider my points objectively and hope that you will make a better informed decision and consider many factors along with quality of life and pollution and nature as well.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1388  Respondent: 10874369 / Christopher and Elizabeth Sturges  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Guildford Borough Council’s plan to allow up to 5,000 houses in the beautiful Green Belt of Ripley, Ockham, West Clandon and Send appears to us to be ill conceived. We cannot understand why the Council would suggest these developments. When we wrote to G.B.C. regarding the proposed Wisley Airfield development we pointed out that utter chaos on the local roads would inevitably ensue if that development went ahead. Only people without knowledge of the area would suggest building hundreds of houses to add to the already over-burdened roads.

As lifelong Conservative supporters we are utterly bemused by the actions of Guildford Borough Council. Admittedly the country needs more housing but why impinge on the Green Belt to achieve this goal? Surely it would be more sensible to extend existing built-up areas and estates where there are already shops and schools and where the roads can be extended without causing excessive congestion. Why ruin an attractive village such as Ripley because of ill-thought-out plans? Woking traffic should not have to go through Ripley from the A3, and how does the Council think the extra traffic they are proposing to incur is possibly going to cope?

Surely Guildford Borough Council must look further afield and make sure the Green Belt remains green

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/570  Respondent: 10882785 / Stephen Fleming  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Guildford Borough Council’s plan to allow up to 5,000 houses in the beautiful Green Belt of Ripley, Ockham, West Clandon and Send appears to us to be ill conceived. We cannot understand why the Council would suggest these developments. When we wrote to G.B.C. regarding the proposed Wisley Airfield development we pointed out that utter chaos on the local roads would inevitably ensue if that development went ahead. Only people without knowledge of the area would suggest building hundreds of houses to add to the already over-burdened roads.

As lifelong Conservative supporters we are utterly bemused by the actions of Guildford Borough Council. Admittedly the country needs more housing but why impinge on the Green Belt to achieve this goal? Surely it would be more sensible to extend existing built-up areas and estates where there are already shops and schools and where the roads can be extended without causing excessive congestion. Why ruin an attractive village such as Ripley because of ill-thought-out plans? Woking traffic should not have to go through Ripley from the A3, and how does the Council think the extra traffic they are proposing to incur is possibly going to cope?

Surely Guildford Borough Council must look further afield and make sure the Green Belt remains green

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the insetting of Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3896</th>
<th>Respondent: 10900065 / Jenny and Guy Marshall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripley has had many houses built anymore will change this lovely village to a town.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/3900</th>
<th>Respondent: 10900065 / Jenny and Guy Marshall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripley has had many houses built anymore will change this lovely village to a town.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/4176</th>
<th>Respondent: 10910753 / Heather Thompson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 in the strongest terms to the Proposed Local Plan as the impact on village life will be disastrous and irreversible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the Proposed Local Plan because these major developments would have a severely detrimental affect on the life of the people who live and work in this area. The problems caused by increased traffic, both domestic and commercial, would cause major problems on local roads. The proposed four way on/off ramp on the A3 would not alleviate traffic, but simply enable developers to go ahead with their plans and, in the process create vastly more traffic. The proposed building of 2000 homes at Wisley, another 2000 at Gosden Hill, 400 at Garlick's arch would bring the total of building in this area to 4000 with the additional traffic created by the proposed industrial units. The traffic implications are horrendous. The whole plan is simply ill-conceived.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the Proposed Local Plan because the roads in the area affected by these plans are, in many cases narrow, single track and without pavements. I live in such a lane and my neighbour was, on one occasion, told by a passing police.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the Proposed Local Plan because there is not the infrastructure to support building on this scale in such a small area. The local schools and doctors' surgeries would find it impossible to cope with the influx of people.

I object to the Proposed Local Plan because the pollution from such development would be detrimental to the health and well-being of the communities of Send and Ripley. Asthma is already very common amongst young children with pollution levels being already higher than advised.

I object to the Proposed Local Plan as it necessitate taking much of the land around the villages out of greenbelt when the circumstances are not 'exceptional' as is required by law. The reasons for this appear simple – green belt is more cheaply acquired, but once taken out of green belt it suddenly becomes much more valuable. It may be cynical, but it appears that there are certain individuals, possibly with offshore accounts, who are likely to make a lot of money out of this unscrupulous deal. They are not the people who elected you – we are and, therefore you should represent our wishes, not theirs.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3844  Respondent: 10912513 / Sarah Green  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

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 Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3841  Respondent: 10941057 / Tim Green  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

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 Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/629  Respondent: 10941697 / Adrian and Tina Curtis Wylde  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the following:
I object to the number of homes (693p.a.) that the Plan intends to deliver

I object to the enclosure of protected Green Belt land within the proposed new village boundaries (for which there will be a presumption for development in the future)

I object to the Garlick's Arch proposal to build 400 houses and 7,000 sq metres of light/general industrial/ storage distribution space on the Green Belt

I object to the creation of new north and southbound slip roads to and from the A3 to the A247 Clandon Road (Policy A43A) at Burnt Common

I object to the wholesale destruction of the Green Belt in this area (including the planned development of 2,000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow, Policy A25) in clear contravention of the central government's stated commitment for Green Belt protection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/100  Respondent: 10963137 / Gabrielle Erhardt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that it will diminish the pride of a longstanding community in our shared environment, a natural environment that will be significantly reduced by the development put forward in the local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/73  Respondent: 10992417 / Philip Erhardt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the eight plots for travelling people. Why do 75% of these site have to be in Ripley.

I object to the inclusion of 6 Travelling People plots as it is entirely inappropriate within the Green Belt.

The Guildford Planning Committee seems to have its head in the sand. We do not need all these houses and definately do not have the roads and infrastructure to support them. This is evidently clear to everyone except your Committee. Why can’t you just accept the will of the people, or is there another reason why you keep on attacking our villages?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/625  Respondent: 11014401 / Peter Doyle  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1408</th>
<th>Respondent: 11029409 / John Lay</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village's green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/44</th>
<th>Respondent: 15106945 / Alisa Bowe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a Ripley resident and I object to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• all erosion of the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• any “in-setting” of any villages from the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the disproportionate amount of development in one area of the Borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the limited consultation period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the last minute inclusion of new sites with less than 2 weeks’ notice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the lack of any evidence for the alleged housing need numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the lack of immediate provision for new schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the lack of any immediate provision for Doctor’s Surgeries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/72</th>
<th>Respondent: 15111905 / Wendy Reed</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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>
We do not wish to live in a large town hence we moved to a village in the green belt. There are sufficient brown sites available and Woking and Guildford are already inundated with tower blocks of new flats. We strongly object to the way Guildford B.Council is attempting to reduce green belt and built houses and incur congestion where it is not appropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/82  Respondent: 15114529 / Phil Vowels  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Driving back into my beloved home village of Ripley from Guildford just now, I was again reminded of its beauty. Tranquil, green open spaces, the farm shop, the common. Immediately opposite the Garlick’s Arch copse of mature trees are a myriad of signs imploring residents to object to the proposal to remove our village from the Green Belt. I agree with the signs.

I OBJECT to any “in-setting” of Ripley.

I OBJECT to all erosion of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/102  Respondent: 15122177 / Madeleine Shillaker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the council plan for development in the Ripley Green Belt and development on Garlick’s Arch.

My reasons for objection are:

Destroying the Green Belt – the areas of Ripley, Send and Clandon should not be removed from the Green Belt. It will have irreversible effects and deafeats the whole point of having a Green Belt! Green Belt should be protected, not moved, de-classified and destroyed.

The proposed development of these sites will cause a significant increase in air pollution and have a detrimental impact on the environment. It will have a disproportionate impact on the surrounding local areas – causing irreversible problems for the local community and those who use the facilities and enjoy the open spaces there today.
Development of Garlick’s Arch will have a huge detrimental impact on traffic in the local area. The roads are not suitable for heavy traffic. Traffic congestion will be severe – these areas already struggle to cope with traffic, it’s a careful balance.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/111  Respondent: 15128801 / David Smith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to any proposed traveller sites in Ripley and the surrounding area.
2. I object to the fact there are no additional doctors surgeries planned.
3. I object as there are no more proposed schools.
4. I object to the lack of evidence for the number of extra housing needed.
5. I object to the huge disproportionate amount of housing supposedly needed.
6. I object to the need for an industrial estate to be built on green belt.
7. I object to the tearing down of ancient woodland.
8. I object to the lack of consultation before these proposals.
9. I object to the limited consultation period.
10. I object to the inclusion of last minute sites

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/112  Respondent: 15128833 / Maureen Smith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to any proposed traveller sites in Ripley and the surrounding area.
2. I object to the fact there are no additional doctors surgeries planned.
3. I object as there are no more proposed schools.
4. I object to the lack of evidence for the number of extra housing needed.
5. I object to the huge disproportionate amount of housing supposedly needed.
6. I object to the need for an industrial estate to be built on green belt.
7. I object to the tearing down of ancient woodland.
8. I object to the lack of consultation before these proposals.
9. I object to the limited consultation period.
10. I object to the inclusion of last minute sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the removal of 15 villages, including Ripley and Send, from the green belt. This will lead to wholesale, and often inappropriate developments.

I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have not followed the correct process for Send and Ripley developments. Any significant changes to the 2014 proposals, such as the proposal development of Garlicks Arch, should have required another full consultation, which did not happen. This invalidates the whole process.

I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have failed to provide sound evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment which shows that industrial space at Burnt Common IS NO LONGER NEEDED.

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 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.

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 do however strongly SUPPORT policy A43.30 - the development of new four way interchange onto the A3. A new interchange is much need already, to reduce traffic flow through the village of Ripley, including huge numbers of HGVs. I would also like to see a southbound entry to the A3 at the A3 junction at Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Having lived in Ripley for some 14 years I am appalled that Guildford Borough Council could contemplate taking Ripley and the surrounding villages out of the Green Belt.

I object strongly to ALL erosion of the Green Belt. Particularly the removal of villages from it’s protection.

There has not been a suitable length of Consultation time for these proposals, with some New Sites being included with less than two weeks notice.

We do not have the infrastructure to cope with these proposed developments. There are not enough Schools or Medical facilities to say nothing of the impact this will have on our roads. Ripley is suffering enormously already with traffic queues now, how does Guildford Borough Council and the Highways Agency think we will cope if all this proposed development goes ahead?

I further object to the suggestion that we need all this new housing – where is the direct evidence for these requirements. This plan also proposes a disproportionate amount of Development in the area.

Please register my comments and my outright objection to this Draft Local Plan.
As a Ripley resident, I am writing to express my objection to the development proposals outlined in the Draft Local Plan. Below are the objections I wish to make:

1. **Destruction of the Green Belt**
   I object to the proposals to remove (or “inset”) Ripley, Send and Clandon from the Green Belt. It is vital to preserve areas of outstanding natural beauty. Further developments will erode this and destroy the countryside.

2. **Overdevelopment**
   I object to the further housing and industrial developments in and around Ripley. There are a number of reasons for this - impact on local public services and infrastructure (see number 3), congestion (see number 4) and air quality (see number 5).

3. **Overburdened infrastructure including added strain on local healthcare, education and police services**
   I object to the lack of planning regarding infrastructure. For example, Garlicks Arch (Ripley/Send border). Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to any development, the quality of life for current residents will deteriorate significantly and in many ways. Existing doctor’s surgeries and schools are already stretched or at capacity. Services such as the Villages Medical Centre in Send will have their services overwhelmed. Many public services (for example, the police) are suffering from funding cuts or freezes. I object to the proposals due to the further burden it will put upon existing services.

4. **Congestion on the motorways, roads and lanes**
   I object to the development of the strategic sites due to A3 and M25 already being at capacity during peak hours. The developments will worsen the situation on the motorways, roads and lanes. Furthermore, Highways England has no plans to look at improving the A3 for a number of years. My village (Ripley) is already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day. For example, the top of Newark Lane leading to the high street is a bottleneck. It is very narrow and has an enormous amount of traffic attempting to get through – I live there and see it for myself every day. As well as being highly congested, there are numerous incidents of road rage. Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are very narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. Road surfaces in general are in a poor condition and heavy traffic will make them worse. I object to further development as it will mean more traffic, more congestion, more frustration, more noise and more pollution.

5. **Poor air quality**
   I object to detrimental effect these developments will have on air quality. Further heavy traffic, particularly in built up residential areas, will only lead to greater levels of air pollution.

6. **Parking**
   I object to the new developments because parking is already a huge problem in Ripley. My partner and I do not even have a parking space. I can only imagine how much worse the situation will get with a larger population.

7. **Disproportionate size of sites**
   I object to the allocation of land to the strategic sites of Wisley Airfield, Garlicks Arch (Ripley/Send border) and Gosden Hill (Clandon). The proposed development of these sites will have a disproportionate impact on the surrounding local villages. They will have a permanent detrimental impact on each of these communities.
8. Unbalanced allocation of development in one area of the Borough
Between the M25 and Burpham (a distance of only approx 5 miles) it is proposed that over 6,500 houses are built. This represents over 40% of the housing proposed in the Local Plan. I object to this area being hit so hard by the allocation of development, which is disproportionate to the rest of the Borough.

9. Capacity of utilities
I object to the undoubted added burden on many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. I object to the development of Garlick’s Arch on the ground that there is little capacity in these networks.

10. Sites being planned in unsustainable locations
I object to the location of these developments because many of the strategic sites e.g. Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch, are in unsustainable locations. They do not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. I object on the grounds that these sites are not sustainable.

11. Lack of proper pedestrian footpaths on local roads
I object to these developments as footpaths in Ripley are already narrow and in some places non-existent. A further substantial increase in the local population will make navigating these footpaths more hazardous.

12. Heritage
I object to the effect these developments will have on the area’s heritage. There are a number of heritage sites in the region and no account is being taken on the impact of these points of historic interest.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp173/139  Respondent: 15144545 / Stacey Maxwell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Ripley and the surrounding villages are already above the legal limit of pollution so even by contemplating these proposed and increased developments at Site A43 Garlicks Arch and Site A35 Former Wisley Airfield, to name a couple, Guildford Borough Council is contemplating breaking the law. This is totally unacceptable. Green spaces are actually needed to counteract the effects of pollution.

2. Ripley, Send and Clandon are rural, distinct villages. The proposal to increase the houses at Garlicks Arch to a minimum of 400 houses will ruin both the rural nature of these villages and will turn us into 1 big town. People buy properties in villages because they want the sense of community that comes with village life. If we wanted to live in a town, we’d have bought a house in one!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/198  Respondent: 15147841 / N Golbengian  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Ripley I object to remove Ripley and send from green belt I object the allocation of land wisely air field , Garlicks arch , gosden hill , it will have terrible impact to local village I object to unbalanced allocation of development I object to development of any further trunk roads I object to further development of roads which adds to congestion already present in our roads I object to have more traffic trying to squeeze in our narrow roads I object to poor air quality follows more traffic I object to the lack of planing and implementation of infrastructure I object to the development of Garlicks arch for lack of utilities capacity in Ripley and send Parking issues in the villages is already serious I object to the planning due to further stress it will put on the health services I object to the planning due to stretching policing services Stress on local welfare There will be lack of protection of the environment

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/199  Respondent: 15148129 / J Golbengian  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to remove Ripley and send from green belt I object the allocation of land wisely air field , Garlicks arch , gosden hill , it will have terrible impact to local village I object to unbalanced allocation of development I object to development of any further trunk roads I object to further development of roads which adds to congestion already present in our roads I object to have more traffic trying to squeeze in our narrow roads I object to poor air quality follows more traffic I object to the lack of planing and implementation of infrastructure I object to the development of Garlicks arch for lack of utilities capacity in Ripley and send Parking issues in the villages is already serious I object to the planning due to further stress it will put on the health services I object to the planning due to stretching policing services Stress on local welfare There will be lack of protection of the environment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/275</th>
<th>Respondent: 15165665 / Neville Rabin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 should like to object to the Guildford draft local plan for the following reasons:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of protection for Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removing green belt from 15 villages including Ripley and Send. It will be an urban sprawl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So many buildings - taking away the green belt - will increase the risk of flooding in the area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripley has already had plenty of homes built - disproportionate housing development. National guidelines state it must be proportional to its locality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure cannot cope. Now there are not enough school places, doctors appointments take 2-3 weeks, public transport is being cut.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic concerns on A3 and M25 which are at capacity now. Most weeks, there is a problem on the roads, our village and local roads see increased traffic. Making the local road less safe for pedestrians and cyclists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air pollution from thousand of extra cars, affecting children and the elderly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/331</th>
<th>Respondent: 15185409 / Sebastian Rudnicki</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objections to Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object very strongly to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object on these grounds...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I object to the Local Plan as the proposed development is not sustainable (Policy S1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,860 new houses proposed is not sustainable – it will have a huge negative impact on local communities by over development, especially Ripley, Clandon and Send. The local communities do not need these houses. Wisley Airfield (A35) and Garlick’s Arch (A43) have no railway stations and extremely inadequate bus services, so almost every adult will have to have a car. The Plan does not benefit the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The development would be best served in urban areas where there is sustainable transport.

- I object to not protecting the Green Belt (Policy P2) I object to removing Ripley, Send and Clandon from the Green Belt, together with sites of Wisley Airfield (A35) and Garlick’s Arch (A43). There are no exceptional circumstances for these villages and sites being removed, as required by the National Planning Policy.

The Plan should develop the existing brownfield site at Burnt Common rather than developing Garlick’s Arch (A43).

1. I object due to the massive congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1) I am due to purchase and complete on a c.1854 cottage in Newark Lane and extremely concerned by the potential increase in traffic on this tiny narrow lane into Ripley village.

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

- I object to development in areas which are at risk of flooding (Policy P4) The Plan does not take adequate account of flood risk as required by National Planning Policy.

The site at Garlick’s Arch (A43) is classified by the Environment Agency as being in a higher risk than the Council’s own assessment. The area has flooded frequently in recent years and so the Council’s assessment is not good enough to be included in the plan.

- 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 this addition will attract a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. For example 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.

- 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 inappropriate because:

1. There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
2. 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.

- I object to the Borough Wide Strategy (Policy S2) GBC’s proposal for 13,860 new houses without any constraints to reduce the overall housing figure, differs from all the other Borough Councils in Surrey.

The Plan is unbalanced across the borough; there is too much development in the north east of the borough (Wisley [A35], Ripley/Send [A43] and Clandon [A25]). 36% of all the Plan’s new housing is proposed in this area, which has only 11% of the existing housing.

5,036 houses are proposed between the M25 and Burpham (about 5 miles) which will obviously lead to a merging urbanisation of identities the villages.

- I object to the damage to the historic environment as a result of the scale of the proposed development (Policy D3) The Garlick’s Arch (A43) proposal would double the built area in the locality, and would irrevocably damage the character of the Ancient Woodland on the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees.
I object to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA figure of 693 houses per annum in the borough being too high (Appendix D) The Plan’s proposed growth is based on the SHMA report, which says that 693 homes a year are required by the borough, which is more than double the figure of 322 used in previous plans. But because the Council will not publish the SHMA report, this figure cannot be verified. This lack of transparency is not right for consultation on the Plan.

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3) The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C) The Infrastructure Schedule sets out the key infrastructure requirements the Plan depends on. There is no schedule for Garlick’s Arch (A43), so the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site. Therefore it is not fit for purpose.

I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5) There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

Furthermore the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been for there decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1) The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2) The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

I am very concerned by these proposals, as I am soon to complete on my purchase of a property in Newark Lane, Ripley. I was so looking forward to my move to this idyllic area and whilst I don't wish to reconsider, it is a matter of grave concern.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
My family & I are residents of Ripley. I understand the need for additional housing in the area but have serious objections to the current plans put forward among our local villages. The OBJECTIONS I have are:

1) **The plans for the manner in which to alleviate the additional traffic in the area**: already the roads through Ripley become un-usable at certain times of day and the noise, pollution and lack of traffic control is unacceptable. The new plans will most certainly not alleviate the issue but make it many times worse. The plans for the new on/off ramp at Clandon will only serve to increase the traffic as opposed reduce it as well.

2) **The erosion of the green belt.**

3) **The lack of provision for infrastructure, such as schooling & doctors surgeries.**

4) **The removal of our villages from the green belt.**

5) **The disproportionate amount of development in one area**: ours are some of the most popular villages in the region and the reduction in their charm & beauty will be terminal for the future of them.

6) **The lack of consultation period.**

Please feel free to contact me should you wish to discuss in greater detail the issues that I have. There needs to be serious discussion with villagers on the current plans and greater consultation & effort to find more appropriate sites for new housing which could be built with suitable infrastructure in place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Please feel free to contact me should you wish to discuss in greater detail the issues that I have. There needs to be serious discussion with villagers on the current plans and greater consultation & effort to find more appropriate sites for new housing which could be built with suitable infrastructure in place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID**: PSLPA16/436  **Respondent**: 15207521 / June Windsor  **Agent**:  

**Document**: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the building plans in the Ripley and surrounding countryside areas.

Traffic is a big problem for our village which will get much worse with these proposals There is no evidence that we need all the proposed building.

There are no new schools planned nor provision for more Doctors Surgeries.

I object to the 2016 DRAFT LOCAL PLAN. And urge you to reconsider.

A very concerned Ripley resident.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID**: PSLPA16/468  **Respondent**: 15220001 / E Haworth  **Agent**:  

**Document**: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to express my objection to the development plans laid out in the Guildford Local Plan 2016.

Ripley

My son is at school in Ripley village, I attend and volunteer at the playgroup there and have a lot of friends in the village. It is a special village with a distinctive historical character. The suggestion to remove land on Rose Lane from the greenbelt is so extraordinary that I didn't believe this could be true at first.

This is greenbelt at its finest. The villages of West Horsley and Ripley are separated by this land and the unique, semi-rural character of each community is wholly dependent on it. Pretty much every morning I see at least one species of bird of prey over Rose Lane, very frequently three different species in one day. Red kites nest in this specific greenbelt land, buzzards and kestrels (less and less common across the UK now) can be seen most days as I drive down Rose Lane.

I have also recently spent a glorious evening in a residential garden in Ripley observing a family of Little Owls. There are also tawny, barn and short eared owls on the Papercourt Meadows along Newark Lane. Be assured that these species cannot survive in isolated pockets of green space. Every bite you take out of the green belt has a direct impact on the whole surrounding area.
It is also worth pointing out the hideous traffic congestion in Ripley village at rush hour. I contend with this on a daily basis and it is both dangerous and stressful for everyone involved and must make the lives of Newark Lane residents a misery at times.

It is astonishing to me that the council sees no duty of care for such a historically significant, thriving village. Instead of supporting the village and it's wonderful wildlife by working to remedy the dreadful traffic congestion you are instead working to worsen this problem and to destroy the very things that make the village special.

Please, leave the greenbelt alone. These developments will cause untold damage to the whole area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1283  Respondent: 15227329 / Sharon Pask  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

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 proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village's green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/547  Respondent: 15234849 / Alastair Fleming  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

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 Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/627  Respondent: 15254401 / Kate Gerry  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

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.
I object to the erosion of the green belt, the removal of villages from the green belt.
I object that you have not provided an adequate consultation process, that you have decided to plan a disproportionate amount of development in one area of the large borough and to include, at the last minute, new sites.

I object to the lack of evidence for this so called housing need.

I object to the ill thought out lack of regard for road infrastructure, services, schools and ancillary services such as shops, doctors surgeries not to mention the increased traffic to an area that is already at maximum capacity and breaking point.

I object that you can make these plans with no regard for the local residents who chose this area, the visitors that come, all of whom enjoy the green belt and all it offers to life styles, ways of life, nature and health.

The removal of green belt and over development is a huge life changing, environmental changing decision and one that should not be made with enormous consideration, facts, evidence, local opinion and due debate. I object to you making these decisions.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/796  Respondent: 15295137 / Helen Trott  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My name is Helen Trott, former Senior Management to E.ON UK PLC specialising in Carbon Emissions working with Local Authorities, Registered Providers and Community Networks;

Last week I had the pleasure of seeing some wonderful areas of Guildford in particular Ripley, while I was a passenger on business I didn’t know Guildford had green, hills, and lots of cyclists and some amazing old historical buildings ……,

I do not live in the area so I require this entire information to be deemed “Independent” , I also do not know any members of the Council or the Community, Therefore this information is completely of the intent to ensure that the information I have digested from both standing cases of pro and cons to be re-evaluated as there is “gaps”

The gaps are a duty of the CEO of Guildford Borough Council “Community Obligations” & his or hers “Executives” as per the clearly cited information surrounding the Health Act 2007 and questions to the party and executive responsible as per special meetings headed on the 8 April 2010 “in ensuring “all” processes are complied with especially around the laws within the Environmental Act 1990”

This bringing a question that over arches any movements on the planning “A change of lead to area responsibility “

To ensure a fair process has be complied with a request for special resolutions under the companies act 2006 must be considered “after the following evidence has been brought to committee to re-evaluate strategy “

1. Evidence the soil governance has been complied with with pre testing of toxins already held within the soils, noting there is plans for the Industrial and Homes, it needs to “prove” there will be no wider impact on the soils variations and the key point that an area so large effects the light energy that the land needs to create oxygenation which in laymen terms means “our air quality”

2. Evidence that the homes are “not” going to contribute further to Carbon Emissions [co2] impact and how this will be presented for validations based on all sources of manufacturing production and installation involved and
their own standing Carbon reduction Policies and process “by law” and inline with relevant ISO carried with the processes to ensure any impacts are minimal - I doubt this can be evidenced back to back to the council

3. The Increase of transport Carbon Emissions on top of an area that already has a massive “unknown” air quality issue from the M25 and interconnecting city functions of commuter traffic which in some cases makes tourism of the natural beauty to be at risk in the future in particular how the next generation in the area will cope with the heavy emissions impacts

4. How is the Carbon emissions going to be controlled from the Property Owners and UK corporate Governance of which holds heavy policy in which they must adhere to before just building a site to profit

5. What thermally efficient materials are being proposed on the site[s] and what measures will be technically adopted to Prove A pre and post “should the site be granted on all evidence of the above being provided and legal “

6. Where was the process to the community being involved in the Councils Planning which by law states a committee approval process

7. who are the industrial buildings being built for and “said contractor emissions “ and what value is the interest to the companies profits, and what percentage is being proposed to give back to the community on top of evidence to points 1-6 should the site go ahead to enable planting “triple” to the damages of what will most certainly create an additional risk of carbon footprint/damage to greenery that produces oxygen content and photosynthesis to “clean air of breathable damaging toxins” and scientifically proven in the “East of England with the Borough or Kings Lynn and West Norfolk “Nelson Country” -

Environmental Acts in-line with added value and compliance to Air, Light, Soil, and Noise governance and extract Pollution(s) risks overarched by the impact of Carbon emissions that require good practice and sustainability to comply with all elements of this Sustainability Policy

Environmental Act 90 there is call for the ‘live control of carbon emissions through intellectual ongoing processes, which includes all means of controls applied to land and air movements from defined subject matter assets - an asset of which has an emission impact and effects cause for concern to future generation.

(i) Environmental Act Section 2 prescribed processes (5)(6) a, b, pointed to ’regulations may designate the substance as one for central control or one for local control’ (7) of the environmental act 1990.

(ii) F36 the Clean Air Act 1993

(iii) F36 Section 3 of the Clean Air Act 1993

(iv) F25(C) Subsection 12 “private dwellings’ means any building any part intended as a dwelling

(v) (1) (c) fumes or “gases” emitted

The Natural Environment Research Council shall be a body established wholly or mainly for objects consisting of or comprised in the following, namely, the carrying out of research in the earth sciences and ecology, the facilitating, encouraging and support of such research 'by other bodies or persons or any description of bodies or persons and of instruction in subjects related to the Council’s activities' 'the dissemination of knowledge' in the earth sciences and ecology, the provision of advice on carbon emissions impacts across 'all standing policies'.

1. is solar being used as a material is of has the products been tested on the “Artificial Light Pollution” variance to the area and more so the “flight paths” of the already existing emissions impacts of the Heathrow and Gatwick airport which penetrates soils - if the material is PV based then this is not a sustaining measure as it blocks natural light energy to the soils and oxygenation to the communities “Air Quality’

Should the validation of my content need to be validated please contact Councillor [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] on the work in their Borough re the Science and technology act 1986 and how in the 21st century technology needs to be heavily validated a firms say so to it adhering to policy and the point of a clean energy future both natural and sustaining - [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 I attended Westminster back in 2014 where by I predicted a current standing
problem in the Energy Company Obligations, its Carbon emissions and data breaching issues; of which is now being led by their largest RP due to the impacts on Welfare and “People”
I hope the information helps “both parties “ make the right and ethical decision to this very historical 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>PSLPA16/855</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15301345 / Pauline Rawlings</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</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>Objection to Draft Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The green belt is not only important to this area, it is beneficial health wise to all residents and visitors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripley cannot cope with the traffic that we have at the moment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We only have limited public transport.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our health service and schools will not be able to accommodate the extra new people that you propose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We do not have a proper foot path from Papercourt Lane to Ripley High Street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to the new development plans.</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>PSLPA16/959</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15324193 / Philip and Josephine Paul</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</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>We strongly object to the planned removal of Green Belt status for the village of Ripley and Send to accommodate extensive development of the immediate area. in particular I refer to the Garlic Arch proposed development. This will put an intolerable strain on local traffic congestion and services. This development plus some other smaller ones would have the effect of more than doubling the current population of 1500. it could easily increase the number of cars using local roads by 1000. An increase in population would put an intolerable strain on already stretched services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The other concern we have is that by removal of the Green Belt status it will have the effect of pushing Ripley nearer to Guildford making Ripley a suburb of Guildford and loose it village status and uniqueness which makes it one of Surrey's much loved villages for inhabitants and visiors alike.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please, Please reconsider this plan</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 wish to register the strongest possible objections to the Draft Local Plan for Ripley and the surrounding area. In particular I raise the following points:

1. From the documents I have read on your web site the proposed developments are likely to at least treble the number of houses in the area. This is completely disproportionate and will have a hugely negative impact on the area as a whole.

2. The roads in the area at peak times are unable to cope with the current volume of traffic. This includes the main roads (M25 and A3) as well as the minor roads, many of which are little better than lanes. Most houses now boast at least two cars, and given no train station exists in Ripley and public transport is poor at best, people will be forced to take to the roads for shopping, commuting etc. Not only will this result in gridlock in the immediate area, but the areas around local stations will become impossible for residents living nearby as people park to facilitate travelling to and from work.

3. The impact on the environment in terms of pollution from the increased number of vehicles will be extremely detrimental to the health of all, but in particular the young and elderly.

4. Increased traffic will increase the number of accidents in the area, with the greatest impact likely to be on pedestrians and cyclists. Many roads and lanes have no pedestrian walkways, and the increase in cycling in the area (partly due to the growth of the hobby in general but in particular due to the attraction of the Olympic/Prudential Surrey 100 route) will endanger the lives of those most vulnerable to road traffic accidents.

5. The local infrastructure will simply be unable to cope with the increased number of people living in the area, not just in terms of roads but also local public transport, GP surgeries, A&E departments, schools etc to name but a few. In general this has already happened in much of the south east but the extreme increase in housing the Local Plan proposes in such a small area means that local services will not be able to cope effectively.

6. The lack of protection for the greenbelt is a concern. While many people enjoy living in an area with views of green fields and woodlands, the green belt has much more important roles. It is the natural habitat for a huge number of native species, many of which are already in danger and struggle to exist alongside man. In addition, the greenbelt represents the lungs around London and major built up areas such as Guildford. It helps to cleanse the air and keep the ecosystem in balance. The longer term effects of upsetting that balance are already apparent in Global Warming/Climate Change, and huge local projects such as that proposed will only increase environmental problems and ensure we continue down the same slippery slope.

I have no problem with increasing housing locally per se, but it needs to be done in a much more controlled way ensuring everything affected by that increase moves forward coherently. The Draft Local Plan is not coherent and in my view represents a knee jerk reaction to the requirement of central government to increase housing. The knock on effects of that increased housing have not been addressed, but most certainly should be.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the 2016 draft local plan.

In particular I object to Ripley, Send and Clandon being removed from the green belt which I believe is called ‘in-setting’.

The strategic points being proposed for development being Garlick’s Arch which is on the border of Ripley and Send at Burnt Common and also Wisley and Gods Hill at Clandon.

The plan is to build 14,000 new homes under a revised draft local plan.

This would surely cause havoc.

I also object to the lack of evidence for the provision of new schools, doctor’s surgeries not to mention drainage/sewage facilities and the chaos which would be caused by traffic, in this day and age the norm has become for most homes to have 2 or 3 cars. The mind boggles at the number of cars on the local roads at any one time especially rush hours.

I object to the short amount of notice given to the inhabitants of afore mentioned villages.

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 problem 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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to any in-setting (i.e. removal) of any villages from the Green Belt.

I object to the disproportionate amount of development in one area of the Borough.

I object to the Limited Consultation Period.

I object to the last minute inclusion of new sites with less than two weeks notice.

I object to the lack of any evidence for the alleged housing need numbers.

I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools.

I object to the lack of immediate provision for doctors surgeries.

I object to all the extra pollution of the environment.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/72  **Respondent:** 15429633 / Stephen Linnegar  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Having previously written stating my objection to the plans put forward at that time, I am amazed that there are further plans which would only cause greater harm to the immediate area.

My areas of concern were traffic flow increase, infrastructure capacity and the demise of the rural nature of the area.

Surely if the infrastructure was to be modernised to allow for the increased capacity prior to any developments this would assist in reducing concerns.

If ALL vehicular access to A58 (Burnt Common), A35 (Wisley Airfield) A43 (Garlicks Arch) were to made purely from the A3 carriageway this would also alleviate local concerns over traffic flow and volumes.

From the above proposed developments only foot traffic/pedestrian access should be allowed from other bordering roads and lanes.

The revised proposed plans fail to address any of the recent concerns so please note my objection to all of the above developments on the above basis as above.

Any development should be in keeping with the countryside and the local environment. No industrial or commercial storage facilities should be even considered in the green/agricultural environment in the immediate surrounding areas.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1909  **Respondent:** 15461025 / Philip Masters  **Agent:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4188</th>
<th>Respondent: 15573793 / Alan Ridley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</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 would be grateful if you would show my objections to Guildford Borough Council's proposals relating to the development of Ripley and surrounding 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: PSLPA16/3180</th>
<th>Respondent: 15577665 / Grant Angus</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</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 do not live in the Borough of Guildford, but I frequently visit the village of Ripley, where my friends live and should hate it to be spoilt by the proposed changes. It is a very beautiful village and, once it's charm has been ruined, it will be irreversible and never be restored.</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: PSLPA16/3074</th>
<th>Respondent: 15585569 / Janet Baddock</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley</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 strongly object to the draft local plan. In particular the severe impact this will have on Ripley village where I have lived for 20 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There has been a dramatic increase in traffic over the years and further planned development as outlined in the plan are totally inappropriate and disproportionate. The local road systems are severely congested currently and the plans to take Ripley out of the green belt and allow thousands of houses to be built in and around the village will mean that local roads will become completely gridlocked.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In particular I object to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Ripley and other villages from the green belt and the disapprobation amount of development in our area of the Guildford 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>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to register my strong objection to the proposed removal of Green Belt to Ripley Surrey and surrounding villages. This part of Surrey is already overcrowded - the schools are full, one cannot get a seat on a train in the morning (although I pay over £3000 a year for ticket); the roads are log jammed all day long and frankly any more housing would make life intolerable. We put up with too much already. I live in West Byfleet and any further housing in the Ripley area would impact on the whole surrounding area. My family have been members of Ripley Cricket Club for over thirty years and any development would impact seriously on the traffic going through Ripley and seriously affect the amenity of residents.

Parvis Road is already seriously congested especially at rush hours and your plans for large numbers of new housing would put serious strain on the infrastructure of the entire area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/5  Respondent: 15599297 / Janice Mcouat  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I live on Ripley High Street and I want to register my objections to items mentioned in the latest local plan.

We currently have a monumental problem at present with traffic going though Ripley village. The proposed increase in housing at Garlicks Arch, Wisley and Tannery Lane will only make the situation worse.

I also object to the plan for 6 travelling show people plots on green belt land as it is a rural environment and totally wrong for the area and this again would lead to increased traffic. Our local roads are too small for this congested traffic.

I think Guildford borough council are hell bent on destroying our village with misconceived and I'll thought out plans, it is time the planning officials started listening to residents of our local villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3586  Respondent: 15609665 / Karen Morse  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am very disturbed and perturbed by the Guildford Borough Council plan.

I have resided in Ripley over the past nine years with my family.

The idea of all erosion of the Green Belt is shocking.

I object to any removal of any villages from the Green Belt. Once the Green Belt is lost we could never get it back. This cannot be.
The idea of the volume of houses proposed in the plan is outrageous. The area is totally unsuitable for the volume of people and traffic that your plan has proposed. Chaos for our local road network would be inevitable.

The lanes and country roads are not suitable for the volume of people and cars that you are planning to bring into the area and surroundings.

I am also very concerned and object to the last minute inclusion of new sites included in the plan with less than two weeks notice. Why and how did this happen?

Has there been any thought that new schools and Doctors Surgeries would be need to be provided for the vast volume of people that would be in the area?

As you can see by my points of view to the Guildford Borough Council plan, I have many heartfelt objections.

SAVE THE GREENBELT!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3937  Respondent: 15641505 / Annabella Goldsmith  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I chose to move to Ripley when I was 74 because it is a peaceful and very pretty village that I have known and loved since I was a child. The people of Ripley work tirelessly and have done over the years, to conserve the delightful individuality and personality of this village and its shops, businesses, pubs and residents have also respected and supported this ethic.

I am absolutely horrified to see how the proposed plans ride roughshod over the very essence of this and the other villages concerned who are at present protected by The Green Belt who like Ripley are small and very valuable to all who visit, work or live in them. What could possibly justify destroying a pretty village in order to create a suburb? Why not create an independent new town for the new housing surrounded by Green Belt instead of destroying a community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4216  Respondent: 15673185 / Simon Jefferies  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Ripley

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 Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am writing to strongly object to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2017), particularly in respect of the changes affecting my village (Ripley) and neighbouring Send. The proposed submission makes the Plan even worse than the 2016 proposals.

My reasons for objecting relate to the damaging impact of proposals and the apparent disregard of the ‘brownfield first’ policy by Guildford Borough Council (GBC).

In particular:

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 an area of more than 100 square miles. Of the 11,350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6 per cent (4,613) are within three 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 hiding of development by ‘deferment’ (A24, A25, A26, A43)

This version of the Plan has concealed some development planned to take place by ‘deferring’ it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This has two effects:

1. i) to hide the number of housed actually being built (A24, A25, A26 – total of 1,100 deferred, but still being built), and
2. ii) to give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 – 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the GBC Proposed Submission Local Plan particularly the changes relating to Ripley and Send.

I object to the proposal for a waste management facility in green belt and the associated adverse increase in heavy goods vehicles through the villages of Clandon and Ripley.

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: Appendix H: Maps - Send
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/408  Respondent: 8553761 / A Howlett  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Guildford Draft Local Development Plan**

I object to all erosion of the green belt and in particular the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford. A vital lung for our congested and polluted town centres.

I object to the building on the Green Belt at Send at site cA34, 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.

I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.

I object to all the proposed sites in Send because they were not included in the previous consultation in 2014. Unlike the rest of the borough Send has not been properly consulted and all its sites have been changed substantially.

I object to the proposal for travelers sites in Send. They should be subject to the same requirements as for other council housing, in work, ability to pay rent, a named person to pay rates, utility bills, council tax, need. With their high social need these sites need to be located next to main conurbations in Guildford and not in Send where local services are overloaded, schools, Doctors Surgeries, banks, shops, groceries, and Public transport.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

Comment ID: PSLPA16/882  Respondent: 8558305 / Boughton Hall Avenue Residents Association (Mr Alan White)  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 2016 Draft Plan in as much as it affects the areas of Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common. I also OBJECT to the massive developments at Wisley Airfield and Gosden Hill Farm, Burpham as both sites will impact on the Send area.

I find the Plan to be misleading and contradictory in its presentation and fundamentally flawed.

The Summer "About Guildford" newspaper states that you have reduced the total number of development sites. Yet you have ENLARGED the Send inset area thereby permitting and encouraging larger developments. You also say Will there be any development along the A3 from junction 10 M25 to the Hogs Back. NO, but then you go on to say that there will be, spaced well apart. NO MEANS NO, NOT YES.
I OBJECT to the removal of some 128ha of Green Belt in the area of the Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common, and Gosden Hill Farm, Burpham.

I OBJECT to the insetting of the Send area which removes some 38.8 ha. from the Green Belt which would enable residential and industrial development in an area where no perceived need has been proven.

I OBJECT to the destruction of 30 ha. of Green Belt farmland (identified as paddock) at Policy A43 Garlick's Arch. No housing need has been proven in the plan and if approved would stretch existing education and medical resources.

I OBJECT to the destruction of 7000 square metres of Green Belt farmland (identified as paddock) for industrial development at Policy A43 Garlick's Arch when the need for industrial development has been dramatically reduced in Guildford's own statement. Guildford B.C. has 40 ha of developable brownfield land at Slyfield. "About Guildford" states that the Plan rejects any schemes that would have a detrimental effect on the Green Belt. So why has this been included? I find Guildford Council's double standards and apparent falsification of evidence to be alarming.

I OBJECT to the destruction of 4.5 ha. of Green Belt farmland (referred to as paddock) at Policy A43a for the provision of the proposed new junction at Burnt Common. This proposal will attract additional traffic to the area from further afield in a misguided hope that they will be possible to "leap frog" the existing traffic jams on the A3. Residents of the area all know that any so called highway improvement of this size will gridlock the A247 from Woking through Send to Burnt Common and similarly gridlock the winding A247 through West Clandon with its narrow pinchpoints. The A247 was not designed for such increased traffic volume and is incapable of improvement without much compulsory purchase of property. AND, in the off chance that neither Guildford's planners or consultants have noticed, the A3 northbound is already gridlocked and has been for some 25+ years. A new junction that attracts additional traffic is a very strange miracle cure.

I OBJECT to the removal of 2.4 ha. of agricultural Green Belt at Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery. The development for 45 dwellings along with the 65 dwellings already approved, will create severe traffic congestion. Tannery Lane is narrow and winding and already has to accommodate large vehicles serving the industrial units. There will be major traffic problems at the Tannery Lane/Send Road Junction.

I OBJECT to the removal of 1.9 ha. of Green Belt amenity area at Policy A44 Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This site was not included in any other Plan and has had no previous consultation. The 40 dwellings will increase the traffic at the narrow Send Hill / Send Road junction, already a local traffic "blackspot" at rush hour and school times. Whilst the Plan acknowledges former quarry workings the description at A44 makes no reference to contaminated land following landfill. Neither does it refer to current venting of the site to dispel underground gasses.

It is evident that the Send area has been targeted by Guildford B.C. to lose some 38.8 ha. of Green belt due to its proximity to the A3. No account has been taken of the social and environmental damage that would occur and it does not appear that any prolonged traffic flow studies have been carried out.

I OBJECT to the lack of any form of infrastructure support for the Send area. The existing schools were at full capacity for the 2014 Draft Plan and still are, as is the Villages Medical Centre.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of this site Policy A35 in the Draft Plan when development of this land has been refused, other than for a waste transfer station.

I OBJECT to the removal of 89 ha. of Green Belt farmland environment at Policy A25 Gosden Hill Farm. Despite proposed road improvements, such massive development will have a major impact on the existing area of Burpham and will also adversely affect Merrow. The Allocation box on Policy A25 sheet clearly shows the destruction that Guildford Council intend to allow to happen to this land. Add together all the proposed uses and it is easy to understand that despite the outlined highway and junction improvements and the railway station, the sheer volume of traffic movements throughout the day for housing, shopping, schools, Park and Ride and general employment will extend the existing daily tailback from Stag Hill/ Cathedral Hill almost certainly to the new junction at Burnt Common! This will be gross traffic mis-management.

Summary
I find that the Guildford Borough Council Local Plan for 2016 is illconsidered and fundamentally flawed in its assessment of the needs of area of the Borough to the West of the town centre.

I am appalled that the Send area has been targeted by Guildford Council to satisfy un-substantiated housing and industrial need. Why should the Send area be subjected to such an increase in traffic? Wasn't the A3 Ripley By-Pass built for the express purpose of removing vehicles from the villages?

Finally, WHY is Guildford Borough Council encouraging developers to progress housing proposals as soon as possible to help boost housing supply in the early stages of the Local Plan? By its very wording it appears that Guildford Borough Council is attempting to present a series of "fait accompli" to the Inquiry Inspector and pre-judge the outcome of the Public Inquiry and the Inspector's Report?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.

I OBJECT to the building on the Green Belt at Send at Garlick’s Arch, Clockharn 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.

I OBJECT to the exaggerated “housing need” figure of 13,860 which is far too high and results in the completely unnecessary development of the Green Belt. The way students, economic need and affordability are calculated inflates the housing need.

I OBJECT to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2158  **Respondent:** 8563169 / Send Parish Council (Debbie Hurdle)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

n/a

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: [LP2016 Local Plan Objections Attachment D Hurdle.pdf](4.3 MB)

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4122  **Respondent:** 8563169 / Send Parish Council (Debbie Hurdle)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**OBJECTION:** The following are comments from Send Parish Council about the proposed Local Plan 2016:

Insetting of the Green Belt behind Heath Drive and Send Road and in the vicinity of St Bedes Junior School Send Hill

Taking the villages out of the Green Belt leads to windfall sites which could mean Send Village could have even more developments than are currently set out in the proposed plan.

Much of this land forms part of the Wey Navigation Corridor which should be protected. This land in turn provides habitation for a great deal of wildlife - foxes, bats, birds etc. It provides a beautiful green backdrop to walkers on the tow path and for distant views from Old Woking and Pyrford.

The statement on page 116 4.6.39 states that “The River Wey Navigation is owned and managed by the National Trust (NT) and is a highly valued asset of borough wide significance, both as an important element of our borough’s biodiversity and as a very significant public space. The NT has compiled a set of guidelines for what it considers important characteristics of the river, and how this should be managed.
These include the importance of the river as a ‘visually important open corridor’ and ‘an important leisure asset’ as well as a Conservation Area.

**Insetting land** at St Bedes Junior School, Send Hill will go against what was stated in a recent Planning Permission granted which stated when the St Bedes School was demolished the land would be returned to Green field. Removing the Green Belt status would present this land to developers.

**Removing the Send Lakes from the SNCI designation**

This means that there is the potential for these lakes not to be so well tended and the risk of flooding in the area to rise. At present a dedicated team tend the lakes, which is a joy for all the villagers to appreciate. It is an area that is a magnet for wildlife.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1086  **Respondent:** 8566049 / Mr David W Lazenby  **Agent:**

I have been studying the outline proposals by Guildford Borough Council for the Send area. With reference to the proposals in principle, I OBJECT to the constant change of plans which have been published over past months, both in fundamental terms as well as in detail. As an example, I have seen no earlier reference to the Garlick's Arch site, which at this late stage has become a major feature.

I OBJECT to the inevitable large increase in road traffic which would pass through Send, which is already overloaded on a daily basis. Send Road would inevitably become the main link route between Woking and the A3 trunk road.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Comment ID:** pslp173/88  **Respondent:** 8568673 / Enid Morgan  **Agent:**

I object to the above Policies A42, A43, A58 and Green Belt Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15 since I consider any encroachment on Green Belt areas is morally and environmentally wrong - given the Brown Field Sites available in the area (including, for example, most of the vast Wisley Airfield site).

Local Plan 2017 is a clear failure of the proper planning process which was the basis of all the tens of thousands of objections to it in its previous guise of Local Plan 2016. However, local Plan 2017 has ignored all those earlier objections and proceeded with even worse schemes, bearing in mind the clearly inadequate surrounding social infrastructure and road links.
Please desist from wasting tax payers' money on such pointless anti-social planning exercise and listen to the wishes of those tax payers in the future.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/154  Respondent: 8574369 / Douglas French  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Send Business Park now taken out of the Green Belt altogether

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt altogether because it is already an inappropriate site for further development in an area of outstandingly beautiful countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation. The access to the site is again along Tannery Lane which is narrow and twisting with few passing places and totally unsuitable for heavy duty vehicles and the many more cars which would be generated by developing this site.

We hope that Guildford Councillors will see sense in the points put forward, and not seek to overdevelop our local villages, spoil Green Belt land and overwhelm the roads and lanes serving our well loved villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/428  Respondent: 8574369 / Douglas French  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1.1 This is an objection under Regulation 19 to the Guildford Borough Council (GBC) Draft Local Plan 2017. I specifically request that my earlier objections to the 2014 and 2016 versions of the plan are also submitted to the Inspector. The change in reference numbers and the fact that sites have been brought in and taken out of the plan and then brought in again has caused unnecessary confusion. But the substance of earlier objections still applies even though in some cases to sites are now referred to differently, both by name, reference number and specification. The earlier objections remain relevant.

1.2 I would like an acknowledgement from GBC please confirming that the whole of this submission and my ones in 2016 and 2014 will be submitted to the Inspector.

Green Belt Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15 Send Business Park

2.1 I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt without any evidence being offered to justify it Send Business Park is for historical reasons in an inappropriate location even for its existing operation and totally unsuited to become a “strategic employment site” as opposed to a “locally significant employment site”. It is an old non-conforming user in a Green Belt location adjacent to the beautiful Wey navigation, which is a conservation area. Any further development there is inappropriate and will detract from the openness of the Green Belt.

2.2 Although this proposal was included as part of site 67 in the 2014 draft plan, it was removed in 2016 following representations. It has now been put back in, which is a good example of why earlier objections are highly relevant and
must be included in the material received by the Inspector. Since it was removed last year because it was considered to be in an area of high Green Belt sensitivity, it is difficult to fathom why, a year later, it is not regarded as being Green Belt sensitive at all.

2.3 I specifically object to the undeveloped field (currently separating the end unit at Send Business Park and the Narrowboat Basin Site currently under development) from losing its Green Belt status. Despite action over the last few years which has made it look steadily more derelict, by parking old vehicles on it and leaving them there for months, that Green Belt field still affords views over the Wey Navigation and the countryside beyond. The openness of the Green Belt would be severely damaged by further development on this site. It has also been noted by a frequent walker that over the last two years the car park has been stealthily increasing in size at the expense of another field. Such encroachment without planning permission is to be deprecated.

2.4 The site lacks adequate access for a strategic employment site because Tannery Lane is very narrow, twisty and dangerous, in parts single track and completely unsuited to commercial and industrial traffic. Given that there are many potential employment sites in Guildford Borough with good access it is to say the least perverse to try to promote one which in so many respects is manifestly unsuitable.

2.5 The Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 recognised that Send Business Park has poor access for traffic and public transport and other serious shortcomings for an employment site. The volte-face shown in the 2017 ELNA, where without explanation completely opposite conclusions are reached, requires some explanation. Given that neither the site nor the attendant infrastructure has changed in that period how can “very poor access to public transport suddenly become “good” access to public transport when the available public transport has not changed?

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

3.1 I object to the Policy 42 change at Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane. It is regrettable that notwithstanding the hundreds of representations explaining to GBC why this site was unsuitable for 45 houses, they have chosen to increase the number by one third to 60 houses. All the reasons previously advanced against 45 are still relevant only more so. Building 60 houses would exacerbate even more than 45 the extremely dangerous road junction where Tannery Lane joins the A247 Send Road. The road is narrow, there are no pavements beyond the first 100 or so metres and pedestrians, cyclists and country ramblers are currently at considerable risk. Increasing the concentration of houses and therefore of cars would be contrary to common sense.

3.2 I object to 60 houses because it would erode the Green Belt in Send village even more than 45. Clockbarn is within sight of the conservation area of the Wey Navigation and no exceptional circumstances have been shown. Before Green Belt land is used for housing it is necessary to show that exceptional circumstances exist. As a series of Court of Appeal cases have shown it has to be demonstrated that the harm to the community at large by taking Green Belt for housing would be less than if it were not taken. The crucial words, which the last version of the local plan ignored and this one continues to ignore, are “to the community at large”. As the Court of Appeal has pointed out one cannot rely on objectively assessed needs for housing without at the same time having regard to the policy restraints. Exceptional circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt has been shown to be outweighed by other considerations. Harm to the Green Belt is one of the factors which the NPPF requires to be taken into account.

3.3 I object to the building of 60 houses on this site because of the presence of common and soprano pipistrelle bats all over the site and their roosts on the adjacent plot. This would be in danger of breaching the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (Section 5), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (Schedule 2)

3.4 The site is full of other wild life too including some rare birds. Since it is within 5 km of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area development on this site could be contrary to Guildford Council’s own SPA Avoidance Strategy. As such it should not be included in the local plan.

3.5 The NPPF makes it clear that “the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by… minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible” (Para 109). Since this objective will be virtually impossible to realise on this site it should not be included in the local plan.
3.6 GBC must be aware that the recent Surrey Wildlife Survey of flora and fauna showed that Surrey has suffered a very much higher rate of loss in species than the UK as a whole – 12% as compared to a national loss of 2%. Of a total of 404 priority species almost 31% are already locally extinct in Surrey while 37% are threatened or in worrying decline. When considering developments GBC should have regard to their obligations in this direction. If they are prepared to ignore them they should be asking themselves whether they are acting responsibly.

3.7 We are asked under Regulation 19 to restrict our comments to changes in the local plan. My objection to 60 houses should not be interpreted as an acceptance of 45. As made clear in 2016 my objection is to any houses at all on what I consider to be an unsuitable site. So my comments this time should be read in conjunction with what I said in 2016 and 2014.

Objections relating to both Send Business Park, Green Belt Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15 and Clockbarn Nursery, Policy A42.

4.1 I object to both developments on the grounds of susceptibility to surface flooding. There is considerable surface water flooding risk in Tannery Lane, as residents know only too well from their experience almost every year. It does not appear from their evidence base that GBC has explored this adequately in the same way as they did not do so in respect of last year’s narrowboat basin application to which they could usefully refer. GBC’s level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2016 makes no reference to Tannery Lane at all. It may be that they are relying on wet spots data from Surrey County Council but this is known to be inadequate. Primary sources, such as Envirocheck, whose work is based on the British Geographical Survey Flood Data, show ground water at 0.4 metres below ground level on the bend in the road near Maybankes. This is at the eastern corner of the Clockbarn site.

4.2 Local testimony asserts that some of the buildings at Send Business Park suffer from ground water flooding affecting their foundations which appears to be exacerbated by proximity to the Wey Navigation. This makes the site unstable and unsuitable for further development.

4.3 GBC’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment needs updating. The aggregate effect on flood risk of the Narrowboat Basin, plus Clockbarn plus Send Business Park would contravene paragraph 100 of the NPPF, that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk. At the very least all sources of flooding need to be correctly assessed which GBC has not done.

4.4 There is no recognition of the impact of these developments on sewage facilities which are already at full capacity.

Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh Policy A43

Now 6 travelling show people plots in addition to 400 houses

5.1 I object because there is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location and GBC has produced no tangible evidence to support their claim that there is. Such a site needs to have parking and turning for lorries and trailers, a service and cleaning area, on site storage and accommodation for show people and their families. Access for this from Kiln Lane or Burnt Common Lane would be very difficult, if not impossible.

5.2 By objecting to this, which I am permitted to do under Regulation 19, I am not implying that I prefer what was proposed before. I do not favour any development at Garlick’s Arch for all the reasons given.

5.3 I object to the policy change at Garlicks’ Arch which now includes some custom and self-build accommodation because:

5.4 The site is contaminated by lead shot which cannot easily be cleaned up because it has accumulated over 50 years

5.5 It is subject to frequent flooding (for which photographic evidence can be provided) and is in flood zone 2 making it an unsafe and unsuitable site choice.

5.6 It ignores the thousands of objections made previously to the previous proposals.

5.7 It is permanent Green Belt Land and no exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated.
5.8 It would destroy ancient woodland dating back to the time of Elizabeth 1

5.9 The site is not near any public transport so residents would be obliged to rely on their cars.

5.10 There are six rural businesses currently on the site and I object to the destruction of rural employment which would result from GBC’s proposals.

5.11 It passes belief that in the whole of Guildford Borough this inaccessible, contaminated, ancient woodland site in the Green Belt, largely unserved by public transport, is the best location that can be found for houses and travelling show people plots.

**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.

**Conclusions**

8.1 In aggregate the above proposals combined with the ones we are not allowed to comment about, amount to excessive over-development in a small village.

8.2 I object to the mechanics of Regulation 19, restricting comments to new proposals only, as it is being applied by GBC. In the context of GBC’s proposals, where site allocations have been changed and then changed back again, sometimes at the last minute, there is a risk, of which GBC cannot be unaware, that an objection may be interpreted as a preference for what was proposed before. It is almost as if some of the changes have been designed to garner positive feedback and skew the numbers. The Inspector will no doubt be alert to this risk.
8.3 The proposals as they stand are intended to be a draft local plan for the whole of Guildford Borough. It is very disconcerting therefore that somewhere around 40% of the development is contained within a geographical area of about 11% of the borough, all within less than five miles of Send village.

8.4 It is also disconcerting that in addition to the 8 travelling show people plots, Send has also been allocated 2 traveller pitches, the only village in this position.

8.5 This looks like unjustified, unfair and unreasonable concentration in one area to the benefit of other areas which are escaping almost completely. One can only speculate as to the reasons underlying this bias. The Inspector will no doubt wish to make his own enquiries as to the reasons for the imbalance, although one does not have to look very far to find them.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/307  **Respondent:** 8575649 / Ian Reeves  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Finally I object to the Green Belt Policy 2 paragraph 4.3.15 I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:- Further expansion or development at this location would not only detract from the openness of the Green Belt it would cause severe problems along the restricted vehicle access of Tannery Lane.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/341  **Respondent:** 8579393 / Mr John Sweeting  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Re: Sites numbered:

A25 – Gosden Hill

A43 and A43a - Land at Burnt Common – known as Garlick's Arch

A58 Land around Burnt Common warehouse

A35 – Former Wisley Airfield

in the revised draft local plan.

I would like to object to the inclusion of these sites in the draft local plan for the following reasons:

1. There is considerable uncertainty in number of houses needed in the Borough. In view of the recent EU referendum vote and its impact on future immigration, the number of houses required is likely to reduce further.
2. Any loss of the Greenbelt should be reassessed as 'special circumstances' necessary for reclassification have not been established.

3. Wisley/Ripley/Send/Burnt Common/Send Marsh is a semi-rural area and development on this large scale will lead to urbanisation and permanently change the nature of the area. In particular this could provide the starting link in connecting Guildford to the M25.

4. These developments place a disproportionate burden on the north east of the Borough.

5. Traffic will increase significantly and the access and exit roads to and from the A3 are too narrow to cope with the resultant increase in traffic - particularly at peak hours.

6. Other infrastructure.
   Is there adequate power, drainage and sewage provision for industrial development and is there sufficient school, medical and similar provisions for domestic expansion?

7. Light and sound pollution.
   The area enjoys fairly dark skies for its proximity to London. Any additional development will add to the light pollution unless provisions are made to ensure strict control of any additional lighting. Please consult Guildford Astronomical Society.
   It already suffers from noise pollution from the A3. Traffic noise pollution seems inevitable if development proceeds.

   If included in the plan, provision should be made for strict control of noise and light pollution emanating from the site – particularly at night time.

8. The sites contain a substantial number of trees many of which are quite mature and must make a significant contribution to the Borough's carbon reduction target. It seems perverse that planning permissions have been refused because of the impact on the individual trees whilst the wholesale destruction of woods seems inevitable if these sites are included.
   It seems difficult to reconcile these two extreme positions.

   If included in the plan preservation orders should be placed on appropriate trees as a minimum requirement.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/349  Respondent: 8587105 / Linda Parker-Picken  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the planned slip roads for the A3 from the Garlick’s Arch site. Access roads are needed to directly serve the new communities at Wisley and Gosden Hill if those sites are developed. The A247 through Send is already under pressure and cannot take further traffic. Nor can it be widened without demolishing existing housing!

I object to the proposed light industrial component of the Garlick’s Arch site. The original site at Burnt Common was far more suitable as it is already partly developed and has direct access to the A3. The land at Slyfield should be developed in preference to the Garlick’s Arch site. The only merit of this site is its immediate availability, but that would be at the expense of threatening ancient woodland and causing havoc to the traffic in and around Send.

I object to the proposed development in and around Send that would lead our village to become a suburb of both Woking and Guildford.

I object to the proposed 45 houses and two traveller pitches on Send Hill, on the grounds that the lane is too narrow to carry further traffic, especially at its junction with Potters Lane; and that the only other route for traffic is along Send Road/ Send Barnes Lane which already suffer from congestion at peak times.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/604   Respondent: 8587105 / Linda Parker-Picken   Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

GBC introduces the Local Plan like this: “Our Proposed Submission Local Plan balances the needs of residents, businesses and visitors with protecting the borough's most important countryside, landscapes and heritage. It addresses housing, employment, retail and leisure requirements, protecting the borough's most important countryside, landscapes including education, healthcare and transport”. My comments aim to dispute most of these statements as they apply to Send.

Send has been targeted throughout this process for a disproportionate amount of development. Our residents’ needs have been expressed in the approx. one third of comments overall received in response to the summer 2016 consultation. But they have been almost totally ignored! Development proposed in Green Belt land plus insetting which will lead to many other areas becoming future development sites pays no heed to protecting the borough's most important countryside (&). landscapes.

Send parish consists of three separate settlements: Send itself, Send Marsh and Burnt Common. These areas are semi-rural and currently have many green spaces used for leisure activities which are now threatened. None of the settlements contains a significant commercial centre and there are no proposals for retail development here. Parking in most areas is limited. Traffic along the main A247 is heavy at peak times and comes to a standstill if there are local incidents on the A31 Hog’s Back, A3 or M25 which result in more traffic being diverted here (transport). The local primary school, which recently combined onto one site with no further potential for development, is almost at capacity (education). There are no proposals for additional bus services (transport) which only run once an hour and not at all on Sundays. The local medical centre (healthcare) already has difficulty arranging patient appointments at short notice. I e our infrastructure is already at capacity.

I therefore object to the further increase in the proposed number of houses in the Send/ Burnt Common area. The housing number has dropped by 39 houses per annum. Yet the proposed number of houses in Send has increased to 500, despite our high volume of objections in summer 2016.

I particularly object to the increase in proposed additional houses in Tannery Lane (Policy A42) from 45 to 60. The arguments against development in this narrow lane were clearly covered in the 2016 objections; yet this number has been increased rather than reduced or removed.

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 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) is the next junction from Burnt Common travelling north on the A3.

I consider that the Local Plan has given insufficient consideration to the overall traffic flows in the Send and Ripley/Wisley A3/M25 interchange areas as they would be affected by high increases in traffic volume caused by additional housing, employment and traveller allocations in both Send and at the nearby Wisley and Gosden Hill sites plus the A43a construction of new slip roads at Burnt Common. (transport)

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4515</th>
<th>Respondent: 8589953 / Michael R. Murphy</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

In addition I attach the reasoned objections to the whole dreadful Guildford Plan which is opposed by virtually all the Villages Around Guildford and most of the Guildfordians and our local MP Sir Paul Beresford. Compiled by Andrew Procter.

Finally the most important objection:

I OBJECT to Send village being removed from the Green Belt.

This fantastic legacy from our Victorian Philanthropists was always intended to be permanent, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. There are no special circumstances to justify abandoning this fantastic legacy.

The Green Belt in Send provides an ESSENTIAL Buffer, stopping Woking and Guildford becoming one conurbation. The GBC Councillors and Government gave clear election promises to protect the GREEN BELT. This plan blatantly reneges on those promises, and goes against Government Guidelines as pointed out by Sir Paul Beresford our local MP.

This would be a Developers Charter to provide unlimited development all over our Village and some other villages.

Please do not allow this dreadful error which will be irreversible.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3509</th>
<th>Respondent: 8590113 / Ms Melanie Mawby</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing to register my objection to projected development around Send and Ripley, in particular the proposals for Garlick's Arch. I also find it staggering that the green belt status of Send and neighbouring villages is threatened, paving the way for further development which will start to close the gap between London and Guildford.

Please take note that I find these proposals unacceptable.
I am aghast at the Plan released for public consultation on 6th June 2016, particularly in regard to our villages of Send, Send Marsh and Burntcommon.

Firstly, I OBJECT to the proposed removal of these villages from the Green Belt. This is a scandalous raping of these rural settlements, and by re-drawing the Green Belt boundaries around them (insetting) you have attempted to transfer those beautiful fields and 16th century woodlands known as Garlick's Arch (Area A43) from Green Belt, protected from development, into building land for about 400 houses and 7000 sq. metres of industrial buildings and warehousing. This site was not included in the Regulation 18 Draft, and has not been consulted on previously, and is therefore illegal in my view. Any requirement for additional industrial development should be at Slyfield, an area which has been developed in this way for many years and if far more appropriate.

Therefore I strenuously OBJECT to Garlick's Arch being removed from the protection of the Green Belt.

I also believe that the proposal in this Draft Plan for 485 new houses for our Send villages is totally out of proportion to the current size of them, and will turn this from a rural area into a suburban one. So I must again OBJECT to this inflated number and ask that it be reduced back to the 185 which it was at in April this year, prior to the last minute inclusion of Garlick's Arch.

Should both Garlick's Arch and the new London bound entry and exit slip roads to the A3 by the A247 bridge go ahead, then traffic will be totally gridlocked around the A247/B2215 roundabout at Burntcommon, by the Shell petrol station/ Little Waitrose. As the only access to and from Boughton Hall Avenue is just 50 metres or so from this roundabout, on to the B2215, I have serious doubts as to whether our residents will actually be able to get in or out of this Avenue, at rush hours particularly. Portsmouth Road will be jammed from Kilne/Send Marsh Road to the roundabout; Clandon Road (A247) will be queueing probably from about West Clandon station to the A3 slip road, whilst Send Road will be solid with traffic for its whole length from the Old Woking roundabout. Traffic trying to exit the A3 from Guildford will be clogging up the whole of the Y. mile slip road to Burnt Common roundabout, and probably back on to the A3 itself. Very, very dangerous!

It seems to me that there has been very little, if any, real thought or planning given to the infrastructure problems that will occur due to all this development. What about Jack of school spaces? And the local Villages Medical Centre? There is only just about enough capacity in these facilities NOW. I attended the special Send Parish Council meeting at the Lancaster Hall on Tuesday 14th June 2016. Also present were Cllrs Paul Spooner and Matt Furniss, plus our local borough councillors Cllrs Mike Hurdle and Susan Parker (who spoke against the Plan). The Hall was packed full of very angry local residents!!! Councillors Spooner and Furniss very clearly stated that no developments included in this Plan would go ahead UNLESS THE REQUIRED INFRASTRUCTURE WAS ALREADY IN PLACE!! They emphasised this. I cannot help but wonder whether this was merely political assurances, given in order to appease the locals, or whether it will actually be written into the Local Development Plan as a positive legal requirement before planning approvals are handed out wholesale to hungry developers!!

(Since I drafted this letter on the 16th June, we've had the result of the referendum, which as we all know, is for Brexit! ! So, as we are promised, immigration will be controlled, and there will now be nowhere near as much need for all the homes that you are proposing. Therefore, this is definitely the case for bringing the totals for Send, Send Marsh and Burntcommon back to the 185 that I mentioned above. Garlick's Arch MUST be deleted from this Plan!)
I ask that a copy of this letter be passed to the Government's Planning Inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3843  **Respondent:** 8591521 / Mark Daniell  **Agent:** 8591521

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Send being removed from the Green Belt. I understand that this designation was intended to be permanent to protect our countryside. If the Green Belt is eroded by the policies proposed Guildford and Woking will become a conurbation. The Green Belt should only be used in very exceptional circumstances which GBC has not justified.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4412  **Respondent:** 8596609 / Penelope Lyons  **Agent:** 8596609

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objections - Local Plan (June 2016)

I write in connection with the Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016) and in particular the effect it will have on me as a resident of Send with a young family.

There are no good grounds for taking land out of the green belt designation in this area and it will significantly damage the existing communities and their ability to use their amenities and infrastructure.

Green Belt (Policy P2)

No exceptional circumstances have been put forward to justify removing Ripley, Send and Clandon from the Green Belt contrary to the National Planning Policy. The villages will soon have no separate identities and will merge.

Transport links

The proposals to create additional access points to and from the A3 will only serve to increase rush hour congestion through Ripley and Send, which is already significantly congested. As the extra housing into the mix and we are going to be faced with gridlock whilst trying to take our children to school and on our way to work.

Swamping of local services

In addition to my concerns about the local infrastructure, no plans are being put forward for extra school places or extra primary care services in our area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I am writing to strongly object to the above Policies/Planning Proposals.

Guildford Borough Council have been proposing various developments for housing and gypsy sites in Send for a number of years. I have objected previously on these proposals. It now seems that GBC are not following due procedure and keep changing the size of proposed developments. They have now added a massive road junction - not previously disclosed.

The proposal for 430 houses in 2014 was reduced in April 2016 to 185. Now GBC have increased the number of houses once again to 485. These changes require full consultation under Regulation 1. GBC are now trying to short cut the consultation via Regulation 19. This action completely invalidates any consultation with residents of Send. I object to GBC trying to impose housing development in Send via such misleading short cut practices.

The evidence GBC are providing for employment needs; industrial space and housing for foreign students is highly questionable. Figures are being manipulated and do not represent current needs. Any new homes can be built of the surplus of brown field sites which would accommodate current needs.

I object once again to the green belt areas of Send being built upon. Policy P2 will ruin the semi rural environment of Send. The current infrastructure of Send cannot cope now with the population. Any increase will have serious adverse effects upon the community.

Our current Surgery, School, shops, flooding problems and particularly traffic congestion will be adversely affected. I struggle to get an appointment with a Doctor as the Surgery is over subscribed. More housing will only increase the problems.

I strongly object to Policy A43.30ha Land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common. Another 400 houses and 7,000 sq. metres of industrial and warehousing which is not needed will have huge detrimental effect upon Send.

We do not need another 400 homes on top of the ridiculous number already proposed of over 13,860. Send cannot cope with such numbers. Each house will double the number of residents at least and if not more. Most homes today own at least 2 cars per household. How on earth are the roads around Send going to cope. We are at near grid lock now at peak times of the day. The A3 is permanently blighted with traffic jams currently.

This proposal is NEW and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon. The area is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. The area has conservation sensitivity being covered by ancient woodland dating back to the 16th century.

As the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows there is a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan - we do not need an industrial development of another 7,000 sq. m.

I object to the horrendous proposal of a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common.
This is total madness!! Apart from ruining the environment I green belt the extra traffic and in particular pollution will have a huge impact on Send. All traffic from the M25 wishing to travel to Woking will be routed through Send.

Send is a small village and our main road A247 cannot cope now. There will be total grid lock! As a resident of over 40 years I have seen Send deteriorate. Living 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] has become a nightmare early in the morning and evening with the lane being used as a "Rat Run" for commuters to and from Woking/Guildford.

I object to Policy No. A44 1.9 ha Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. Another 40 homes on top of the 400 proposed for Burnt Common area is totally unacceptable and not necessary. Brown field sites should be used and the Green Belt should be retained. The Conservative Party at the last election (GBC being Conservative) promised voters to protect Green Belt land. The current Government and GBC are not fulfilling their promises.

I am not prepared to standby and watch BGC ruin Send and its surrounding areas to fulfil some brief from the Government who have broken their promises to the people who elected them regarding Green Belt.

I cannot understand why common sense does not prevail within Government and Councils. It is so obvious that the South of England is over populated and at grid lock with traffic and the associated pollution. The infra structure cannot cope, the local surgeries and hospitals are in melt down.

Stop trying to increase the population in this area and think of spreading the load northwards. This will encourage more employment to areas of deprivation in the Midlands and North.

Much more and the South of England will fall into the Channel under the weight of people and traffic and industry.

Please take my above objections into consideration and listen to the residents of Send. We live here!!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.

I object to the building on the Green Belt 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:
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4148  Respondent: 8717921 / Helen Jefferies  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 Send

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/242  Respondent: 8734785 / Bill Houghton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- Plans A25, A42, A43, A43a, A44

I object to all the above plans as they are an unconstitutional attack on the local Green Belt & based on unsubstantiated housing needs

I also object on the grounds that they are a disproportionate development in our area of the borough.

They do not take into consideration the lack of schools & medical facilities but above all they will have a devastating effect on the A247. Plans already agreed – ie the Send Marina, & the additional houses on the Vision Engineering plot will be more than enough to bring this road to rush hour standstill & the Tannery Lane crossroads, already difficult for large commercial vehicles will become an even more hazardous accident spot.

The short section of the A247 between the Burnt Common roundabout & the new north & south A3 slip roads will have to absorb all this new local traffic but it will also attract those who currently go through Ripley.

A traffic survey of current levels would surely confirm that there are certain times of the day when we can take several minutes to gain access to the road.

I most strongly object to the inevitable increase in air pollution & noise. It is worrying to think that we would have to endure even higher levels of both, a further increase will be a serious threat to health & well above acceptable levels.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2007  Respondent: 8774369 / Gary Cooper  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 remove Send and Ripley from the Green Belt.

Removal of Send and Ripley from the Green Belt is almost certain to result in one massive development area on both sides of the A3 road, all the way from the M25, down to the North Downs. The villages will be entirely swallowed up to become like those to our North East at Surbiton, New Malden, Worcester Park and all the way through to Sutton and beyond.

For Guildford to retain its current charm, it is vital that the village environments should be maintained for future generations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/177    Respondent: 8775137 / Annette Clark    Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am really concerned and I know many residents are in the local area to this unrealistic and extremely large expansion plan in the local area of Send, Ripley and Clandon, which are the areas that effect me most.

I have been a resident for over 15 years and have on several occasions completed objection emails and letters regarding building excessive houses and developments in the local area. It seems that every few years we have to keep objecting to the very same issue and my opinions don't and won't change!!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/177    Respondent: 8775169 / Shaun Cheyne    Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

(4) I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt (Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15) because:

1. This is an area with prolific birds and wildlife
2. It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
3. There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
4. Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Green Belt, Policy 2 Send Business Park removal from the Green Belt

Further development being made possible by this action is not appropriate, given that this is a non-conforming development in an area of outstanding beauty and next to the Wey Navigation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I write to strongly object to the G.B.C. suggesting removal of Send and local villages from the green belt.

How sad, if we should finish up as gridlocked corridor from Guildford to Woking – another Camberley Frimley, Farnborough and Cove scenario. Over development in our villages leaves us desperately under catered for, for schooling, doctors, transport, roads etc.

Here in Send we are so lucky to still have some farm land, water meadows and open space. This supports wildlife, plants and animals and gives pleasure to local people and visitors.

Be careful what you vote to ruin for us all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the removal of Send and Ripley from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford. This is my biggest objection as it creates huge risk of Send and Ripley both changing beyond recognition. There are no exceptional circumstances for these villages and sites being removed, as required by the National Planning Policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3182  Respondent: 8824609 / Richard Sands  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

The schools also could not cope with the scale of expansion proposed. Despite the new building for St Bede’s in the village & its amalgamation with Send First School, there will be no room for extra classes. It would also put more pressure on the Villages Medical Centre which is already oversubscribed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3784  Respondent: 8828929 / Janice Hurdle  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

The schools also could not cope with the scale of expansion proposed. Despite the new building for St Bede’s in the village & its amalgamation with Send First School, there will be no room for extra classes. It would also put more pressure on the Villages Medical Centre which is already oversubscribed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3786  Respondent: 8828929 / Janice Hurdle  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

I understand that Guildford Borough needs to build more houses although I also understand that it is not clear how the stated requirements were reached. In the original draft 430 houses were proposed for Send; this went down to 185 in April of this year but has suddenly gone up again to 485 houses. This cannot be right. It is not also sensible to build these houses where the infrastructure is poor & where the roads cannot cope.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/26</th>
<th>Respondent: 8838337 / Gregory Webb</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 Send being removed from the Green Belt. Our village and the Green Belt provide an essential buffer between Guildford and Woking. This part of Surrey should not be considered for urban sprawl. Particularly vulnerable areas of land being removed from the Green Belt include, but are not limited to:

1. The land behind the school including playing fields and woodland
2. The land to the right of Cartbridge by the River Wey Navigation up to the new boundary fence with Vision Engineering
3. Land to the left of Cartbridge towards the old depot on the Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/689</th>
<th>Respondent: 8839521 / Lynn Yeo</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing to OBJECT to the 2017 version of the Guildford Local Plan. There are several policies that I wish to object to and will list them below. I have sent in objections to previous versions of the Local plan and am baffled to find that despite significant local objections to inappropriate overdevelopment, this version of the plan actually further increases the development around the villages of Send, Ripley and West Clandon, making a mockery of the principles of consultation. Unlike what I might expect from a normal planning process and consultation, where objections are considered and proposals are altered accordingly, Guildford Borough Council (GBC) appears to not have listened at all to the thousands of objections lodged, and have actually increased the level of development in Send, which seems to have been disproportionately targeted with housing and industrial development. The number of homes has been increased from 485 homes to 500 homes, and 2 traveller/ show people pitches to increased to 10. The amount of proposed area for industrial use has increased from a maximum of 7,000sqm to a minimum of 7,000sqm.

1) I OBJECT to change of sites and last minute additions of sites

Major sites in and around Send have changed three times. First we had Burnt Common, then Garlick’s Arch and now both of them. GBC appear to have a predetermined agenda to build on the Green Belt and without any reasonable constraints to take account of inadequate infrastructure – roads, schools, medical facilities – as required by law. The traffic and pollution implications of the current proposals will be completely overwhelm Guildford, especially smaller villages like Send, Ripley and West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I am writing to OBJECT to several procedural issues in the Local Plan 2016.

I OBJECT to the lack of consultation of residents from Send for sites in the current draft of the Local Plan.

For the most part the sites in Send were not included in the previous consultation in 2014. Send has not been properly consulted and all sites apart from one have been changed substantially. Most egregiously, Sites A43 and A43a were only included at the last minute, less than two weeks before the draft was voted on and published. These sites are significant (Site A42 includes 400 homes, 7000sqm industrial space, new A3 on off ramp) and should require a full consultation under Regulation 18, not the short cut of Regulation 19. This procedural error should invalidate the addition of this site to the local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Green Belt Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15.

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park, Tannery Lane, from the Green Belt.

This site is adjacent to the River Wey Navigation and alteration or enlargement would appreciably reduce the enjoyment of walkers and boat users along the Navigation.

Further development would worsen the problems at the junction of Tannery Lane with the A247.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

The correct process has not been followed by GBC. GBC have changed every major site in Send proposed for development since 2014. GBC have made considerable changes from 430 houses, then down to 185, and then...
up again to 485. These significant changes require another full consultation under Regulation 18, not the short cut of Regulation 19 which GBC are trying to get away with.

- GBC have exaggerated the housing need. They say that 13,860 houses are needed. If the population grows by 20,000 in the plan period, we actually need 8,000 homes (based on an average of 2.5 persons per home)

- Brown Field sites should be used for housing development NOT the green belt, this is a directive from Central Government.

- Policy P2 SEND VILLAGE SHOULD NOT BE REMOVED FROM THE GREEN BELT. The Green Belt land that is under threat from development in Send is some of the most beautiful countryside in the area. It contains woodland and green fields that are full of wildlife, and it would be disastrous to the natural environment if it were lost. It is Send's buffer between Guildford in the South and Woking in the North. Send village will become an urban sprawl, with congested roads and choking traffic fumes.

Local Authorities are allowed to apply 'constraints' to the number because of factors such as Green Belt or infrastructure issues, however these do not appear to have been applied in the latest draft of the Local Plan, where Guildford has 89% Green Belt.

Send Village have been unfairly victimised by GBC with the huge amount of development being proposed, plus the removal of the village from the Green Belt. It is obvious that Send Village is being targeted because of the GREED of the developers who have bought up cheap Green Belt as land banks years ago and now want to make their millions. The conservative councillors promised the electorate in their pre-electoral leaflets that the Green Belt would be safe and protected if they were voted in. This was not true, but they knew if they were honest about their intentions they would not have been elected, as they know that the majority of the population of Guildford want to keep 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: PSLPA16/2067</th>
<th>Respondent: 8861697 / J J Simmonds</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am writing to object to the proposed submission local plan. Whilst realising the need for future houses, the enormity of the proposed number seems disastrous. The area will lose all local identity and will cause chaos, both from the transport angle and the general infrastructure. Where will the additional population find schools or medical attention, just to name two of the much needed facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/677</th>
<th>Respondent: 8875361 / P A Clarke</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please see my following comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the plan to take the village of Send out of the Green Belt. Send and its surrounding green areas provide a buffer between Guildford and Woking which if built on will create an ugly urban sprawl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/682</th>
<th>Respondent: 8875361 / P A Clarke</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As well as the roads being unable to cope with such huge population growth, neither will the local schools or the Villages Medical Centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2143</th>
<th>Respondent: 8875841 / J James</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am writing to Guildford Borough Council to object to the Council’s ill-conceived Draft Local Plan in relation to the proposed developments in the village of Send as listed below and I would like these objections to be seen by the Inspector:

| A42 | Clockbarn Nursery, n-annery Lane, Send | Send | Homes(C3) | 45 |
| A43 | DLand at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh Burnt Common and Ripley | Send and Lovelace | Homes (C3) and employment floorspace (Ble, 82, 88) | 400 |
| A43a | Land for new north facing slip roads to/ from A3 at Send Marsh/ Burnt Common | Send and Clandon and Horsley | 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 |
| A44 | Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill,Send | Send | Homes (C3) and traveller pitches (sui generis) | 40 |

As you are aware Send is a small Surrey village that is surrounded by "Green Belt" land and I most vehemently object to the Council’s plan to remove Send from the "Green Belt". This Green Belts permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances to overturn this. The green space around Send acts as a buffer separating the towns of Woking and Guildford giving them their own Identity. Further development within the area will lose this identity completely.

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. This site is New and was NOT included in the regulation 18 draft and has not previously been consulted
2. 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.
3. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented.
4. The increase in population of Send will impact on school places in both Ripley and Send and services such as the Villages Medical Centre where it is already difficult to arrange appointments with the Doctors.
5. The industrial development is not required as the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment of 2015 shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous ELNA undertaken by GBC in 2013.

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 ancient woodland containing trees that have existed since the 16th
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
3. Access from Send Marsh Road to the 82215 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 Ripl
4. The A3 corridor is such a busy route already so further development anywhere along its length is a ridiculous

I trust you will view my concerns and objections favourably and drop the proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/245  Respondent: 8879937 / Dietlinde Brown  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object 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 its removal from the Green Belt, and GBC have not even attempted one. Therefore no exceptional circumstances, as required by the NPPF can be claimed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1429  Respondent: 8880385 / John Telfer  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to any further development at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane. The lane and junction are too narrow and tortuous for any additional traffic. In my view it was a mistake to grant permission for a marina and flats despite overwhelming local objections - not a good example of local decision policy.

I object to any proposed development of Garlic's Arch land because it was included too late at the planning meeting in contravention of Regulation 18, drafted to prevent last minute additions without due time for consultation. The site is totally unsuitable because it is further loss of Green Belt, liable to flooding, contains several ancient protected trees, and too near to the A3 -causing excessive noise and pollution -and difficulty of access. The linked "gift" of land for an enlarged roundabout and slip roads is obviously a device offered by the owners to encourage the Council to give planning permission, otherwise the improvement proposed would worsen traffic flows through Send, Ripley and Clandon .

I object to further development because there is no demonstrable improvements to the infrastructure either with plans or sources of funding of programmes. The proposed development will place a disproportionate strain on existing resources which cannot really cope with present requirements.

I object to any further proposed developments at Send Hill and the other proposed significant developments at Gosden Hill Merrow and Wisley Airfield, all of which will involve the destruction of vast areas of the Green Belt and other reasons at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1058  **Respondent:** 8880929 / Maurice Dawes  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed sites in Send because they were not included in the previous consultation in 2014.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1356  **Respondent:** 8886945 / Brian Osborn  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I writing to object to the 2016 Regulation 1 9 Draft Local Plan. I find the plan has not addressed my concerns regarding infrastructure capacity and traffic on the A247. Infact the introduction of Garlicks Arch and on/off slips roads to the A3 at Bumtcommon (sites A43 and A43a) will only add to these problems. I re-send with this letter my original objection.

I object to site A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Bumtcommon and Ripley and building 400 houses on this site as this site was not included in the initial consultation of the Draft Local Plan in 2014. This number of houses is out of scale and all proportion for a village settlement.

I object to A43a Burnt Common on and off slip roads to the A3. The traffic impact on the A247 through Send and Clandon and surrounding B roads would be immense. Many of these roads are already in a poor state with potholes. The roads at the Clandon traffic lights are already in a terrible condition. I am concerned at more NOISE from traffic and AIR POLLUTION as I live on the main A247.

I object to the proposed housing figure for the Local Plan to build 13,000 plus homes at 693 homes per year for next 20 years (2013-2033). This figure is not sustainable for local infrastructure to cope with.

I object to building 485 homes in Send Parish. The population \viU increase will lead to congestion on roads, pressure on local schools, the Villages medical centre and hospital facilities.

I object to removing the Send Lakes from SNCI status. More should be done through policies in the Local Plan to ensure and protect SNCI status as a basis for environmental sustainability of the plan.

I object to building houses at site A42 Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane. I visit friends in Brook Lane, Tannery Lane frequently and Tannery lane and itsjunction with Send road are hazardous and the Papercourt Lane end of Tannery Lane is very narrow. The business centre and the now approved planning penission for a Narrowboat basin in Tannery lane will combined put a lot of pressure on this lane and to add a further 45 houses would really add to those problems. I
also would like to see Nurseries and Farms remain as such and be used for growing crops/produce as local industry - not become housing developments.

I object to site A44 S end Hill. This site is within the Green Belt and development of this site would harm the amenity of the surrounding countryside.

I object to removing villages from the Green Belt. I moved to my bungalow in the 1960s to live in a village and I would like Send to remain a proper village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2702  Respondent: 8886945 / Brian Osborn  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to removing the Send Lakes from being a (Site of Nature Conservation Interest) SNCI status. Bats, Herons, Kingfishers and Hedgehogs are all part of the wildlife that can been seen in and around the lakes. The local plan should encourage this through policies aimed at preserving the lakes SNCI status as a part of the local plan’s environmental sustainability. It should not be removing them from SNCI status. The lakes act as an important “green lung” and wildlife corridor for the village.

I object to site A42 Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane. In recent documentation for planning application 14/P/02289 - Land to the north of Tannery Lane and east of Wharf Lane Send, surface water was considered an issue (see item 4.3 Non technical Drainage report by Stilwell Partnership. In response a drainage strategy was submitted by Johns Associates proposing - Surface water run off is to be managed by digging deeper ditches around boundaries of the site, infiltration and attenuation ponds. This land adjoining site A42 Clockbarn Nursery. The building of houses on Clockbarn has potential to add pressure to land drainage and increasing the risk of surface water flooding. This scenario is not covered in GBC’s Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) as this plan preceded approval of application 14/P/02289. The SWMP is a necessary part of the evidence base to ensure that Local Plans manage flood risk as required by the NPPF - but with regard to site A42 this is not covered by SWMP and this site is not compliant with NPPF requirements to manage flood risk from all sources. Moreover, in the case officer report for approved application 14/P/02289 - Land to the north of Tannery Lane and east of Wharf Lane Send it is noted that the nursery to the west of this site (i.e. Clockbarn Nursery, site A42) provides foraging habitat for bats. This would appear as a mitigation measure for approval of application 14/P/02289 and it would not now be appropriate to destroy this wildlife corridor to the west of the Marina development by building houses on the site.

I object to site A43a Burnt Common on and off slip roads to the A3. The traffic impact on the A247 through Send and Clandon and surrounding B roads would be immense. Air quality monitoring has not been undertaken on the A247 ahead of this proposal. This new road junction is a significant change between the Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 consultation and people have not had opportunity to be involved or consulted accordingly.

I object to site A43 Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Burntcommon and Ripley and building 400 houses on this site as this site was not included in the initial consultation of the Draft Local Plan in 2014. This number of houses is out of scale and all proportion for a village settlement. Moreover, this area of land is identified as Green Belt within the evidence base document, Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study - Volume IV (2014). See page 62. This site is a significant change between the Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 consultation and people have not had opportunity to be involved or consulted accordingly.
**I object to site A44 Send Hill.** This site is a significant change between the Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 consultation and people have not had opportunity to be involved or consulted accordingly. Moreover, this area of land is identified as Green Belt within the evidence base document, Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study - Volume IV (2014).


**I object to Gosden Hill site A25** (building 2000 houses) and **I object to land at former Wisley Airfield site A35** (building 2000 houses) Both these developments are at odds with the sustainability corridor and the impact on junction 10 of the M25 would be enormous.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/19  **Respondent:** 8899169 / Michael Jordan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

The 2016 Plan put forward was rejected by local residents from over 32,000 objections largely by Send Residents.

Is the GBC not listening, the stealing of Green Belt lands for domestic and commercial expansion and the many points put forward on the lack of infrastructure and environmental reasons have simply been ignored.

The Government has made clear that the Brown Field sites must be used for future development and Green Belt land only to be used in very exceptional circumstances. What are the exceptional circumstances in this case. Send village has been selected out and most disproportionately targeted by the GBC for this proposed development.

Our village which has many narrow roads has problems now in handling traffic on a daily basis any more additional traffic will stop us villagers with right of free movement.

Two sites in our village have changed three times by the GBC namely Burnt Common and Garlick's Arch which are now both back in contention, what is going on. These latest changes are totally unacceptable. The GBC seem to have some kind of rigid agenda to ignore residents comments and to destroy what we have for future generations and not taking into account the problems of infrastructure and the environment which is required by Law.

Green Belt, Policy 2 at para.4.3.15

Send Business Park now taken out of the Green Belt in its entirety.

I strongly object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt it is effectively an old-conforming user in an area of beautiful open countryside enjoyed by local residents for walking and local wildlife all along the Wey Navigation.

The road along Tannery lane is so narrow cars have to stop and allow oncoming cars to pass in places.

Lorries jam up now, more will be ridiculous.

Any further development here is most unacceptable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1071</th>
<th>Respondent: 8899489 / A.A. White</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 manner in which Guildford Borough Council has presented this latest Plan. I consider that the Plan is misleading and contradictory to their presented by Guildford B.C. especially the Summer edition of &quot;About Guildford&quot; where statements are made and then immediately contradicted. For example:-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You state that the number of development sites has been reduced. YET you added more sites at short notice, Garlick's Arch and Winds Ridge/ Send Hill AND ENLARGED the Send inset area, thereby allowing and encouraging larger developments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You state that there will be NO development along the A3 between Junction 10, M25 to the Hogs Back. YET YOU PROPOSE (including Wisley Airfield) some 6800 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/3925</th>
<th>Respondent: 8900641 / Caroline Carr</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a local resident I feel I must make a strong objection to these proposed developments in the Send and Send Marsh areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish to object to the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I object to all erosion 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: pslp173/51</th>
<th>Respondent: 8901953 / I.G. Howell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt. This country can no longer afford to keep chipping away at the last remaining vestiges of rural countryside on the whim of local planners. Our descendants will not thank us for destroying their heritage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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 all building on the Green Belt at Send and neighbouring villages because any called for development can be accommodated in Guildford’s brownfield areas much closer to existing transport facilities.

2. 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.

3. I object to all proposed sites in Send as they were not included in the previous consultation in 2014. Send residents have not been consulted on any of the new changes and all its sites have been considerably changed.

4. I object to the building of 400 houses at Garlick’s Arch. These are not needed in Send or the borough and the proposal was announced at the last minute without any prior consultation.

5. I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch. It is not needed and there is already an available site at Slyfield where it can be built.

6. I object to the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch because the site is home to ancient woodland which should be conserved and is also subject to flooding.

7. 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.

8. I object to any building on the Green Belt at Send at Garlick’s Arch, Clockbarn Nurseries or Send Hill because there are no special circumstances to do so and the Green Belt is supposed to be permanent.

9. I object to the quoted housing need amount of 13,860 which is far too high.

10. 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.

11. I object to the very large proposed development of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm because it will wipe out large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land. It would also prove to be catastrophic to the surrounding small roads, which would not be able to cope, and on the A3 and M25 interchange nearby.

12. I object to the total ignorance of infrastructure requirements. Roads, medical facilities, schools etc. will not be adequate to cope.

13. I object to expanding Send’s housing by over 25%. Objections were raised before and the number was reduced to from 435 to 185. It does not make any sense and goes against many people’s wishes to expand on this number once again.

14. I object to the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch as it is part of the Green Belt and helps stop merging of towns and settlements. This is the main purpose of the Green Belt. I believe it needs to stay as such.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Comment ID: PSLPA16/485  **Respondent:** 8922625 / Jim Morris  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I object to Green Belt development at the proposed sites A35, A43, and A45. Development at these sites will increase traffic exponentially without providing the required infrastructure.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4118  **Respondent:** 8923905 / Claire Bridges  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I object to the new boundaries proposed for insetting the villages of Send and Send Marsh/Burnt Common from the Green Belt (policy P2).

The boundaries drawn enclose huge areas of open spaces that should be retained as Green Belt land and not developed at any time in the future. The village boundaries should be much more closely circumscribed to prevent urban sprawl and retain their village identity.

By having such a tightly inset area around the village then the greenbelt will be completely lost forever and urban sprawl will ensue.

With a presumption for development within these ‘inset’ areas, the proposed enclosures would encourage over-development and expansion of the villages in the future and completely ruin their essentially rural nature.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4119  **Respondent:** 8923905 / Claire Bridges  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

Fields around Danesfield, Send Marsh (GU23 6LS)

**I refer to this area because it is not currently high profile but it is a significant site for other reasons.**

I wish to object to this site although it is not specifically mentioned. However, I understand this site is regarded as ‘safeguarded’ and therefore could come into play should some of the sites drop out.

If you look at the maps then you will see that the far end and sides of Danesfield have had their boundaries inset and now the back gardens of these houses now are the proposed greenbelt boundary. As we are surrounded by open fields then
this suggests that everything the otherside, i.e. open fields, would be redesignated as non greenbelt and therefore will be developed.

My comments on this site are as follows:

1. This site is on a flood plain. Over 37% of the site is in flood zones 2 or 3, with over 25% in flood zone 3. Therefore, this land is clearly not suitable for development and this was borne out whenever there is heavy rain and the land floods. I am reliably informed that the area becomes almost a large lake when there is a heavy downpour and this can be seen from the road and footpaths.

1. GBC policy and the Environment Agency are against developing on flood zones and so for this reason the land should not be built on or developed. GBC could face legal action from the Environment Agency if they were to go against this and spend tax payer’s funds to defend such a claim. This would be an irresponsible use of tax payer’s money.

1. I know photographic evidence showing the effect of flooding on the site have been sent to GBC and they have accordingly downgraded the site from a Potential Development Area to a Safeguarded Area.

1. Any building or hard standing will reduce the land available to absorb the run off from heavy rain falls and this will exaggerate the flooding affect. This could cause flooding and damage to adjoining property in Danesfield which may lead to future insurance claims.

1. There are many bats on this site which are protected under The Conservation of Habits and Species Regulations.

1. The access into the site is limited to only two points of entry. One entry is onto the busy Send Marsh Road which is narrow and unsuitable to carry more traffic. This entry point is near to a blind bend so there would be a safety concern and a potential accident black spot with approaching traffic from the direction of Send. The other entry point is into the side of Danesfield where the access is deliberately narrow as it is a residential road where many families live with young children. There is only just enough room to get two cars passing so a massive increase in traffic would be totally impractical as well as dangerous for all the small children who play in the road. Furthermore, there is an old established oak tree on the entry point which would have to be cut down and I believe this has a TPO on it.

1. As a resident of Send and with my family living here and our garden backing onto this site, I am very concerned about what is being discussed regarding potential building on the site. It would be an absolute travesty if this land were to be lost to building. This corner of Send Marsh is of an open rural nature and therefore totally unsuitable for insetting from the green belt.

1. Our village is loved and cherished by all those of us who live here. Send Marsh has a long history of generations of families living here and we all love the open countryside, the lovely walks, the beautiful views and the village life atmosphere. To commence on such a thoughtless and aggressive building program would bring this to an end and would mean that we could never go back to what we once had.

1. The site should not be termed “safe guarded “as the meaning of ‘safe’ does not seem to apply. As I understand the term as used here, this site could be back on the table as a possible contender for consideration for planning permission if other sites do not get their planning granted. There would not be a democratic process for this site to then have a further round of public consultation as the date will have been passed. We would then be at the mercy of GBC and the planners.

1. Send Marsh has already seen a dramatic increase in the traffic flowing through it and into Send village at peak hours with long tailbacks from the traffic lights at Mays Corner. Send Marsh regularly sees delays getting onto the Portsmouth Road at Send Dip with long queues of traffic going towards Ripley and Burnt Common.

1. This site is at the back of Danesfield has limited access onto Send Marsh Road and if this was the only way out then this would put a lot of strain onto an already congested road. If the access was through Danesfield then this would seriously congest our road as it is very narrow and difficult to pass cars at various points.
1. This site should not be removed “inset” from the green belt as this would mean planning permission would surely be granted for the future.

1. The field behind Danesfield is a beautiful open space with much wildlife including deer and foxes as well as lots of birdlife. The field is enjoyed by those in the village who walk and take their dogs by the adjoining footpaths.

1. Send Marsh Road has a very narrow and dangerous bridge which would need to be widened to make it safer and the whole of the Send Marsh Road would need to be overhauled. There is no mention of this in the plan.

1. Send Marsh does not have any infrastructure. There are no local shops, no school, no doctor’s surgery and no public park area. It comprises mainly all houses and so the addition of so many new houses will put huge pressure on the infrastructure on Send and Ripley, both of which can hardly cope with the current pressures. You would have to walk a considerable distance to access any of these services and so this would mean owners would have to use a car. This would seem contrary to the governments’ policy for us all being green and reducing pollution.

1. The bus routes to and from both villages are very poor and infrequent, about one per hour. Again it is essential to have a car. The roads are too narrow and dangerous for cyclists so this is not really an option.

1. By proposing greenbelt sites in the area means this land will be gone forever. It is essential we protect the greenbelt or we will simply be a concrete jungle joined to Guildford and Woking with no green space in between. These greenbelt areas are essential to everyday living to provide clean and open space for everyone to enjoy.

1. There are plenty of brownfield sites available which should also be considered. In addition, there are sites which have been given planning permission but builders are refusing to build on as presumably, they are waiting for house prices to increase so they can maximise their profits. I feel time limits should be placed on planning permissions granted to encourage building in any economic climate.

1. Send Marsh is poorly served by schools, particularly the secondary school. It has become increasingly difficult to get children into George Abbot which is the closest school to the village. With the amount of houses to be built set to increase, where will the children go to school if we don’t have a plan to build schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I strongly object to Send being removed from the Green Belt which may be your method of proposing even more development later.

My family moved to the tranquil village of Send nearly 50 years ago. Your proposal will destroy our village.

There appears to be no consideration to limiting infrastructure of the current village. Our schools are full, the medical centre cannot take more patients, it takes some time to get appointment.

Please reconsider the details of your proposed plan, it will destroy our village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• I object to removal of Send Village from the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3510  Respondent: 10394625 / Simon Greener  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) is Sound? ( ) is Legally Compliant? ( )

I think it is safe to say that given the staggering lack of foresight that has gone into the creation of the new local plan its authors have not read the National Planning Policy Framework, or have simply chosen to ignore its contents. May I therefore remind the planning department of GBC (in addition to its collective duty to uphold electoral promises to protect the Green Belt) that a key tenet within it is: “The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.”

I object to the removal of Send from the Greenbelt on the grounds that Green Belts should be kept open and permanent. To remove Send from the Green Belt would be shockingly myopic and would deprive future generations of their right to a Green Belt that is open and permanent.

Also from the National Planning Policy Framework: “Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.”

I object to the removal of Send from the Greenbelt on the grounds that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. There are categorically no proven, justified, or exceptional circumstances to do so.

Also from the National Planning Policy Framework: “As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

I object to the removal of Send from the Greenbelt and the proposed development of over 400 houses which is inappropriate, disproportionate and harmful to the Green Belt. Seeking to inset the village does not resolve the problem; it just exacerbates the harm.

I could go on of course but I think GBC’s proven scattergun approach to town planning, flagrant disregard for previous promises and a blinkered approach to Local Plan development means the views of 1000’s of local residents are unlikely to be heeded or properly considered in a fair and reasonable manner. However, I’m an optimist so remain hopeful that the words of the author Bill Bryson in ‘The Road to Little Dribbling’ may generate a flicker of reasonableness, common sense and foresight from the disfunctioning pool of incompetence that is the GBC Planning Department. I doubt it but shall include the quote anyway: “there isn’t a landscape in the world that is more artfully worked, more lovely to behold, more comfortable to be in, than the countryside of Great Britain. It is the world’s largest park, it is the most perfect accidental garden. I think it may be the British nation’s most glorious achievement.”

I object to the GBC planning department ‘insetting’ Send from the Green Belt and in so doing permanently destroying the character of the village and by proxy the beautiful surrounding countryside.

I hope that your individual legacies will not be the indelible destruction of another small part of British countryside.

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 2016 Plan put forward was rejected by local residents from over 32,000 objections largely by Send Residents. Is the GBC not listening? The stealing of Green Belt land for domestic and commercial expansion and the many points put forward on the lack of infrastructure and environmental reasons have simply been ignored.

The Government has made clear that Brown Field sites must be used for future development and Green Belt land only to be used in very exceptional circumstances. What are the exceptional circumstances in this case? Send village has been most disproportionately targeted by the GBC for the proposed developments as now shown.

Our village which has many narrow roads has problems now in handling traffic on a daily basis. The additional traffic will simply add to the gridlock situations that arise every day.

Two sites in our village have changed three times by the GBC namely Burnt Common and Garlick's Arch which are now both back in contention. What is going on? These latest changes are totally unacceptable. The GBC seem to have some kind of rigid agenda to ignore residents' comments and to destroy what we have for future generations and not taking into account the problems of infrastructure and the environment which is required by Law.

The previous comments still stand. Is the GBC not listening to the previous objections of local people?

There are no exceptional circumstances existing to continue and over develop the Green Belt in this beautiful village with history dating back to Elizabethen times. The purpose of the Green Belt must not be ignored. We must safeguard our wonderful woodland and open countryside. This particular land I understand is a flood zone 2 area and any further development will cause additional flooding during parts of the year. Local wildlife will also be affected. More additional traffic will bring pollution in air quality and noise. There is no justification for this proposal.

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.

Green Belt, Policy 2 at para.4.3.15

Send Business Park now taken out of the Green Belt in its entirety.

I strongly object to the proposal to remove Send Business Park from the Green Belt. It is effectively an old-conforming user in an area of beautiful open countryside enjoyed by local residents for walking and local wildlife all along the Wey Navigation.

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 **strongly object** to the changes to the plan. You have already received thousands of previous objections from people in the Send, Send Marsh and Ripley communities. As a result of the **changes** you have made, **I strongly object** as follows and my comments need to be seen by the Planning Inspector.

**Policy 2, paragraph 4.3.15 – Green Belt. I strongly object** to taking Send Business Park out of the green belt altogether as it is situated in an area of outstanding natural beauty with very narrow, country access roads which should not be spoilt. People visit the footpaths from miles around and the area is well known for the quality and tranquillity of the public footpath walks in this specific area.

Our area simply cannot take any more traffic; grid lock occurs many times each week now. You are planning to ruin our area. Please give greater consideration to protect the area which includes the necessary green belt. Without it, we may just as well live in the centre of a major conurbation.

Please keep your promises over the years of protecting the green belt. Please do not destroy our communities.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/460  **Respondent:** 10543937 / Sarah Wright  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt due to the following points:

The roads to this area are rural roads, single track for the most part, certainly not suitable for any more traffic, especially larger commercial vehicles. At one end it joins another rural road with a weak bridge in one direction and a very narrow junction in Ripley in the other.

Any more development in this area ruins the surrounding Green Belt land, which comprises open fields and the River Wey.

The original development is effectively an old non conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside, so shouldn't even be there.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/273  **Respondent:** 10544353 / Janet Govey  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 15 villages, including Ripley and Send, from the green belt. This will lead to wholesale, and often inappropriate developments.
I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have not followed the correct process for Send and Ripley developments. Any significant changes to the 2014 proposals, such as the proposal development of Garlicks Arch, should have required another full consultation, which did not happen. This invalidates the whole process.

I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have failed to provide sound evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment which shows that industrial space at Burnt Common IS NO LONGER NEEDED. You are not following the letter of the law, follow consultations and listen to public objections, stop trying to bring in underhand changes.

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 live on the A247 this road is always busy with extremely fast traffic, it can not take that volume of traffic as the local infrastructure is not good enough.

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. I appreciate they need somewhere to live, but this access is particularly bad and the road is busy enough with school traffic.

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. My son lives in Send and was unable to get into his nearest school as it was full!!! Where are all these new children going to go?! The school is being rebuilt but not any bigger!! The extra land is being used for housing, more children, traffic and patients for doctors surgery.

Pls listen to public objections

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the proposed industrial space of 7000 sq m at Garlicks Arch, Burnt Common -Site A43a as there does not seem to be a proven need. Indeed, if such a need was established, brownfield sites should be sought before eroding green belt land. It is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

I object to the proposed new 4 way junction at Burnt Common as this will massively impact on the local area and Send in particular. There is already a problem with traffic which at rush hour involves serious queuing and the A247 is likely to be gridlocked all day if this junction were to go ahead because of the additional volume of traffic. Send would be used as a cut through to the A3 and the M25. I object to the A25 Gosden Hill Farm 2000 housing proposal - such a proposal would hugely increase traffic levels if this 4way junction were to go ahead, causing significant traffic flow problems so close to Send and Ripley.

I object to the disregard for the Green Belt. It seems very cynical to alter the village boundaries and remove land from the Green Belt designation to facilitate development. It makes a mockery of Green Belt protection - Green Belt is vitally important to protect our villages from becoming an urban sprawl and is even more important now with such pressures for development. The whole character of Send, Ripley and the local area would change irrevocably and we have a duty to protect our villages and the countryside from inappropriate and ill advised development. The Green Belt helps maintain a buffer between Guildford and Woking.

I object to the proposed huge development plans at the Wisley airfield site. Although it has been refused, it is subject to appeal and is therefore a very real possibility. Such a large scale development would have a devastating effect on the character and amenities of the local area and the traffic levels would dramatically increase. The A3 is already struggling to cope with traffic at a standstill on several days each week, and not just at peak times, with accidents occurring regularly. This large proposed development of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield along with 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm 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 proposed 45 homes on the former nursery- site A42. This land is low lying and subject to flooding. Tannery lane is narrow and twisting and unsuitable for the increase in traffic that such a development would inevitably bring. Also the land opposite {former vineyard] has been cleared and fibre optic cabling installed - no doubt preparing for future development and so the flood gates would be opening. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

I object to the 40 houses and traveller pitches A44 at Winds Ridge and Send Hill - again a new addition to the local plan - not previously consulted on. It is a landfill site and its suitability is questionable and again Send Hill is a narrow, single track in places, country road which would be adversely affected by the increased traffic.

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 and existing amenities will be unable to cope. 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt close to the A3, which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and A247and surrounding roads, which are at present already struggling to cope.

I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt.

Would you please take into account these concerns and objections and write confirming that they have been duly noted.

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> pslp163/307</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10561953 / M Conisbee</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 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.</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 gridlocked all day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village infrastructure simple cannot take more people , school ,doctors , roads are all under pressure now as things stand,</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>I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.</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> pslp173/90</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10562049 / Ian Cameron</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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>IN GENERAL, I OBJECT TO DEVELOPMENTS AROUND SEND, TOGETHER: policies A42, A43, A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to changes to these Policies in the Plan on the grounds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Since 2014, GBC has repeatedly changed its mind on what is appropriate for Send, showing lack of co-ordinated strategy. Again now, it is relentlessly and unfairly targeting the area with developments, regardless of previous objections to these excessive plans.

2) The local “village” services, roads, transport, doctors, etc, barely cope as it is. But, under the Plan the population of Send will increase so much that I think that local services will be “unsustainable”; and that is against the fundamental principles of “proper” planning.

3) The Burnt Common area will become “traffic chaos” in peak hours, having 3 major new developments nearby: a huge new housing estate, industrial park, and new A3 slip-road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
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.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1632  **Respondent:** 10570049 / Jenny Peachey  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building on the Green Belt at Send at Garlicks Arch, Clockbarn Nurseries and Send Hill because it is not justified by any "exceptional 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:** pslp173/70  **Respondent:** 10570049 / Jenny Peachey  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Local Plan proposes an increase of 500 homes in Send, that is nearly 30%. (40 at Send Hill, 60 at Tannery Lane and 400 at Garlicks Arch).

In addition, within a few kilometres there are proposals for another 4500 homes (2000 at Wisley and 1500 at Gosden Hill Farm).

Add to this the proposal to build 10 hectares of industrial/warehousing at Burnt Common.

Add to this the proposal to build north and southbound interchanges onto the A3 trunk road at Burnt Common.

This is not sustainable for such a location as Send and Ripley as there is not the capacity to upgrade the infrastructure to accommodate such increases.

Existing residents, roads and facilities will overwhelmed.

The consultation of Guildford's Local Plan in 2016 produced over 33,000 comments and one third of these came from Send.

Send appears to have been allocated additional development in this latest submission despite a reduction of the overall housing numbers in the borough, plus an increase of industrial/warehousing development.
Guildford Borough Council have requested a consultation and comments from local residents. They must take on board the comments and modify the submission accordingly.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2011  **Respondent:** 10647585 / A.C. Hill  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the proposed plans of the GBC for several reasons.

1) The government vowed to protect the 'Green Belt'. To remove Ripley and Send from the 'Green Belt' would violate this agreement.

2) Building so many houses on Wisley airfield and at Garlick's Arch and other sites would create one large urban sprawl and destroy an ancient and historic (900 years old) village

3) It can be almost impossible to exit my drive in the rush hour with cars at a standstill a mile back to get on the A3 which is npw at full capacity.

4) There is a lack of evidence for such numbers of housing.

5) There is no immediate provision for infrastructure.

6) The Wisley airfield proposal has previously been turned down and is prone to flooding.

7) Increased air pollution.

8) a disproportionate number of building disposal in the beautiful area.

9) The present frequent congestion on the A37 M25 would become a nightmare.

10) The present A3 was built to save Ripley but already too much traffic passes through this historic village.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1969  **Respondent:** 10648353 / Hugh Proctor  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I am writing to you because I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan.

In particular I object to any encroachment on GREEN BELT land which under your plans would be lost forever and deprive future generations from enjoying it.
You are obviously targeting the villages in North Surrey and I object to your policy of 'in-setting' these villages, particularly Ripley, Ockham, Send, the Clandons and Horsleys to name just some. I also object to what is clearly a disproportionate amount of development in one area.

I particularly object to the underhand way in which the Garlick's Arch site has been handled allowing a development of at least 400 houses to be considered with less than 2 weeks notice.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Advice and I know there is a shortage of housing for people on low incomes who do not own cars and therefore are better housed near the town centre.

Students also need to be housed on or near the university, ACM etc and flats for them would help free up other accommodation for local residents -perhaps the council should be thinking of that rather than building over greenbelt. Also priority should be given to sheltered housing which allows older residents to leave larger homes and again free up residential space.

Now we come to more specific objections.

**OBJECTIONS RETRANSPORT IN RELATION TO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IN SEND**

The councilors admitted that the road infrastructure of the area is at breaking point but all they can offer Send is a million and half over 10 years for unspecified improvements to the road through Send. That road leads to a mini roundabout at Old Woking which cannot cope now, let alone increased traffic from all the new development proposed.

Policy A44 The proposed development on Send Hill will add to the problem -already horrendous at the Send Road end during school drop off and pick up time and positively life threatening at the Potters Lane end.

Policy A42 More traffic will be generated by the Tannery Lane development. This will have to join Send Road in the village as the road is too narrow to make it safe or sensible to leave via Ripley. Send Road is grid locked most mornings and cannot be widened as there are houses both sides, as well as the aforementioned constriction at Old Woking.

Policy A43 However these developments are as nothing to the new Garlick’s Arch development which was slipped into the plan at the last moment. The land has been 'gifted' to the council in return for a massive development of 400 houses and a strategic employment site -by a developer, whose name, unbelievably, Councilor Spooner could not remember! The council gain land to put in a four way junction with the A3 which is supposed to be some sort of magic bullet - however this development is going to generate huge amounts of new traffic .This traffic will have to be absorbed in and around the already clogged roads of Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon.

The A3 is a road that is at saturation point and we are offered the possibility of a tunnel at some point in the future to create relief and Councilor Furness says we need the new junction to enable the tunnel. However surely we are putting the cart before the horse as we need the tunnel to be approved and funded first before we have any necessity for the new junction. Once again its the unnamed developer who is driving the plan.

- **OBJECTIONS RE OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE ISSUES RELATING TO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IN SEND**

The new residents will require school places but there is no provision for new school places. The redevelopment of St Bedes does not envisage an increased intake as far as I am aware. In any event the secondary schools are also going to require enlarging to cope.

Our village medical centre is already under strain and it is increasingly hard to get an appointment - this too will be exacerbated by this huge increase in the population.

- **OTHER OBJECTIONS RELATING TO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IN SEND**

**Policy A44 Send Hill** development this development is in the wrong place. The large field on Send Hill is one of the few remaining large open spaces. It is a glorious place to walk in the summer as the skylarks sing overhead. If there is a need for 2 traveler sites, surely they should not be put along a narrow road on a site which is said to be polluted. No one is keen to accept travellers but they are citizens too and need to be housed – I accept that, but why not put the sites in close to Ewbanks at the Burnt Common roundabout where they won't have to go up Send Hill. In fact the whole Send Hill development would be better placed there.

**Policy A42 Tannery Lane** - the council have already approved a marina that is not wanted by local people and that will add to traffic. The road is a narrow country lane and not suited to 40 new houses, quite apart from the destruction of open land.
Policy A43 Garlick Arch - this site will require the greatest destruction of greenbelt - the cutting down of ancient woodland and the likelihood of upsetting the water table. Flooding in Send Marsh has been mitigated by work at Send Dip but locals, more knowledgeable than I, feel that building and tarmacking over a large area at Garlick’s Arch may well create new flooding problems.

OBJECTIONS RE OTHER PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS IN THE AREA

The council turned down the development at Wisley but have not had the courage to take this site out of the plan - one has to ask why? It continues to be the case that we are NOT ALLOWED to know who the developers are - which is outrageous. How can local people believe that nothing underhand or corrupt is not going on if we do not know who is behind the development. Councillor Spooner claims he does not know who they are - well, either he is not telling the truth or he should be striving to find out on behalf of us all. A new town at Wisley would change the whole area and lead to ribbon development all the way to Guildford - Ripley – Garlick’s Arch - Gosden Farm - Burpham etc.

OBJECTION TO THE DESTRUCTION OF THE GREENBELT

Once the greenbelt has gone it has gone forever. By taking the villages out of the greenbelt then there is no defence to ever greater development within the settlement boundary - and it seems the council can move the boundary of the settlement at will. It seems curious that some land near Councillor Spooner’s constituency is apparently being put back into greenbelt, while Send (who dared to vote for some independent councillors) are being disproportionately hit. What are we to think?

I hope the planning inspector will look into all aspects of how this plan was drawn up, as well as the sites in the plan itself. I am not a Luddite and I accept there has to be some building but it should be done sensitively and only when need is proved. Tonight we were told the local population figures are fairly stable in Guildford so why are we going headlong towards Greater Guildford with developers calling the shots.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am writing to strongly object to the final draft local plan and my reasons are as follows.

There is little reliable evidence or justification for such a massive development in Send's Green Belt. The scale of the development proposed for Send and Ripley is excessive, unnecessary and destructive to our community and Green Belt. There is no justification for the additional houses nor the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq. m. at Garlick's Arch. Even with the proposed interchange on to the A3 at Burnt Common the whole area will be gridlocked. At the present time any problem at the M25/A3 interchange Send and Ripley becomes gridlocked. The whole Plan is a disaster waiting to happen. It goes against the principles of community planning and is no more than a green light to developers, backed by Guildford Borough Council, to carve up rural Surrey.

The well established policies of the Green Belt is to protect open spaces, prevent encroachment into the countryside and stopping linear development leading to the joining together of developed communities have been ignored in the proposals for Send. This plan will produce a huge overload on local and main roads.

Additional points I wish to add are as follows:

There is no requirement for the scale of development proposed. Surrey already has the largest population per square mile in the UK and should not increase.

This plan does not take flooding into account and we all know that this is a problem for residents. I look forward to hearing that you have a revised sensible and thoughtful local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I wish to object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. The fact that it is in the Green Belt, is the reason we brought our house here.

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, as traffic from tannery lane is already a problem.

With interference to Garlick's Arch, the building of houses there plus 1000 sq m of industrial space I wish to object this as it will ass to the traffic problem we already have.

I wish to object this as it will add to the traffic problem we already have.

I wish to object to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common as this will also bring heavy traffic through Send.

I watch large vehicles mount pavements outside our house from my kitchen window. Because of this cars along Send Road tend to park up on the pavements. We have many cyclists using these pavements. This tends to make a problem for pedestrians trying to walk to shops and the Villages medical centre. I would like to have confirmation that this letter has been received.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT TO NEW DEVELOPMENT SITE AT GARLICKS ARCH NOT INCLUDING IN REG.18 DRAFT, PERMANETLY PROTECTED AS GREEN BELT BY NPPF PUBLIC CONSERVATION OF ANCIENT C16 WOODLAND WOULD SUGGEST IF 7000sqm INDUSTRIAL SPACE IS NEEDED BUILD IT ON THE BROWNFIELD SITE AR SLYFIELD.
I OBJECT TO POLICY A44 SITE WEST OF WINDS RIDGE & SEND HILL TO BUILD 40 HOUSES & 2 TRAVELLERS PITCHES ON SITE CONTAINING DOCUMENTED UNSAFE LANDFILL WASTE & WITH INSUFFICIENT ACCESS FROM SINGLE TRACK.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1586  Respondent: 10721121 / L Beraud  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Re THE FINAL DRAFT LOCAL PLAN for SEND

I WISH MY FOLLOWING COMMENTS TO BE SEEN BY THE INSPECTOR

1. I object to the recent proposed plan of the Guildford Borough Council. Since 2014 the G.B.C have changed every Major site in the proposed development for Send, and now have added a massive New Road Junction( which will add to the congestion that is already being experienced on the A3 and local roads, cyclists and pedestrians will suffer, environmental health will suffer through increased air pollution as well increased noise and light pollution). In the proposed plan of 2014 there was provision for 430 houses, this was reduced to 185 in April of 2016, I now note the number has increased to the proposed plan of 2014. These significant changes require another full consultation under regulation 18 and not the short cut of regulation 19 which the G.B.C are trying to get away with. THIS INVALIDATES THE WHOLE PROCESS.

1. I object to policy P2 the proposal to remove Send from the Green The use of the Green Belt Areas for development means local villages will join up and become an urban sprawl and form a Suburbia The new local plan is to remove 15 villages from the Green Belt this includes RIPLEY and SEND. A huge development such as this will limit the ability to mitigate climate change and weather events such as flooding.

1. I object to the Building of 45 Houses at Clockbam Nursery because of inadequate access and traffic Tannery Lane is far to narrow and twisty to accommodate any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles trying to join the main road. Planning has been granted for 64 apartments at Tannery Lane and for building a Marina, both of which will generate additional heavy traffic. The lane cannot take any more traffic the junction is too dangerous already and will be made worse.

1. I object to policy 43.30 ha the use of land at GARLICK’S ARCH Burnt Common designated for 400 houses and 7.000 sq.m of Industrial and Warehousing. There is no need for any more houses on top of the 13.860 already proposed for the borough. This proposed site is new and was not included in regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. It is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. THERE ARE NO EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES. This site has a particular conservation Sensitivity since it is covered with Ancient Woodland, trees which have existed in the 16th century and would be endangered. The proposed Industrial Development of 7.000 sq.m is simply not required since the latest employment land needs assessment 2015(ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7.000sq.m of Industrial space it should be at Slyfield. A new 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this development would be disastrous for Send. The Send road (A247) would be gridlocked all day, Send would be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and the A3. The proposed 2.000 houses to be built at Wisley and the 2.000 at Burpham would make Send an impossible place to live.

1. I object to policy 1.9 ha land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill designated For 40 houses and 2 Travelers Pitches, this site is new and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon.
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 Travelers Pitches is inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

1. I object to the proposed plan of G.B.C for Send. They have failed to provide sound evidence in the terms of employment land needs. Also the need for the housing numbers required of 13.860 homes. If the population is to grow by some 20.000 in the plan period we actually need 8.000 homes (This is based on a average of 2.5 persons per home). The Green Belt does not need to be built over, of the new homes required 50% or more could be built on Brownfield sites. The G.B.C transport assessment was not even available to the councilors for the vote taken the 24th May being published on the 61st June.

Infrastructure overload has not been taken in to account.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the proposal to INSET SEND BUSINESS PARK FROM THE GREEN BELT BECAUSE it is EFFECTIVELY AN OLD NON-CONFORMING USER IN AN AREA OF OUTSTANDING COUNTRY SIDE. There is a HIGHLY RESTRICTED VEHICULAR ACCESS ALONG TANNERY LANE IN BOTH DIRECTIONS. Further EXPANSION OR DEVELOPMENT AT THIS LOCATION DETRACTS FROM THE OPENNESS OF THE GREEN BELT AND IS INAPPROPRIATE.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

The proposed plan for Send does not take account of what local residents, most of whom seem to support the presumption against building in the Green Belt, want.

With many of my friends, I regularly walk long distances in and around the village. The plan proposals put at risk the beautiful countryside we enjoy, which, if Green Belt status is removed, is likely to become a congested suburb.

I further object to the proposed Local Plan in so far as Send is concerned because there is:

1. existing chronic traffic congestion,
2. substandard and only partial connections onto the main A3 and M25 roads,
3. an overloaded local road network connecting towns such as Woking and Guildford,
inadequate infrastructure including but not only schools and medical facilities, and your draft plan under consultation fails to say how any of these shortcomings will be resolved.

So far as the process under which the plan has been devised is concerned I wish to say that:

- the assumptions the plan is based on are fatally flawed,
- no exceptional circumstances justify taking land around Send out of the Green Belt
- no evidence supports a requirement for the proposed scale of development,
- development proposals reflect artificial and ridiculously high projections of need,
- no evidence of need for extra industrial or warehousing land in Send has been tabled.

These faults render the Plan invalid.

Potentially destroying our sustainable community is unacceptable.

The Plan seems to reflect an irrational fear of unwelcome planning appeal decisions based on accusations of inadequate provision for future growth. It would be better to tackle the planning and appeals systems rather than appease the officials who operate a system that generates such problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

--

Comment ID: PSLPA16/35  Respondent: 10722209 / S.K. Trammell  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 new proposals being put forward for Send Village. Send should not be removed from the green belt.

I strongly object to the proposals for Garlicks Arch this being houses and industrial site. This will cause considerable problems with traffic etc. It is already bad enough. More houses mean more people and longer waits for Dr's appt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

--

Comment ID: pslp173/57  Respondent: 10722593 / D.C. Johnson-Webb  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 new proposals being put forward for Send Village. Send should not be removed from the green belt.

I strongly object to the proposals for Garlicks Arch this being houses and industrial site. This will cause considerable problems with traffic etc. It is already bad enough. More houses mean more people and longer waits for Dr's appt.
I object to Green Belt Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15 to insert send business park from the Green Belt because it is an area of outstanding countryside next to the River Wey. Again it has wey restrictions vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions.

I object to the total disregard to, residents views to the buildings on Green Belt land and destroy village life where the Government has pledged to preserve it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1466  Respondent: 10722689 / D.M. Johnson-Webb  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the way the council have changed the plans for Send after the original plan was put forward.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1216  Respondent: 10723297 / G Chubb  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 say Send will no longer be a village if all this building and road widening.

I object very strongly about building on Green Belt Land. I also object to 4 way interchange at burnt common, Send cannot take any more traffic or big lorries as it has damaged all roads through send and it is jammed with traffic most of the day.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/856  Respondent: 10723425 / Eileen Nolan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building houses at site A42a Clockbam Nursery Tannery Lane. Planning permission has recently been granted for a Narrowboat basin in Tannery lane which will lead to an increase in traffic using Tannery Lane. The junction with Send Road (A247) has always been hazardous and the Papercourt Lane end of Tannery Lane is very narrow. Building houses at Clockbam Nursery will add to this problems and create too much traffic for this narrow 'B' classified lane.
I object to site A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Bumtcommon and Ripley and building 400 houses on this site as this site was not included in the initial consultation of the Draft Local Plan in 2014.

I object to building 693 homes per year for next 20 years (2013-2033). This figure is not sustainable for local infrastructure to scope with.

I object to building 485 homes in Send Parish. The population will increase by more than 25% leading to congestion on roads.

I object to the Draft Local Plan because no regard to new schools, additional medical or hospital facilities has been given to make this plan sustainable.

I object to removing villages from the Green Belt. I moved to my bungalow in the 1960s to live in a village and I would like Send to remain a proper village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/891  Respondent: 10724801 / B. Robson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 affecting Send on the following grounds:

1. I OBJECT to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.

2. I 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. I OBJECT to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

6. I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more
7. I OBJECT to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

8. 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.

9. 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.

Please ensure my objections are shown to the Planning Inspector and also provide confirmation that this objection has been received.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2101  
Respondent: 10724897 / Hilary Sewter  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to GBC no having stuck to the rules; for example the proposed 430 houses to be built in 2014 went down to 185 in April 2016 and has just gone up again to 485. There should be another full consultation under Regulation 18 not using a shortcut of Regulation 19. The process is in invalidated by this.

2. The Employment Land Needs assessed first in 2013 and later in 2015 showed a reduction in employment space of 80%. This shows industrial space at Burnt Common is no longer needed and I object strongly that GBC say the requirement is still high

3. I also object to GBC exaggerating the number of houses needed to be built

4. I object to no sign of consideration of increased and improved infrastructure – in fact GBC’s traffic assessment was not available even for the councillors when they cast their votes on 24th

5. I object to the Green Belt being built over especially in Send, which is a buffer between Woking and Guildford. The green spots of land are precious for people and wildlife. Green Belt is permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances

6. I object to a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. Send is frequently gridlocked now. This wouldn’t be an improvement. It would be singularly inappropriate to even consider this

7. I object to land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill being considered as being suitable for 40 new homes and 2 travellers pitches. This site is new and not included in the Regulation 18 draft. It has not been consulted on previously.

8. I object to this land being even considered as the land is permanent Green Belt. This land is beautiful and can only be approached on very narrow country lanes, which are already overloaded with traffic.

9. I object to land being dug up which although beautiful to look at and enjoy contains a variant of unsafe landfill waste. For safety’s sake – leave it alone.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2055</th>
<th>Respondent: 10725345 / T. Sharman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 very strongly to the removal of Send from the green belt as this will ruin what is a beautiful area enjoyed and used very much by the local people</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: PSLPA16/2056</th>
<th>Respondent: 10725345 / T. Sharman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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>Also much of the proposal is woodland which should be protected by you</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: PSLPA16/2684</th>
<th>Respondent: 10725633 / K. Mitchell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 request that the following comments be shown to the Planning Inspector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Government gave us the Green Belt to protect from planning, to save our wildlife and protect trees. I object to any planning application that would take this away from us. We do not want Guildford and Woking joined together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to building 400 houses at Garlicks Arch, this is ancient woodland. The impact of additional traffic would be horrendous as it is already difficult and dangerous to access the A3.</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 a beautiful site opposite a peaceful cemetery. It is mainly a single traffic road and one often has to stop to let another car through. It is also unsafe landfill waste.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt common, getting into Guildford is already gridlocked at certain times of the day and night. Living here you already here the A3 noise we dont want anymore.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general there is not enough infrastructure to cope with xxxx amount of people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally, I find it difficult enough to exit Sandfields into Send Hill, when the parents are dropping off and picking up children at St. Bede's school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We want to keep our village a village, and not have developers make it into a town.</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: PSLPA16/1211  Respondent: 10725729 / Annie Hotson  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Some of my children have been looking forward to returning to the Borough of Guildford to raise their families. They now feel that if this madness is to be allowed they will not.

I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford. I also object strongly to the following.

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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1212  Respondent: 10725793 / Ken Hotson  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford. I also object strongly to the following.

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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1619  Respondent: 10726977 / C.M. Lavender  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Guildford Borough Council's Local Plan

I am writing to object to the "final draft" of the Local Plan which has been prepared without the requisite full consultation under Regulation 18 to the residents of Send village. The Local Plan has changed vastly from that originally proposed,
and objected to, in 2014, raising the number of proposed houses from 430 to 485, and now adding a new road junction which was not mentioned in the earlier Plan.

Guildford Borough Council has not provided sound evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA). A significant number of the new homes needed could be built on brownfield sites, not green belt sites, as proposed.

I strongly object to Send being removed from the green belt. The fundamental aim of green belt policy was to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Local authorities were encouraged to consider protecting land around their towns and cities by the formal designation of clearly defined green belts. While the need for new housing is appreciated, there is absolutely no reason these should be built on green belt land when there are so many brownfield sites available.

I object to the proposal for 400 houses and 7000 sq m of industrial and warehousing at Garlick's Arch, and a new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this development. Again this has not been consulted upon previously and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft. The amount of traffic coming through Send to access this proposed new junction would cause gridlock in an area where many of the roads are already extremely busy.

I also object to the proposed new homes on the land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. Yet again, this was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously.

One of the main reasons for the objection to this area is that the subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented.

Finally, the infrastructure in the village of Send just does not exist to support any of this proposed extreme development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
unrestricted development would change it forever. Residents have chosen to live here because of the rural aspect and this would be destroyed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1950  Respondent: 10728353 / Pat Randles  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO the provision of travellers' sites so close to existing houses and the very well used footpath which I and many others use as a short cut to the village shops (so that cars can be left at home). This is also a favourite path for dogwalkers and we could all be deterred from using it as travellers seem to prefer noisy semi-feral dogs as pets which is a rather frightening prospect. Most importantly the narrow single track country road could not provide sufficient access to the site.

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 because of their size and without sufficient room on their side of the road. All the access roads to this site are narrow. There is already access to 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.

In conclusion, some new affordable homes would be welcomed in Send but the huge numbers proposed would overwhelm the already stretched infrastructure available, whether surgery, schools or narrow roads which would become completely gridlocked.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2019  Respondent: 10729473 / P.T. Elms  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

THE FINAL DRAFT LOCAL PLAN (SEND) OBJECTIONS

Please make sure that my views are made known to the Planning Inspector. I commence with a general point

I object very strongly to the underhand, dishonourable and unacceptable behaviour towards the people of Send. Your behaviour is truly worthy of condemnation as completely unbefitting of a public institution. I object to this blatant display of utter contempt for the people of Send. You should be ashamed of yourselves. You are a disgrace to Guildford and have run roughshod over the reputation of Guildford Borough Council.

I continue with detailed objections.
I object to the removal of Send Village from the Green Belt altogether.

I object to what appears to be the strong reluctance of GBC to build on brownfield sites (50% of new homes needed could be built on brownfield sites).

I object to the failure of GBC to follow the correct process. Since 2014 GBC has changed every major site in Send proposed for development and has now just added a massive new road junction. These significant changes require another full consultation under Regulation 18.

I object to GBC trying to use Regulation 19 and, therefore, the invalidation of this whole process.

I object that GBC has failed to provide sound evidence in terms of ELNA 2015 which shows an 80% reduction in employment space from the previous ELNA carried out in 2013.

I object therefore to the use of Burnt Common as ‘industrial space’ as this is no longer required.

I object to the questionable nature of the housing numbers from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment

I object to the wrong use of foreign student numbers to inflate the need for housing.

I object to what appears to be an exaggeration in the number of houses needed in the local plan (ie 13,860).

I object to the lack of attention being given by GBC to infrastructure overload.

I object to what appears to be the gridlocking of Send. Send will be choked by large lorries, many more cars, and therefore dangerous levels of pollution, on top of the close proximity of the A3 and M25. This appears to be a deliberate policy of GBC.

I object to the dangerously high levels of pollution which will be the result of the plan.

I object to the removal of the Green Belt buffer that Send provides between Guildford and Woking. It will become one suburban sprawl.

I object to policy A43 involving Garlick's Arch (38ha), Burnt Common (400 houses and 7000 sq. m. of industrial and warehousing). This site is new and was not included in Regulation 18! It is Green Belt under NPPF protection.

I object that GBC have (dishonestly?) ignored the latest ELNA 2015 showing the reduction of 80% in required employment space from the previous draft plan.

I further object in the above context to the planned 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. Send would be obliterated by the sheer, unsustainable weight of traffic. Who are these people and what sort of people are they who can propose such horror for the entire population of Send?

I object that GBC have shown little sign of common decency and humanity towards us, the citizens of Send who pay rates to GBC which should be remembered!

I object to Policy A44 (1.9ha). The site 'land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill' - 40 homes and two travellers' pitches is a new site and was not included in the Reg. 18 draft and not consulted upon. This site has permanent green belt status and is part of an area of lovely countryside which ought not to be spoilt. The subsoil contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is vented. A single track road provides inadequate access.

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?
1.1) I am **objecting** to **ALL** proposals for Send in the LOCAL PLAN 2017 Regulation 19 (as set out above) on the grounds that these proposals accumulate to development that is **not sustainable for Send**.

1.2) **I am objecting** because the overall scale of development proposed for Send in Guildford Borough Council (GBC) draft Local Plan 2017 is **not support by the evidence base for the plan**. For instance, a key document used to assess sustainability is the Settlement Hierarchy’s (2014). However, the Settlement Hierarchy document has not been updated since the beginning of the Local Plan process in 2014 and as a result the proposals set out in the 2017 draft and which outline major development of Send are not substantiate by evidence that Send is a village capable of accommodating “major development” in accordance with the Settlement Hierarchy 2014. I will expand this point further in my objection to Policy A58.

Moreover, as the Settlement Hierarchy’s 2014 document is a key piece of the evidence base underpinning Policy P2 Green Belt of the Local Plan; it would appear that as a result of the 2017 changes for Send in the draft Local Plan (which are not supported by the Settlement Hierarchy’s 2014) Policy P2 is at odds with NPPF guidance on the role and purpose of the Green Belt to act as an important constraint on development to ensure sustainability of settlements.

Send is a rural village in the Green Belt. The changes introduced in the Guildford Borough Council (GBC) draft Local Plan 2017 to include two strategic employment sites (A58 and change to Policy 2, paragraph 4.3.15 removal of Send Business Park from the Green Belt) alone would amount to “major development areas” and this is without even beginning to take into account the 500 houses proposed for this one village.

In Sum, my objections to the Guildford Borough Council (GBC) draft Local Plan 2017, are as follows :-

- The 2017 proposals for Send now amount to vast overdevelopment of Send village.
- The 2017 proposals for Send now make this Local Plan without doubt incapable with its own evidence base (the Settlement Hierarchy and the Green Belt and Countryside Study) for Green Belt Policy 2.
- The 2017 proposals for Send make the Local Plan incapable with NPPF guidance on the Green Belt paragraphs 79 -86.
- The 2017 proposals to expand the Send Business Park make the Local Plan unsound on the basis of NPPF paragraph 100 in relation to flood risk in Tannery Lane.
- The 2017 Proposals for A58 are not supported by Highways England and adequate road infrastructure.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
These boundaries double the size of our villages and enclose areas of open spaces that should be retained as Green Belt land and not developed. A presumption for development within these new ‘inset’ areas, would encourage additional development and expansion of the villages in the future and ruin their nature.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3118  Respondent: 10731969 / Tony Mason  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 the Green Belt.

I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.

I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildfords urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.

I object to the building on the Green Belt at Send at Garlick 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.

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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/779  Respondent: 10732161 / Anne Bowerman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the proposal to build 400 houses and to the allocation of 7,000 square feet for industrial purposes at Garlick's Arch.

I object to the apparently underhand way in which the Garlick's Arch proposals have been smuggled onto the Plan for the first time, especially as there was so much opposition to the previous plan.

I object to the proposal to build on the Garlick's Arch site because it is prone to flooding and is ancient woodland. The area has flooded many times in recent years and has been classified as of higher risk by the Environment Agency than GBC's own classification.

I object to the fact that the Garlicks Arch proposal will change the nature of the area and local heritage and lead to yet another large number of extra vehicles resulting in yet more overcrowding on the A3.
I object to proposals for the Burnt Common A3/ A247 interchange which will convert a reasonably quiet and peaceful area into a giant Spaghetti junction.

I object to the proposed enlarged interchange at Burnt Common as it will draw very much more traffic along the A247 through Send. This road goes through the residential and shopping centre of the village of Send. It is already dangerous and subject to tailbacks, partly due to directly passing the entrance to the local medical centre and, further along the road, the school which is about to be enlarged.

I object to the proposal to build 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because there is already inadequate access to and from Tannery Lane onto Send Road, the A247, which is residential. Access at the Newark Lane end is even worse as it is much narrower there.

I object to the proposal to build at Clockbarn Nursery because Tannery Lane is narrow and twisting. For much of its length it is single track only and has no footway.

I object to the proposed development of 40 houses and two travellers' pitches on a site on Send Hill which is narrow and has no pavements. The Send Road access is shared with a school and there is already congestion at certain times of the day. At the Potters Lane end access is even worse as the road there is narrow and winding and on a steep gradient. Accidents occur there through the virtual absence of sightlines.

I object to the proposed development at Send Hill because the land is a disused refuse site and may be contaminated.

I object to the proposed development at Send Hill because development there would spoil an area of natural beauty and cause more delay to traffic already using the road.

I object to the proposal to build houses behind the Talbot Hotel in Ripley. This is over development in a conservation area and will further overload traffic and parking facilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I have perused most of the latest Local Plan and was dismayed to see that it effectively merges all villages along the A3 from the M25 to the Hogs Back with no provision for any infrastructure improvements to either the A3 or local roads! I live in the Send/Ripley area and all these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on local roads in this area. Although Ripley has the A3 as a bypass, to try to get onto the A3 London bound from Ripley at peak times requires a lot of patience!

I was also horrified to learn that the local villages of Clandon, Ripley, Send and Wisley, as well as other villages in Surrey, are to be removed from the designation of "Green Belt" which will allow unlimited future development and result in the destruction of our lovely rural villages!

I OBJECT to the above-mentioned villages being withdrawn from the Green Belt as they provide an essential buffer from Woking and Guildford becoming one large conurbation. Central government and local councilors both gave election promises to protect the Green Belt from further erosion and have reneged on this.

I OBJECT most strongly to the development of Garlick's Arch opposite Send Marsh Road's junction with the Portsmouth Road for housing and industrial development on land which is currently agricultural Green Belt. This is already a very busy junction and causes long delays at peak times. Further housing would also add to the already serious problem of lack of school places and even longer waiting time for doctor's appointments.

I OBJECT to the proposed new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common as this would have a major impact on traffic through Send and the surrounding areas.

I OBJECT to the proposed development of 40 houses and 2 travelers’ pitches at Send Hill. This site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented. The roadway is also single width providing insufficient access. (Again more houses would have an effect on schools and the Villages Medical Centre.)

I OBJECT to the proposed building of houses at Clockbarn Nursery. This junction with Send Road would cause further traffic problems and there is inadequate access as Tannery Lane is very narrow with many tight bends Again, further houses would have a detrimental effect on schools and medical facilities.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of Wisley airfield site as it has already been rejected by Guildford Borough Council. The building of so many homes and the enormous amount of infrastructure it would require would have a tremendous impact on local roads and, again, facilities, schools, hospitals etc.

I OBJECT to the suggestion of 2,200 homes on Gosden Hill site at Glandon and Burpham. Again, this would require major infrastructure works and would greatly increase the volume of traffic on local areas of Glandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send.

All the suggested developments would require significant improvements to the A3 and local roads and would contribute to the destruction of our rural villages!

I hope that my comments will be read by the inspector!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to:-

GBC using faulty and out of date statistics and not considering the GBC transport assessment of June 6th.

Send road is already overloaded with traffic, it will become gridlocked increasing noise and pollution levels even further.

Proper use of Brownfield sites ie Slyfield mean that this green belt area is not needed for industrial development.

Plans for 64 apartments and a Marina are already in place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I wish to object to the above on the grounds of its lack of planning for infrastructure to accommodate the large number of houses mentioned.

There is no mention of plans to cope with increases for school places which would be flooded and medical facilities and surgeries.

The main road which runs through the centre of Send, A247, is already very congested at times and would just not be able to cope with the extra traffic which would be caused.

I also object to Policy A44 where 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches would be built. The access to the site in Send Hill, a lane which is very narrow and has 2 very tight bends which would be very hazardous.

Finally the idea of the destruction of the green belt in this area is ridiculous. This part of the green belt is absolutely essential for dividing Guildford from Send and Woking, alternative it will mean a completely built up area from Guildford to London.

My husband and I have lived in Send in this house for 35 years. We have walked every public footpath and know and love every part of this area which is very beautiful although my husband has passed away I know that he like me would wish future generations to have the same opportunities to enjoy the Green Belt as we have done.

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? ( )

As a resident of Send I am appalled at the proposals put forward in the Local Plan. The plan is supposed to be the result of the consultation process between the Borough Council and its residents. We have already put forward our views during the process and have been totally ignored. It is not surprising that the people of this country have lost faith in our politicians (you guys). My objections are covered in the following five points:

1. **I object to Send being removed from the Green Belt.** The Green Belt was established as a permanent feature required by the National Planning Policy Framework and not something that can be taken away under pressure from property developers, unjustified government targets or a Borough Council who prefers to develop in the areas that they believe will give them the least resistance.

There are no special circumstances to justify Send losing its Green Belt status and as a buffer to separate Guildford from Woking it is essential that its Green Belt status be retained.

Local councillors and central government gave a clear election promise to protect the Green Belt. The current proposals renege on those promises.

1. **I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery.** This is a ridiculous idea. Tannery lane is a narrow and bendy road joining Send Road at a very difficult and potentially dangerous junction. The traffic in Send is already heavily congested and further traffic emerging from Tannery Lane will only make this worse. Traffic improvements at the junction will not help, as the congestion is the result of bottlenecks at both the Burnt Common and Old Woking roundabouts. The future traffic has already been exacerbated by planning permission for 64 apartments and a marina further down Tannery Lane.

1. **I object to building 400 houses and 7000m2 of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch.** Ancient woodland! Subject to flooding! Plenty of brownfield sites already available in the borough! Slyfield is already the industrial centre of Guildford Borough so why create another one especially as there is an over supply of industrial space in the area at the moment and for the foreseeable future. In addition, Guildford’s housing plan requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and when challenged, the council refuses to release their calculations.

1. **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.

1. **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 trust you will consider my comments and those of all the other residents in Send and the surrounding villages before inflicting any further irreversible damage on our communities.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I am writing with regard to the Local Plan and the resulting effects on the villages and Surrey's Green Belt.

I object to the removal of Send Village from the Green Belt. If developers move in and use Green Belt for housing, industrial, etc. it will mean the merging of the Send/Ripley/Glandon area with Guildford, thereby making the area one urban area as opposed to villages with open spaces relative to the population.

I object to the proposed building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane, Send. The access to Tannery Lane at present is hazardous to say the least and the prospect of a further influx of traffic entering and exiting onto Send Road will cause an enormous amount of disruption in the village which is busy enough already.

I object to the proposed new development of 40 houses and two travellers' sites in Send Hill. Again, Send Hill is on a busy junction and extra traffic will again cause disruption. This area has permanent Green Belt status within an area of beautiful countryside, not land to be used for development.

I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch and the proposed new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. It is grossly indecent to utilise Green Belt land to build this amount of dwellings and provide for industrial. There are brownfield sites in the area that can be allocated for industrial use. This site is prone to flooding and whereas much work was carried out in the Send Marsh area in the 1980's to prevent flooding in the area, this development would put pressure on the current safety levels. This particular Green Belt site has conservation issues in that it is covered in ancient woodland.

The current infrastructure cannot cope with this influx. I do not merely refer to services, but also to the local schooling, doctors' surgeries, local travel and road usage itself. If these developments were allowed to proceed, it will be nigh impossible to move on the roads in the immediate area - they are proving to be difficult now without any new influx.

Promises were made by Local Councils and Central Government to protect the Green Belt and if these promises are not kept, developers will take advantage and our Green Belt will be no more.

I urge you to take note of the objections listed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am so disgusted with these plans; who would even wish to build upon Greenbelt areas within beautiful rural villages. There seems to be too many corrupt people working within this council, whom are only interested in earning a back earner!!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/877  Respondent: 10741729 / Jean Page  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 content of the local plan and want my comments to be seen by the Inspector. My reasons are as follows:-

1. **I OBJECT** to these areas of land being taken out of the Green Belt i.e. the land behind the school including playing fields and woodland, the land to the right of Carbridge by the river Wey Navigation up to the new boundary fence with Vision Engineering and the land to the left of Carbridge going up to the old depot on the Wey Navigation. This would in effect lead to the destruction of the village of Send, removing it from the Green Belt and making it part of an urban sprawl. It is my understanding that the Green Belt is an area to be protected for perpetuity for our children and our grandchildren. It has remained protected for the benefit of every one, not just those people who live nearby but also visitors from London and other urban areas who visit to cycle, walk, picnic and to enjoy the tranquillity and closeness to nature in the countryside. It has yet to be demonstrated that there are “exceptional circumstances” for building on Green Belt land.

2. **I OBJECT** to the proposal to use land at “Garlick’s Arch” on which to build 400 houses and 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing. This would also remove this land from the Green Belt and it has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland and trees over 500 years old would be endangered along with the protected wildlife which lives there. The proposed industrial development has not been identified as being required by the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment (2015) which actually indicates a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan.

3. **I OBJECT** to the proposals for Garlick Arch as it has been indicated that this would require a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common and if there has been a thorough investigation into the traffic congestion which already exists in this area, it must be apparent that this would cause traffic chaos. It is also my understanding that no firm proposals or time scales for changes to any of the roads in this area have been agreed. How can this proposal go ahead without any commitment to any changes in the road layout and even if these do go ahead, they will do nothing to alleviate the major traffic havoc which will ensue and will severely increase if any of the proposals for Send and Garlick Arch go ahead.

4. **I OBJECT** to the addition of new sites, i.e. land west of winds ridge, send hill and Garlicks Arch, to the increase in the number of houses to be built and to a major new road junction which were NOT previously included in the Borough Plan and which have not been consulted upon previously. These areas have NOT been subjected to full consultation under Regulation 18 which I believe invalidates the whole process. This proposal would again mean that an area of the Green Belt would be lost. It is also my understanding that the subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste.

5. **I OBJECT** to the inclusion of two more Travellers pitches. I am not aware of any research that indicates the need for these in this area. In my view, if some members of society choose to live in caravans and to travel, that is their right. What I am at a loss to understand is why “travellers” need a permanent pitch [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]

6. **I OBJECT** to the increased level of building and inclusion of travellers sites which is included in the “Newlocalplan” since I believe that it does not take into account a realistic appraisal of the additional
infrastructure that would be required to meet all the needs which would arise. Hospital services, GP surgeries, schools, transport etc.

7. **I OBJECT** to new homes being built on greenbelt land when the availability of brownfield sites has not been thoroughly explored. The plan indicates that 40% of the housing will be “affordable”. Please can you provide a figure of what you consider constitutes ”affordable”. If the planning committee has been aware of the research done by the BBC they will know that the shortage of housing in the South East is due to lack of social housing for those who cannot afford to buy at any price and the fact that private landlords are charging more than local authority housing benefit will pay. This development will do nothing to alleviate the housing difficulties which exist in London and the surrounding areas. It will merely serve to line the pockets of the developers and possibly the County Council who can benefit from the “sweetners” demanded by them.

8. **I OBJECT** to the huge amount of housing and the areas of land on which it is proposed to be built. It is well known to all the residents of these areas that they flood every time there is heavy rain. Building houses and industrial units on land prone to flooding is not only distressing to the residents in the event that it occurs but also has a knock on effect on the rest of society whose insurance bills increase every time the insurance companies have to pay out millions of pounds.

Overall, I am deeply upset, disappointed and feeling betrayed by the local Councillors who I thought were elected to and would be committed to protecting my home and environment, as well as protecting the green belt for our children and their children. Since Monica Juneja and Mansbridge have left the Council (under a cloud of proven fraud and suspicion) I had hoped for a more open and honest Council who would listen to the wishes of the electorate and investigate their genuine concerns without prejudice but I am finding no evidence that this is so. Local councillors and the government gave a clear election promise to protect the green belt but it seems that both are prepared to renege on it for the sake of a “quick buck”.

I find it difficult to express how disillusioned and let down I feel by my local representatives. The people to whom I have entrusted the safeguarding of my home, environment and provision of essential services and who have failed to do so spectacularly.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/383</th>
<th>Respondent: 10741729 / Jean Page</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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>

Green Belt Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15 I object to this proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:-

It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation.

Tannery Lane is a one track road which is unable to accommodate any increase in traffic in both directions.

Here again the openness of the Green Belt would be impinged upon.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/371</th>
<th>Respondent: 10741793 / Dianne Mathie</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I am writing to you to log my objection to the removal of Send from the Green Belt not least because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford but also because I really do feel totally let down by everyone of those pushing this plan forward.

I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs. Please do not do this to an area which is so beautiful.

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. Surely these plans cannot legally go through to completion because of this?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the plan to inset Send business park from the green belt on the grounds that this site is adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation and flood plain meadows and is an historic left over which should be confined within its existing space in order to prevent further erosion of the nature and character of the area.

Overall I have serious concerns about the manner in which the clear and settled opinion of the villagers affected by the local plan have been ignored by the council both in the initial instance and in the revisions made. Local infrastructure is already unable to cope. No further significant housing or industrial development should be made until measures are taken to alleviate traffic overload through Send. Limited affordable housing should be placed on previously developed sites (e.g. old school site) before any green field sites are allowed. Local services like schools, which are at full capacity in Send, sewers, and medical services are already overburdened- the doctors and pharmacy has just had to increase the time taken for a repeat prescription to 5 working days. Guildford borough council has an obligation to take the Send neighbourhood plan into consideration in development decisions and needs to honour local opinion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I am writing to you to object to the changes to the Local Plan, especially the council's proposals to develop the land at Garlick's Arch at Burnt Common on the Send/Ripley borders for housing and industrial warehousing, however there are many aspects to the revised Local Plan that I find incredulous.
I am completely bewildered and angered by these proposals, the beauty of these villages and surrounding areas will be absolutely destroyed by the plans proposed. To suggest Ripley, Send and Clandon should be removed from the Green Belt is a disgrace. The infrastructure and services simply cannot support the levels of housing and warehousing proposed and the council 'dangling a carrot' in the Local Plan about creating new A3 slips at Burnt Common is nothing short of bribery.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/53  Respondent: 10750593 / Jo Williams  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In short:

• I object to the erosion of the Green Belt, 16th century trees, beautiful countryside and natural habitats for animals will be destroyed
• I object to Ripley, Send and Clandon being removed from the Green Belt, this would devalue the homes of existing residents and cause destruction of our rural villages
• I object to the disproportionate amount of development being proposed, these are villages with defined boundaries, not towns
• I object to the last minute inclusion of these proposals in the Local Plan with less than 2 weeks’ notice and suggest the approach taken was unethical
• I object to the fact that no housing needs analysis has been produced and made available publicly, even affordable housing in these villages would be out of reach for the majority
• I object to the fact that no industrial warehousing needs analysis has been produced and made available publicly
• I object on the basis the infrastructure cannot accommodate the proposed development, there is no immediate provision for new schools, doctors surgeries etc. and the Royal Surrey Hospital is under significant strain
• I object on the basis that no other alternatives for traffic calming/routing have been produced and/or made publically available (I suggest options above)

Do not destroy our beautiful villages and rural surroundings, I appeal to your moral compass!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/665  Respondent: 10750657 / John Quin  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Having recently had an extension to our property and experiencing nearly 2 years of rejections from the planning department for an extension which several of my neighbours had already had similar work. The planning department repeatedly stated the importance of send maintaining is quaint appearance and keeping development in the area controlled. I therefore find it personally insulting to see this plan being proposed for this 'quaint area' from the department that made us reduce a dormer window by 10cm (a 5% adjustment!) are now planning to tear up the rule book they so stringently stuck to when looking at our planning application. This screams of massive double standards. We paid for
many architects drawings to appease the local planning department who now seem happy to add 100's of new houses to
the area. I would urge you to look at their rejections to our planning application and apply these to the local plan.

I wish to register my objection to the local plan for the Send area for the following reasons highlighted by the save
send action group, I wholeheartedly agree with all points raised:

• 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.
• 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 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 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:</th>
<th>PSLPA16/1790</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10753025 / V. Erridge</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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>

GBC have not followed correct process. Concerning Send there is a change in the details concerning the 2014 proposed Reg. 18 the short cut to regulation 19 invalidates the whole process.

I object to policy P2. Send should not be removed from the Green Belt. Send is a buffer between Woking and Guildford. All the plans if put into practice will cause even more traffic on A247, increase in heavy goods traffic. The particularly vulnerable areas of land being taken out of the green belt include the land behind the school including playing fields and woodland.

The land to the right of Cartridge by the river wey navigation up to the new boundary fence with vision engineering

Land to the left of cartridge going up to the old depot on the wey navigation.

I object to Policy A44 1.9 ha land west of winds ridge and send hill.

Designated for A40 homes and 2 travellers pitches. This site is new and was not included in the regulation 18 draft has not been consulted upon previously.

Permanent Green Belt status. Housing development inappropriate due to its Green Belt status. Development would spoil an area of beautiful countryside.

The subsoil of the area contains documented unsafe land fill waste.
2 travellers pitches would be inappropriate due to narrow width single track road – causing insufficient access to site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3725  **Respondent:** 10757185 / Liz George  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Plans for 64 apartments and a Marina are already in place

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2057  **Respondent:** 10764385 / E.E Whearley  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the over development in the particular areas of Send and Ripley.

I object because of a limited consultation period for the plan.

I object because new sites were included with less than 2 weeks notice.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/789  **Respondent:** 10773345 / mavis davies  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. We were given an election promise by both Government and local councillors that Send would remain in the Green Belt, providing a buffer between Woking and Guildford. There are no special circumstances which would warrant that removal.
- I object to 45 new houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane is narrow and full of bends, and is quite unsuitable for more trafic.

Already it will be overburdened by the planned new houses at the Tannery and by the new marina.
• I object to the planned new houses and industrial development at Garlick's Arch. The site is one of ancient woodland and is liable to flooding.
• I object to the planned development of houses and travellers' sites at Send Hill. The road is too narrow and the actual site contains unsafe landfill material.
• I object to the new interchange with A3 at Burnt Common. All the new housing in the area would generate traffic from A3 M25. Woking and Guildford all passing through the Send Road, which is already impassable at busy times of the day. In particular, people such as myself and my 95 year old husband find the road almost impossible to cross now, and more traffic would render us housebound.

Please show these comments to the Planning Inspector, and please 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:** PSLPA16/791  **Respondent:** 10773345 / mavis davies  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Send Village being removed from Green Belt status. There are no special circumstances that warrant going back on the election promise made to us by local councillors and central government.
2. I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. The road is quite unsuitable, being particularly twisty and narrow and the access onto to Send Road is hazardous.
3. I object to building 400 houses and 7000 sq. metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch. It is a site of ancient woodland and also is liable to flooding.
4. I object to more houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill.

Again, this is a very narrow, unsuitable road for extra traffic. The buildings themselves would be over an old documented unsafe landfill site.
5. I object to the new interchange planned for the A3. So many new houses are planned for this area and a lot of the traffic from these would flow through the Send Road, which is already overloaded and at a standstill during busy times.

Please show these comments to the Planning Inspector and also please confirm that you have received this email.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1335  **Respondent:** 10775137 / Wendy Lodge  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am absolutely appalled and wish to **object in the strongest terms** to the latest plans by Guildford Borough Council for future development in Send Village.

Firstly, as a resident of Send Village, I object to Guildford Borough Council not following the correct process of consultation with Send residents.
In April 2016 the hugely excessive 2014 plan to build 430 houses in Send had been reduced to 185, which was a much more realistic figure in relation to the size of the village. The new plan is now for 485 new houses which is more than twice as many as recommended in the April plan. This should surely trigger full consultation under Regulation 18, as it will have such an impact on the village, rather than Regulation 19 which Guildford Borough Council are trying to do.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1337  Respondent: 10775137 / Wendy Lodge  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Finally, I strongly object to the cynical manner in which Guildford Borough Council has added unnecessary housing and industrial proposals to our Local Plan. I find it difficult to believe that it is legal for the development of a large road junction with such huge impact to the surrounding area to be shoehorned into this plan without proper consultation. I also strongly object to Guildford Borough Council ignoring Government advice that Green Belt land must remain protected except in exceptional need, which does not exist in this local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/660  Respondent: 10776033 / Prue Robinson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
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 Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford and I particularly 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. In fact that area of 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: PSLPA16/662  Respondent: 10776033 / Prue Robinson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford's urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transports hubs.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/663  Respondent: 10776033 / Prue Robinson  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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>In fact I object to all the proposed sites in Send because, not least because they were not included in the previous consultation in 2014. Unlike the rest of the borough Send has not been property consulted and all its sites have been changed substantially. We were promised there would be no major changes made to the 2016 draft plan by the Leader of the Council.</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: PSLPA16/784  Respondent: 10782433 / Timothy Croxford  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 write to convey my distress at the way in which GBC is proposing to wipe out the Green Belt status of Send Village, and impose huge numbers of houses and industrial space onto the local area of Send and Ripley Villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local community/infrastructure will not be able to cope with the current plans, let alone the loss of Green Belt status, and GBC should withdraw and amend the current Local Plan with immediate effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish my email to be forwarded to the Planning Inspector to register my objections to the imposition of the GBC Local Plan, and the removal of Send Village from the Green Belt. I strenuously object to each and every one of the Council's plans for the 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: PSLPA16/785  Respondent: 10782433 / Timothy Croxford  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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>As a resident of Send for 20 years, the appalling plans set out for Send and Ripley by GBC constitute nothing but the total destruction of the Green Belt for Send, and a huge increase in traffic on local roads which are in places simply one car wide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To remove Send Village from Green Belt status, impose hundreds of houses on the area in addition to industrial space, and further create a massive road junction on already highly congested local roads is insanity. Schools, infrastructure, surgeries, local village lifestyle and the chosen way of life for thousands of people will simply buckle under these new ridiculous plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Council quite simply appear to have thrown every ludicrous idea into a pot and come up with the destruction of village life in Send and Ripley, dismantling the area and covering it in concrete, together with a random number of new-build houses and industrial units which cannot be coped with in any conceivable way.

I wish this email to be forwarded to the Planning Inspector dealing with this completely ill-thought out local plan, and I object most strongly to the Council's obvious intention to wipe Send Village, its Green Belt rating and Ripley Village off the map, to be replaced by a grotesque building site destined to ruin the area completely and cause the utmost disruption to both villages for years on end.

These plans must not be allowed to go through - they are disgraceful, we are Green Belt here and must remain so. This is akin to being punished for wishing to live in the countryside by a bullying Council.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1206  **Respondent:** 10783937 / Daphne Jackson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Thank you for your letter of June 2nd

I have read your “Proposed Local Plan” and I am now replying with my views

My objections are :- the removal of send from the green belt. A large area of beautiful countryside will be lost to thousands of people so I object to the huge number of houses that are planned to be built. I object to the Garlick’s Arch policy (A43), which will include the filling of very ancient trees, to build to proposed 400 houses, light industry and storage space on Green Belt. I object to new slip roads at Burnt Common (A43a)

The A247 is already a very busy road and a dangerous one for pedestrians to cross. At peak times the traffic is at a standstill.

I object to the proposal to build 40 new houses and two traveller pitches on Send Hill (A44). The number is far too large. The area is a formal refuse sight, but now is a part of beautiful countryside and totally out of keeping for your proposal.

The number of extra people in Send would create a huge problem for the medical centre. There are currently over 7000 patients on record.

Also the schools are already full and parking to deliver and collect children on Send Hill causes a huge problem to local residents so I object to these proposals. I object to the wholesale destruction of Green Belt in the area. It would be a sad day for many people.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3858  **Respondent:** 10784769 / Jane Baker  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 15 villages, including Ripley and Send, from the green belt. This will lead to wholesale, and often inappropriate developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2113</th>
<th>Respondent: 10789601 / Jennifer Hodgetts</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 latest group of proposed developments for Send. The GBC have not followed correct procedure and their reasoning is unsound and underhand. There is no evidence in 2015 for and increase in employment space – quite the opposite an 80% reduction shows from the 2013 ELNA carried out 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: PSLPA16/2114</th>
<th>Respondent: 10789601 / Jennifer Hodgetts</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 feel very sad that our elected councillors and planning officers could even think of destroying our communities in Send and Ripley. There is no need for all the green belt to be built on. I would like these comments to be seen by the inspector and hope good sense will prevail.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1237</th>
<th>Respondent: 10793697 / Norman Carpenter</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 I mentioned in my previous letter, I had the planning brief on Send parish council for 10 years. In that time my proposal that threatened access problems to or from the property were automatically turned down by the Borough. It seems that policies A42 and A44 ought to follow that rule particularly in their extremely dangerous situations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/306</th>
<th>Respondent: 10799489 / Shai Sinai</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.

1. I 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.

1. I object to the exaggerated “housing need” figure of 13,860 which is far too high and results in the completely unnecessary development of the Green Belt. The way students, economic need and affordability are calculated inflates the housing need.

1. I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.

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.

1. 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.

1. 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.

1. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

1. I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

1. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding. I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

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.

1. 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.
1. 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.

1. I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

1. I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I am writing to voice my objection and concern for the proposed development of circa 400 houses in Send.

In short the local infrastructure cannot cope with the current population growth let alone another 1000+ people. The doctors surgery is creaking and requires a one week plus waiting list. The local school is probably one of the worst in the county with several friends pulling their children out and having to suffer the financial burden of private schooling despite paying taxes for state education. Roads in the area incredibly congested and at times during rush hour the queue from the Old Woking roundabout is often past the end of Potters Lane. On that subject the traffic from the A3 through Potters Lane is horrendous with very few adhering to the speed limit. Lorries follow the satnav down a totally unsuitable road. I genuinely think it is only a matter of time before a child is killed on the road.

It’s worth mentioning specifically the junction on Potters Lane where Send Hill, Church Lane and Vicarage Lane meet. With the increased traffic volumes this has become incredibly dangerous. As one example my sister in law was pulled out on and wrote her car off with a 6 month old baby in the back (it was incredibly lucky there were no serious injuries). I have had to brake suddenly and take avoiding action on numerous occasions. These are country lanes that form a large part of the roads in the area, they simply will not cope with increased traffic volumes.

It’s worth pointing out at this stage therefore that the idea of 40 more homes in Send Hill is just ridiculous from a traffic and infrastructure stand point. Also why are two travellers sites required? I have seen no evidence to suggest that they are required and none provided by the council?

Also Send is a wildlife corridor with several endangered and rare species (bats, newts, Owls etc) relying on this piece of rare green belt. Clearly I also object to the ridiculous idea of another industrial estate, do we not have enough in the area already? We have a duty to our children to retain green areas and protect the intimacy of the village environment.

Flooding is another yearly issue that seems to go un discussed, I’m sure the residents of Old Woking will be very glad of 500 extra homes as they flood for the third year in a row.

Frankly the fact that these proposals have come up again after being turned down is depressing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2088</th>
<th>Respondent: 10805889 / Bernard Corrigan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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'm writing to you regarding the proposal to remove Send village from the green belt, to which I strongly object, for the following reasons:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no special circumstances to justify abandoning the National Planning policy Framework. Also, the government and local councillors have given clear election promises to preserve 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: pslp173/43</th>
<th>Respondent: 10806945 / Chris Lee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 Green Belt, Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15 (Send Business Park) being taken out of 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: PSLPA16/101</th>
<th>Respondent: 10812289 / Deborah Clover</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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>As a resident of Send, I am writing to object to the proposed development of Green Belt land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common &amp; to Land West of Wind's Ridge &amp; Send Hill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send ward has been allocated 485 new homes under Guildford's revised Local Plan, an population increase of over 25%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt. It is vital that this land is not built upon &amp; it is totally unnecessary as most housing required could be built on brown field sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Green Belt was established after the Second World War to limit the urban development. Remove it &amp; Woking &amp; Guildford will merge in to one huge city. Guildford Borough's own vision states it envisages Guildford as &quot;A county town set in a vibrant rural environment&quot;. Well, that will no longer be true &amp; Guildford &amp; its surrounding villages will no longer be such a desirable place to live! Our roads at peak times are already struggling to cope with the volume of traffic. Send's school &amp; doctor's surgery are also full, we simply do not have the infrastructure to support such a huge number of proposed additional houses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the required 13,860 houses in the local plan is exaggerated. The number of foreign students living in Guildford have been wrongly used to inflate the need. Also, if the population is to grow by some 20,000 in the plan...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
period, we actually only need 8,000 new homes (based on 2.5 people per home) & 50% of these could be built on brown field sites.

I strongly object to Policy A43, land at Garlick's Arch designated for 400 houses & 7,000 sq m of industrial & warehousing units. This site is a late addition to the plan & was put through under Regulation 19. This significant development requires full consultation under Regulation 18 as it has not been previously consulted upon. This is green belt land covered by ancient woodland & protected by NPPF. There are no exceptional circumstances.

The proposed industrial development here is simply not required. The latest ELNA shows an 80% reduction in land required for employment floor space, since the previous draft plan. A new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this development would be disastrous for Send. The A247 would be gridlocked all day & the surrounding roads could simply not cope with the increase in traffic.

I also object to Policy A44, land West of Winds Ridge & Send Hill, designated for 40 homes & 2 Travellers Pitches. Again, this site is new & was not included in the Regulation 18 draft & has not been consulted upon before. This was previously a land fill site which is currently vented, making the subsoil inappropriate to build upon. It is also within the Green Belt & so protected. The proposed Travellers Pitches are totally inappropriate due to the single width narrow country road access. Both proposals would impact on existing residents, cemetery users & the quiet country road.

I would be most grateful if you could pass my comments on to the Planning Inspector. I am passionate about the beautiful area in which we live & would hate to see it ruined by overdevelopment & the loss of our very valued Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
• There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
• Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/249  Respondent: 10815681 / Penelope Corlett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Send - I object to the significant changes from 185 houses in April 2016 to the presents 485 which will require a full consultation under Regulation 18, not the short cut of Regulation 19.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/9  Respondent: 10815681 / Penelope Corlett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy 2 Green Belt at paragraph 4.3.15

I object to the proposal to take Send Business Park out of the Green Belt. It is an old site on the banks of the River Way with very limited access via Tannery Lane and further development of this site would present innumerable problems. The land floods and the increased traffic created on this narrow lane which is single track for much of it with few passing places, would prove impossible. Once again this land is Green Belt and should be preserved as such.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/155  Respondent: 10818177 / Heather Coussens  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

DRAFT LOCAL PLAN SITES A42, A43, A44 – PLEASE PASS LETTER TO INSPECTOR

I object as a Send resident to the number of new house builds being proposed in Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common. 485 is excessive. 20,000 comments from the first local plan in 2014 resulted in the number of 431 being reduced down to
185. 485 houses could mean 1940 people and 970 cars. Plus I object to our elected Council allowing and passing A43. for the 400 homes so late on in the proceeding when no one else had chance to view it. The doctors and school here will not cope Send is already getting new house building on the Vision/Engineering site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/455  Respondent: 10818561 / Molly Elizabeth Ness  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I moved to Send in 2015 - always desirous to live in a small friendly environment, having lived in large towns and cities most of my life. At the rate GBC plans to implement the building of thousands of new houses - WILL THERE BE ANY VILLAGES LEFT IN THE UK IN 20 YEARS TIME for my children and grand children to enjoy??

I STRONGLY OBJECT to the imminent erosion of OUR GREEN BELT land in order to build houses which are not required in such numbers (693 pa??)

A village has LANES not wide roads and the increase in traffic which all these new houses will bring (presumably two cars per household, minimum) will mean chaos in the mornings and evenings particularly - we have a junior school on the main 'road' in Send!!!!

GBC has not listened to the objections previously submitted in 2015, they undemocratically plough on with ludicrous ideas for areas which they know nothing about (HOW MANY COUNCILLORS ACTUALLY VISIT THE AREAS THEY WANT TO BUILD ON?)

THE CONSERVATIVE GOVERNMENT promised that GREEN BELT land would be PROTECTED - was that a lie?

In conclusion please address the question - Is this the way to preserve quality of life? It's not all about money surely?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1799  Respondent: 10819329 / D Smith  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO SEND being taken out of the Green Belt as it will allow undesirable developments and spoil the rural nature of the village. This will make it a far less desirable place to live.

I OBJECT TO the number of major sites which have been added to the Local Plan. These were not in the original Consultation Document and were added at the last minute. The 2014 proposal of 430 houses has increased to 485. These changes require a full consultation period.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the proposed local plan for Send on the grounds that it is ill conceived with no apparent evidence base to substantiate it. There is little reliable evidence or objective need assessment to justify such a massive development in Send’s Green Belt. There has been no environmental impact assessment. There has been no effective traffic impact assessment. Send map

I object to the scale of development proposed of between 22% and 27% respectively for Send and Send Marsh/Burnt Common is excessive, unnecessary, and destructive to our community and Green Belt. There is NO justification for an overall additional 652 houses per annum. It goes absolutely against the principles of community planning and is no more than a green light to developers backed by Guildford Borough Council to carve up rural Surrey. Send map

I object to Send being expected to take a disproportionate amount of the stated development housing need for the Borough. The insetting proposal for Send more than doubles the current amount of land to be taken out of the Green Belt. This is very misleading and is not made clear in the Local Plan. The above sites 64, 74, 75, 76, 99 total 81.6 acres, but the additional inset land for Send extends the existing settlement boundary by a further 100/125 acres. This could easily mean an additional expansion of the village in excess of 50%. This inset gives the green light for development along one mile of the River Wey contravening policy statement Para 4.231 Local Plan. It also gives a green light to developing the school playing fields contravening NPPG 81.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the proposal to insert Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
- It will make the erosion of the green belt in our village worse
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

I OBJECT to the fact that these changes represents a terrible sentence for our village. We are destined to become a suburb of the conurbation of Guildford and Woking. NPPG 83 states that the Green Belt should only be altered in “exceptional circumstances”.

THERE ARE NO EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES IN SEND.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3097  Respondent: 10820481 / Lisa Smith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 local plan for Send on the grounds that it is ill conceived with no apparent evidence base to substantiate it. There is little reliable evidence or objective need assessment to justify such a massive development in Send’s Green Belt. There has been no environmental impact assessment. There has been no effective traffic impact assessment.

2. I object to the scale of development proposed of between 22% and 27% respectively for Send and Send Marsh/ Burnt Common is excessive, unnecessary, and destructive to our community and Green Belt. There is NO justification for an overall additional 652 houses per annum. It goes absolutely against the principles of community planning and is no more than a green light to developers backed by Guildford Borough Council to carve up rural Surrey.

3. I object to the blatant ignoring of the well-established policies of the Green Belt (NPPG 79-83) to protect open space, prevent encroachment into the countryside and stop linear development leading to the joining together of developed communities have been ignored in the proposals for Send. This plan will produce a huge overload on local and main roads, overcrowd our schools and put enormous pressure on the local surgery and hospitals. It will effectively join Send and Burpham along the A3 creating exactly the type of urban sprawl the Green Belt was set up to defend against.

4. I object to Send being expected to take a disproportionate amount of the stated development housing need for the Borough. The insetting proposal for Send more than doubles the current amount of land to be taken out of the Green Belt. This is very misleading and is not made clear in the Local Plan. The above sites 64, 74, 75, 76, 99 total 81.6 acres, but the additional inset land for Send extends the existing settlement boundary by a further 100/125 acres. This could easily mean an additional expansion of the village in excess of 50%. This inset gives the green light for development along one mile of the River Wey contravening policy statement Para 4.231 Local Plan. It also gives a green light to developing the school playing fields contravening NPPG 81.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/695  Respondent: 10820961 / D Davies  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy P2 Send, Ripley and Clandon being removed from the Green Belt. Send provides a buffer between Guildford and Woking. The particularly vulnerable areas of land behind the school including playing fields and woodland. The land to the right of the cart bridge by the Wey Navigation up to the new boundary by the River Wey Navigation up to the boundary fence with Vision Engineering and Land to the left of the cart bridge going up to the old depot on the Wey Navigation. So the council can concrete over the whole area of Ripley Send and Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp173/56  Respondent: 10820961 / D Davies  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Green Belt. Policy 2 Paragraph 4.3.15

I object to the proposal to insert Send Business Park from the Green Belt

- It is effectively an old non-confirming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the Wey navigation
- There is highly restrictive vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
- Further development or expansion at this site detract from the openness of the Green Belt and is not appropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/328  Respondent: 10821665 / Chris Sansom  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 Guildford Borough Council's Final Draft Local Plan that is trying to permit an additional 400 houses (policy A43) together with 7000 square metres of industrial space and the proposed new A3 junction at Garlick's Arch (policy A43a).

I strongly object to the proposal of removing Send's Green Belt status along with neighbouring villages. I also object to the proposed Winds Ridge/Send Hill development (policy A44) as some of the vehicles involved in its building and subsequent occupation will be exiting into Potters Lane via a narrow road on a blind bend on a de-restricted speed limit stretch of road.

We have had to endure the disruption in Send Road caused by the building of Weycott and the ongoing disturbance of the development of the Vision Engineering site. We have the prospect of further chaos yet to come with the granted approval of the marina in Tannery Lane and the additional proposal policy (A42) for 45 houses on Clockbarn Nursery.

Send does not have the suitable roads, public transport (one bus an hour each way between Guildford and Woking) or the necessary utilities infrastructure to cope with these proposals (witness the recent chaos in Potters Lane while the gas main was renewed). Even with the merging of Send First School and St Bede's Junior School, there will not be any additional capacity available for pupils generated from new housing developments. Nor will the Villages Medical Centre be able to cope with such an influx of people calling on its services. Will the existing St Bede's School site become the next target for development? Where will it all end?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/698  Respondent: 10824065 / B. Self  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I wish to register several objections to the published Draft Local Plan.

1. Having lived at this address for 23 years, I feel that in respect of Send and Ripley this plan is disproportionate and out-of-keeping with the historical nature of this area.

2. I object, in the strongest possible terms, to re-designating areas which currently enjoy 'Green Belt' status. Something that has served well for many years should not be changed, and the evidence to do so now does not bear scrutiny, in my opinion.

3. I object to the large-scale nature of proposals for development in areas around the villages of Send and Ripley as it would result in less separation between them, with the consequent loss of identity and individuality.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to Send village, Wisley, Clandon and Ripley being removed from the Green Belt. We bought our house in this village to be outside of the hustle and bustle of Guildford or Woking and to bring up our children in a small village environment. This environment will be ruined by these plan.

I object to the number of homes that the plans intend to deliver.

I object to the new 4-way on/off ramp to A3 at Burnt Common (A43a). This will not alleviate traffic in Send, Ripley or Clandon. I believe it will make it worse. And it will enable further development.

I object to the inclusion of Green Belt within the proposed new Village boundaries (which is very likely to lead to more development in the future)

I object to Garlick's Arch proposal (Policy A43) to build 400 houses and 7000 sq. Metres of light industrial warehousing. This is literally on our doorstep and the increased traffic and noise would be unbearable.

I object to the destruction of the Green Belt in this area, including the development of 2,000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow (Policy A25) which is in clear contravention of the central Government's stated commitment to Green Belt protection.

I object to the last minute inclusion of new sites with less than 2 weeks notice. Due process has not beed followed.

I object to the limited consultation period which doesn't give residents enough chance to digest everything and the impact this will have on their lives.

I object to policy A44 involving 1.9 ha of land to be designate for 40 homes and 2 travellers' pitches. This is new and was not included in the regulation 18 draft, and has not be consulted upon previously. Development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent Green Belt Status.

The Green Belt was intended to be permanent, as required by National Planning policy Framework, and there are no special circumstances to justify abandoning it. Send's Green Belt provides an essential buffer stopping Woking and Guildford becoming one conurbation.
If we had wanted to live in an urban environment we would have bought a house in Guildford or Woking. We bought into the beautiful countryside on our doorstep. These plans will be devastating for the villages of Send, Clandon and Ripley and I wholeheartedly object to them.

I would like my comments to be given to the planning inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/862  Respondent: 10826657 / Rod Underdown  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I moved to Send to live in the quite and pleasant village in the GREEN BELT when I retired some twenty years ago.

I OBJECT MOST STRONGLY THAT CONTRA TO ALL PROMISES FROM THE LOCAL COUNCILORS YOU WANT TO DESTROY MY PEACE AND PLEASURE IN LIVING IN THIS VILLAGE.

I object in particular to the plan to build 400 houses and industry at GARLICKS ARCH SITE as this will mean an unbearable load on local roads, Doctors, and schools.

I object to the development of the A3 junction with 2000 houses at Wisley and 1859 houses at Blackwell farm as this will give more traffic than the present road system can take. In particular heavy lorries preventing access from my road to the traffic system .

I object to the Send Hill plans to spoil the look of a quite road and give more problems of traffic flow in this area.

I object as Guildford Town has more available space on brown field sites that should be used. I do not want to be part of Guildford or Woking I want to stay in A VILLAGE.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/389  Respondent: 10828897 / Christopher Merrick  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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. The Council has a duty of transparency especially regarding such highly contentious issues. It appears the Council is neglecting its duty?

13. I object to the removal of 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 whatsoever for it’s insetting (removal) from the Green Belt, interesting that GBC have not attempted to offer a justification? Therefore no “exceptional circumstances”, as required by the NPPF can be claimed.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1606  Respondent: 10828961 / Carey Lodge  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Guildford Borough Council (GBE) not following the correct process of consultation with Send residents.

In April 2016 the vastly excessive 2014 plan to build 430 houses in Send had been reduced to 185, a far more reasonable figure in relation to the size of the village. The new plan is now for 485 new houses, more than twice as many as the April plan said we needed. This should surely trigger full consultation under Regulation 18, as it will have such an impact on the village, rather than Regulation 19 which GBC are trying to do.

I object to GBC not taking evidence into account when producing the current plan.

The Employment lands Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows an 80% reduction in employment space from the previous ELNA of 2013. This surely indicates that there is no need for any further industrial space in Send Village. I object to plans for further unneeded industrial development in Send Village.

I have concerns over the assessment of housing need in Guildford. If the population of Guildford is to grow by 20,000 in the planned period this would require 800 new homes, based on the average 2.5 persons per home. There is not a need for 13,500 homes and the use of foreign students to inflate the figure in The Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015 (SHMA) is wrong.

There is enough brownfield land in Guildford to build half of the required 800 new homes. I strongly object to GBC planning to take Send and Ripley out of the greenbelt.

I find it surprising that GBC are prepared to make such far reaching decisions when they did not have their own Transport Assessment to guide them. It suggests they want their plan to go through, no matter the consequences to Send residents. The infrastructure of Send and Ripley will not cope with such a high increase in population as envisaged under these new plans.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3246  Respondent: 10829281 / Kevin Nicholls  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. Send sits in the green belt between Guildford and Woking preventing a conurbation. This clearly goes against local Councillors promises to protect the green belt and they should be fighting proposals for any threats to this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Policy A42-44 Land at Garlicks Arch Burnt Common

I also object to the proposed development of some 485 houses and 2 traveller sites, which given the ratio of 2.5 people per household unit represents an increase in the population over 1200 people for the planning period. This is a substantial increase of people in a relatively small village area. Additional pressures on the local infrastructure are axiomatic, for example the Villages Medical Centre, local schools and like public services such as policing. I am unaware of any plans to increase this infrastructure, given the financial pressures on public authorities generally.

I note the traffic management proposals with regard to the A3 north facing slip roads to/from the A3 at Send ~Marsh/ Burnt Common.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/203  Respondent: 10830753 / AJ Cheeseman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful National Trust Wey Navigation;
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions;
- Further expansion or development t this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1454  Respondent: 10830785 / PE Whatley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the sites chosen in Send village and nearby as they are either unsuitable or will cause chaos and gridlock for all the village and local residents. Roads, public transport, drainage, power and other facilities are already below what might be defined as a good standard. In an area already easily prone to flooding this seems either unwise or crass stupidity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object specifically to Ripley and Send Villages being removed from the Green Belt. The green belt was intended to be permanent, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, and there are no special circumstances to justify abandoning it. Send’s Green Belt provides an essential buffer stopping Woking and Guildford becoming a conurbation. Local councillors and central government gave a clear election promise to protect Green Belt ad this renews on it, Developers will be quick to take advantage and there will be nothing to stop them.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
It seems to me that you propose to remove the villages of Ripley, Send, Clandon and Wisley from the Green Belt and turn them into towns by overdevelopment. There is no justification for this and no planning for the aftermath of chaos that will occur. The village roads cannot be widened, no traffic study has been carried out, no new doctor's surgeries are planned and no new schools are planned. But you propose to solve 70% of a so-called housing need of 13,860 new houses by concentrating only on four villages in the Green Belt without first investigating all brown field sites in and around Guildford.

This is a planning disaster which has been made on the hoof without proper consultation or planning. In fact a new site for housing and industrial development called Garlick's Arch comprising 400 new homes has only just been proposed without warning having turned down further industrial development at Slyfield where it belongs. This is totally ridiculous and I wholeheartedly object. Such a development would bring the villages of Ripley and Send to a standstill. We are already gridlocked for four hours a day in the morning and then again in the evening. Has the Highways Department undertaken a traffic study confirming that our village roads can take double the volume of existing traffic without difficulty? Is it not reasonable to assume that if narrow village roads cannot be widened then further housing in that area should be restricted to preserve the Green Belt.

Might I suggest to the Council that they revisit this figure of 13,860 houses being needed in the light of Brexit, whereby we can control and reduce the number of people coming to stay in this Country and also anticipate the vast numbers of City workers whom are to be relocated in Europe thereby freeing up a great deal of housing stock in and around Guildford.

I also object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of inadequate access and traffic volume on Tannery Lane. The junction with Send road is already very difficult for vehicles trying to join the main road.

I also object to the development of 40 houses and 2 traveller's pitches at Send Hill due to its restrictive access and twisting narrow roads. The subsoil on this site contains unsafe landfill, as known to the Council.

In addition I also strongly object to the new proposed interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because of the obvious massive increase in traffic this will cause pouring onto village roads that are already swamped. Our village roads will become car parks and destroy our quality of life.

Please think again and ask the Highways Department where are the roads that are capable of taking increased volumes of traffic without causing gridlock. Having identified those areas the Council can then identify where a new school to cater for the new houses is to be built and the new doctor's surgery for that area. Your current proposals are completely without merit, thought or understanding, which it seems you wish to impose with minimal or no consultation.

I very much look forward to hearing of your withdrawing the current proposals and the introduction of a more professional approach to the requirements for housing in the Borough based on detailed traffic studies, and the infrastructure contemplated to complement these new houses for public consultation and agreement.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/83</th>
<th>Respondent: 10832673 / Lisa Hall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 am lodging my views on the Send housing development as per below. Also, why do we need two travellers sites in Send?????? What justification is there for these two separate sites? We've seen no details of traveller demographics in the
area to support that. Please acknowledge this email as I tried lodging my views before and got told I couldn't email in until after a certain date!

Thank you.

I am writing to complain about the ridiculous idea that the council now has about building potentially up to 485 new houses in Send. There is absolutely no way our village would cope. The school has gone down the pan and it utterly rubbish and below par and is meant to service our village. We live in an affluent area and don't even have a decent school in sight. We can barely get an appointment for an adult at Send In Village which by the way services the surround areas of Send, the Clandon's and Ripley. It's near Impossible to get an appointment without waiting a week unless it's an emergency. We live on Potters Lane and the traffic down our road is absolutely dire and dangerous. No one sticks to the 30 mile limit. My husband had almost been knocked off his bike a few times as he cycles to woking station and back. He's had many rucks with drivers and I am forever waving at people to slow down. Someone will kill a child down this road if we are not careful. The blind corners are ridiculous for all the traffic. I have had 2 near collisions recently where I've had to slam on the break (with a toddler in the car) as as I've gone around one of the blind corners a lorry has been coming the other way taking up half my side of the road. This has happened twice lately. Then the other issue is Lorries get stuck and cause a queue and you nearly crash into the back of someone around the blind corner. My sister in law actually wrote her car off w a baby in the back, as she was going along potters lane and an old boy pulled out of send hill without hearing her coming and she smashed right into the side of his car. So the streets around here absolutely cannot take anymore cars. Absolutely no way!!! It's utterly dangerous. To think Send is a pass thro village anyway linking woking and the m3 to the other side of send - cars come from everywhere and drive through send. I do the school run everyday and can never get out of the end of woodhill because of the a3 slip road. Permanent cars coming thro and you have to sit there for ages coming into woodhill and out of it and the council think it's a good idea to increase the cars and traffic in the area by building 485 more house!!! Totally absurd and ridiculous! We literally have no facilities in Send to service anymore houses. The traffic thro ripley each morning is ridiculous too. And take today, it was gridlocked because of a crash on the a3. Gridlocked through all the country lanes which just shows how many people pass thro tiny old send! Our village is going to be absolutely ruined! How on earth is anyone going to be able to move for cars? The roundabout by the shell garage at burnt common is permanently gridlocked. You can't go anywhere in a rush in rush hour. How on earth will it be with 485 more houses when typically most household has 2 cars and if teenagers or young adults then potentially 3 or 4 cars - but say 2 per house, that would be a further 970 cars on average if not way more, in addition to the gridlock that already is during rush hour. Absolutely absurd!!!!!!! We just go not have the facilities to support this kind of a development in our 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? ( )

I wish to object to the Local Plan proposed for Send, Send Marsh and the surrounding area on the following grounds:

I object to the proposal to build 45 houses at Clockbam Nursery, on Tannery Lane. There are already 64 houses planned for the area, plus the development of a marina, on a narrow, single track country road which cannot take the traffic. The planned building of these houses is already too much for this site (which also consistently floods) so adding 45 more houses would be disastrous.

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch for 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space. The A3 is already at a very high capacity; the additional traffic from the houses and an industrial site would lead to severe congestion, nearing (or even reaching) gridlock. I also object to the industrial space on the grounds that the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan of 80%, so it is simply not needed.

I object to all the proposed sites in Send because they were not included in the previous consultation of 2014. Send and Send Marsh have not been properly consulted on the current sites, especially Garlick's Arch and a new, 4-way A3 junction, which were pushed through at the last minute, not having previously been proposed and consulted on with local residents and businesses.

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.

I object to Send being removed from the Green Belt (Policy P2). The Green Belt land around Send and Send Marsh act as a buffer between Woking and Guildford. This is one of the tenets of The National Planning Policy Framework, namely point 80, which states that one of the purposes of Green Belt land is 'to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another'. It is vital to keep this buffer in place, not only for the local community, but because of the great natural beauty of the area.

I object to the proposals for the development of 40 houses and 2 traveller's pitches at Send Hill (Policy A44 . 1.9 ha). There is only a single track road, which already suffers from heavy traffic; it would be a grave mistake to add to this strain with the additional traffic the development would create.

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. Not only will this result in large areas of Green Belt being destroyed, but it will also add to the heavy traffic congestion on the A3, especially at the junction with the M25 and through Ripley, Send and Send Marsh, which are already under immense pressure from the volume of traffic travelling through and around these areas.

I object to the Local Plan based on the fact that the infrastructure of Send and Send Marsh is wholly inadequate, and cannot cope with the increase volume of traffic and population. Our schools, nursery and The Villages surgery are under immense pressure already, and could not cope with such a proposed increase in population. The road system would also be unable to take the increased volume, with the very real risk of not only gridlock, but increased risk of accidents to drivers, cyclists and pedestrians (including children at Send Primary and St Bede's schools). However, any further development of the road system would destroy the Send Marsh and Send village, which act as the essential buffer between Woking and Guildford. The plan is entirely unsuited to the area, and so I urge you to abandon it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Re: Guildford Borough Council's Final Draft Local Plan

I am writing to show my objection to your plans for development in Send and the surrounding area and would like my views to be seen by the Planning Inspector.

The amount and scale of proposed development in a village such as Send is beyond a level that is reasonable. The number of proposed new houses has been increased from the number last objected to, up to 485. Surely this warrants another consultation!

Send is within the Green Belt, which in itself should preclude any development that is not reasonable and in keeping with the identity of the village. The village of Send does not have the space or resources to accommodate the infrastructure that is needed to cope with the development which includes an increase in housing, and a development to build 485 houses and an area of industrial, storage and distribution space at Garlick's Arch.

This area can specifically not handle the additional traffic that will be developed if a new interchange on the A3 is built and the roads will be gridlocked all day and night.

The scale of the proposed development will destroy the Green Belt and the rural identity of the village and lead Send to become a concreted "suburb" of Woking or Guildford and lose its Green Belt status. Some of the development is on or near to land that regularly floods and therefore not practical.

We will also lose beautiful, green spaces in which to play and walk and which are of benefit to all. Send is a "buffer" between Woking and Guildford and should retain its Green Belt status and not have unnecessary and unsympathetic development within its boundaries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/61</th>
<th>Respondent: 10839009 / Jacky Fenton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 am writing to object to the local plan proposed, and express my worries about the assault on the countryside and Sends local environment. Policy P2 removal of villages from the green belt is very worrying and I object most strongly as it sends the opposite message to your statement in the &quot;About Guildford&quot; publication - &quot;One of the boroughs biggest assets is our significant Green Belt and major consideration is given to protect this&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to Policy A43, Garlick's Arch with its proposed A3 junction, 400 houses and a large area of Industrial and warehousing 1000 sq metres. This would really impact on all aspects of Send's life. The A247 is already at a stand still morning and evening during the week and when there is an accident on the A3. It would also make a huge impact on the schools and medical centre. This site has been sprung on us as is on Green Belt protection through NPPF and also it was not included in the regulation 18 draft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I also object to Policy A44, which again was not included in the regulation 18 draft which is in permanent Green Belt status it contains unsafe landfill waste and is only accessed by a narrow single track country road and Send cemetry is close by, it would disturb the peace and quiet we would hope to keep.</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: PSLPA16/1990</th>
<th>Respondent: 10839009 / Jacky Fenton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 have now seen your new revised Local Plan and am appalled by your plans for Send. You have not followed the correct process and have changed every major site in Send proposed for development since 2014. Not only that, you have now added the &quot;Garlick’s Arch&quot; at Burnt Common and a new development of 40 houses and 2 Travellers Pitches on Send Hill.</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>
Your original plan of 2014 proposed 430 houses for Send, but this went down in April 2016 to 185 after many objections. This has now gone back up to 485. You cannot make these significant changes without another full consultation under Regulation 18. This will invalidate the whole process!

You have failed to provide sound evidence for your "late additions" in terms of the Employment Lands Needs Assessment of 2015 (ELNA), which shows an 80% reduction in employment space from previous Assessment carried out by Guildford Borough Council in 2013. This means that industrial space at Burnt Common is no longer needed.

I strongly OBJECT to removing Send from the Green Belt, you are just using this to your advantage to allow for more development. The Green Belt around this area is permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents merging settlements. This area contains ancient woodland with trees from the 16th Century. 50% of new homes needed could be built on brownfield sites.

I strongly OBJECT to Garlick's Arch as this site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted on previously.

I strongly OBJECT to the housing suggestion at Garlick's Arch, as there is no more need for these houses. The number of foreign students I feel has been wrongly used to inflate the need. The required 13,860 houses in the local plan is vastly exaggerated. If the population is to grow by 20,000 as suggested in the plan period, we actually need 8,000 homes, (based on an average of 2.5 people per home).

I strongly OBJECT to the industrial development at Garlick's Arch. This is just not needed since the (ELNA) has shown a reduction of 80% in required floor space from the previous plan. If there is a need for industrial space, then this should be a Slyfield.

I strongly OBJECT to a 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. This would mean the Send Road (A247), would become a through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and A3 and also the proposed 2,000 houses at Wisley and the 2,000 houses at Burpham which would leave it gridlocked all day long and not just at rush hour.

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 appropriate 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: PSLPA16/1437  Respondent: 10839937 / Mark Pycraft  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
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 proposed Local Plan for the village of Send, Send Marsh and the surrounding Green Belt area.
I object to the Local Plan on the grounds of Guildford Borough Council (GBC) having made major changes to the Plan in recent months. These changes are so significant that another full consultation under Regulation 18 is required, as opposed to Regulation 19, which GBC are trying to use to quickly force through the proposals.

I object to the proposal to remove Send from the Green Belt (Policy P2). The National Planning Policy Framework (point 80) states that Green Belt land is vital ‘to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another’. Send and its surrounding Green Belt land plays precisely that role, between Guildford and Woking.

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch, which is being proposed as the site for 400 houses and also 7000 square metres of industrial space. The Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) has concluded that there has been a dramatic reduction in the employment floor space needed, down 80% from the previous ELNA of 2013. This means that there is no longer the need for this industrial space. Also regarding the industrial space, together with the proposed 400 houses at this site; the pressure on an already heavily used A3 would be too great, leading to severe delays, increased accident risk and potential gridlock.

I object to the proposed 4-way A3 interchange at Burnt Common, as Send simply cannot cope with the additional traffic it would bring, especially if the proposed developments at Wisley, Gosden Hill in Burpham and Blackwell Farm go through. Send has one road passing through it, from the A3 down Send Hill, past The Villages Surgery and two schools and on to Woking. The current demand for access to and from the M25 and A3 is already too great, with traffic often crawling for miles, and sometimes at a standstill. There is simply not the capacity for the increase in traffic the interchange would bring, and the increased risk of traffic accidents, particularly around the schools and the centre of Send village would be significant.

I object to the proposed development of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill in Burpham and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm. There is already immense traffic in these areas, particularly around the M25, and as such will only add to the high volume of traffic passing through Send and Send Marsh, which do not have the infrastructure to cope.

I object to the proposed development of 40 houses and 2 traveler’s pitches at Send Hill and lands west of Winds Ridge (Policy A44 . 1.9 ha). As stated previously, the road through Send is already at full capacity regarding traffic, and could not cope with the additional traffic which would arise from this development. Furthermore, this is a newly proposed site, as it was not included in the Regulation 18 draft, which in turn means it has not been consulted on previously; such a consultation must take place before any decisions are made.

I object to the proposal to build 45 houses at Clockbam Nursery on Tannery Lane. The lane is winding and narrow, with several blind corners, and is only wide enough for one vehicle at a time in many places. To build here would require a huge remodelling of the area and complete construction of a new road, thus decimating this Green Belt land, which is actually prone to frequent flooding (The area is called Send Marsh for a reason). It also acts as an important buffer between Send Marsh and Send.

I object to the Local Plan, as it clearly fails to recognise that there is insufficient infrastructure in and around Send and Send Marsh to cope with an increase in both traffic and population. Not only are the roads unable to take more vehicles, but The Villages Surgery and the two schools are also already under severe pressure, and as such cannot be expected to cope with an increased population. There is also the very real danger of an increased risk of accidents around the schools. Much of the land proposed for development is also prone to frequent flooding.

These are clearly valid objections in the eyes of those who know the area. For these reasons, I strongly urge for the Local Plan to be rejected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<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 have lived in the Send Marsh area since 1968.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to all erosion of the green belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to site A43 Garlicks arch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to site A43a the on and off ramp at Clandon- this will increase traffic problems in the villages, not help them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to site A45 The Talbot- this is overdevelopment in a conservation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to site A57 The Paddocks- this is unlawful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to any &quot;in- setting&quot; (i.e removal) of any villages from the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the disproportionate amount of development in one area of the borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the limited consultation period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the last minute inclusion of new sites with less than 2 weeks notice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the lack of any evidence for the alleged housing need numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the lack of immediate provision for new schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the lack of any immediate provision for doctors surgeries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why are many of our local villages in the pipeline for local destruction. Surely we should be looking to preserve our green belt. Once they are gone, they are gone forever.

I am 78 years of age. When I die I would like to leave behind a country that is England- our green and pleasant land- not a concrete mess, trying to accommodate all and sundry.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/148  **Respondent:** 10840321 / J.A. Manlow  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

<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 2 at paragraph 4.3.15 because:-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Send business Park is taken out of the green Belt our countryside is systematically now being destroyed. This cannot be allowed to happen with all this proposed extra housing etc, surely this will be an enormous strain on medical facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2592  **Respondent:** 10840513 / Lee Webb  **Agent:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/22</th>
<th>Respondent: 10843585 / Jackie Payne</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

**2016 Draft Local Plan objection:**

I 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. The Garlick’s Arch site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. The site is also subject to flooding.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/12</th>
<th>Respondent: 10844673 / James Purkiss</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 object to the new draft local plan 2017 with regards to Send as follows:

Send raised a large proportion of the 32,000 objections to the 2016 plan yet GBC appear to have made no attempt to mitigate and amend the plan and have in fact made it worse for Send residents and our part of the borough has been targeted disproportionately for development.

I object to Green Belt, Policy 2, paragraph 4.3.15 regarding Send Business Park being taken out of the Green Belt altogether. This Business Park is in a beautiful area adjacent to the Wey Navigation. Tannery Lane is effectively a country lane and there is highly restricted vehicle access in both directions of Tannery Lane. Any more development on this site will detract from the beauty of the Green Belt in that area.

Overall, the traffic and pollution implications of the above proposals will be untenable. We do not have the infrastructure in place to be able to cope with such massive over development of Send. Please take Send's objections to these proposals seriously.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/12</th>
<th>Respondent: 10844673 / James Purkiss</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 2. Taking an area out of the green belt to cater for GBC's insane desire to concrete over the area is another example of the dirty tactics that are being used.

For heavens sake, will someone in the council drive down Tannery Lane and look at the roads you are proposing to dramatically increase the traffic on.
I would like to know if the current planning policy has been implemented simply to make it look like the planning department are doing something!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/516  Respondent: 10844929 / Maureen Wright  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt due to the following points:

The roads to this area are rural roads, single track for the most part, certainly not suitable for any more traffic, especially larger commercial vehicles. At one end it joins another rural road with a weak bridge in one direction and a very narrow junction in Ripley in the other.

Any more development in this area ruins the surrounding Green Belt land, which comprises open fields and the River Wey.

The original development is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside, so shouldn't even be there.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4093  Respondent: 10844993 / Simon Wright  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford. Any more development in this area would surely constitute urban sprawl.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/45  Respondent: 10846241 / John Ford  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because it is an old non-conforming user on the lovely open Green Belt area adjacent to the Weymouth Navigation. The restricted access of Tannery Lane makes this proposal even more undesirable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1037</th>
<th>Respondent: 10848417 / Amanda Quin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 you to strongly voice my objections to the huge and completely inappropriate development proposed in Ripley and Send (Garlicks arch and burnt common) and Send hill.

As a resident of Send village I would like my objection to be seen by the planning inspector.

I am completely shocked and appalled that it appears Guildford borough council are underhandedly trying to push this through and attempting to remove Send village from the green belt altogether.

I was of the impression that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts and that it had stayed a commitment for green belt protection. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their PERMANENCE! Send provides a buffer between Guildford and Woking. Removing Send from the greenbelt simply cannot happen, the green belt was put in place when our government had the foresight that one day we might need to be forced to protect our green open spaces from our future selves and they were right to do it.

It’s where we relax. It’s where we watch wildlife. It’s where we take part in our hobbies. It’s where we eat and drink. It's essential for our local wildlife and the health and well being of the local residents. We must protect it. It is a slippery slope if we start to bend the rules here and there just because there are housing targets to meet. We should all think of the future of these areas for our children and our grandchildren and for generations to come.

I object to the fact that Guildford borough council have not followed the correct process of another full consultation for these proposed developments, under regulations 18 this is required. These regulations are in place for a reason. Why is it that guildford borough council do not feel they have to follow correct procedure? The trust of the local community has been shaken by their blatant attempt to cheat the system to achieve their goals with no consideration for the effect this would have on the beauty and quaintness of our country village.

I also object on the basis that Guildford borough council also seem to have fabricated their evidence in an attempt to justify these plans. The evidence they have provided is inaccurate and therefore cannot be used to justify these plans. I urge you to read the 2015 ELNA assessment which shows an 80% reduction meaning the industrial space at burnt common is not needed anymore.

**Guildford borough council should be using brownfield sites to help tackle the housing crisis. They should not be re-classifying green belt to skirt around the rules and regulations.**

I object to the planned development at Send hill and Winds ridge and also the traveler site that has been proposed. This was NOT included in regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted on previously. This is a quaint peaceful area that will be ruined and destroyed by either of these things. Send Hill is an important part of our local countryside, with open grass areas with wild flowers and bee orchids essential to the survival of local insects, especially bees which are at serious risk if we don't not make a commitment to saving these areas.
A traveler site is not appropriate for this area. I work in Epsom and regularly see areas where travellers live and settle and they are completely destroyed. Not to mention the increased risk of crime that ultimately comes with having travellers living in the area. I speak from personal experience. Even if you discount all these reasons, this is inappropriate simply due to the narrow width single track country road.

I objects to Send being removed from the green belt.

I object to policy A 43. 30 land at garlicks arch, burnt common proposed housing as there is no need for any more houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough. This site is new and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted on previously. This is green belt protected by the NPPF. There is no reason to justify this whatsoever.

If there is a shortage of living space in this area I would suggest Guildford Borough Council allow planning permission to existing residents to extent their dwelling where necessary and possible. They are renowned for objecting to planning application for even basic extension work. Yet they now feel it's appropriate to destroy our countryside and village with these proposals.

My husband and I had a planning application refused and one of the main points quoted for this refusal was that "it would have a harmful impact on the host property and character of the local area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to policies H9, G5 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (as saved by CLG Direction 24 September 2007) and Supplementary Planning Guidance 2003: Residential Extensions.” How can Guildford borough council possibly justify these huge proposed developments and changes that threaten to destroy the identity of our villages, zone vast areas of green belt land for development and cause huge problems with our local roads.

Please do not let this happen to our beautiful countryside, local wildlife and quaint English villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I inherited the green belt, I am therefore responsible for my children, their children and great great grandchildren to also inherit this precious land, I also vote people in to council who will also look after our inheritance, if promises are to be broken that is not a democracy. The building on green belt is not necessary or needed as there are local brown belt sites which can be used.

The site at Garlicks Arch is a prime example of cutting down trees, destroying the habitat and rising more flood to Send Marsh, having spent money to prevent this.

The term affordable is incorrect as proved as White Hart Court, Ripley the prices were not negotiated before planning consent was given and put them out of the reach of the majority.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3188  Respondent: 10849697 / Audrey Moore  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT strongly to SEND Village being removed from the Green Belt which was supposed to be a permanent thing and there are no circumstances justifying abandoning it. Send's Green Belt provides a "stop" between Woking & Guildford Councillors & the Government gave us a promise to protect the green Belt and this clearly back tracks. Developers will leap on this and there will be nothing to stop them.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/480  Respondent: 10849761 / Tony Beresford  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because, There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/255  Respondent: 10851745 / Natalie Green  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I strongly object to the GBC Spatial Strategy and the number of houses proposed to be built in the village. We are not a town and do not want or need this many houses in our village.

I strongly object to Send Village being removed from the Greenbelt. This is an atrocious plan, we want to retain our greenbelt protection now and for the future of our children and keep our green areas and wildlife safe.

I sincerely hope that Guildford borough listens to the people of Send village and stops the plans to excessively build on our Greenbelt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/60  Respondent: 10851745 / Natalie Green  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

GBC has not listened to the residents at all and you have in fact amended your plans to make the outcome worse for Send villagers.

I strongly object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

Tannery Lane has restricted access and is not suitable for more vehicles.

It is in an area of outstanding beauty, is already a large site and does not need or warrant being made bigger at the detriment of our beautiful countryside and wildlife.

I sincerely hope that this time you listen to the resident of Send's objections and act accordingly. Leave our green belt alone!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/471  Respondent: 10852065 / S Freeland  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to all building in Send because,

1. You have already given permission for a marina which has parking for 84 narrow boats. This means more cars to & fro along Tannery Lane.
2. More office building in Tannery Lane with obviously more traffic.
3. Houses in Clockbarn Nursery more traffic in Tannery Lane. This road is far too narrow and access onto A247 junction is impossible as it is.
4. Also the effect all of this will have on schools and doctors.

The more houses you build means there are no longer any villages as they will all be joined together.
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>PSLPA16/726</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10852097 / Bryan Wakefield</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guildford Borough Council Plan (2016).

**I am objecting to the 2016 draft local plan.**

I have lived in Send Marsh for forty-four years. During that time I have seen Send Marsh, Send, and Ripley grow as new developments and extensive infill have taken place. During that time no attempt has been made to upgrade the infrastructure. The roads do not have sufficient capacity for today’s traffic, and there seems to be no plans to answer traffic congestion issues. The only exception was the Ripley bypass. What a mess the A3 would be if that had not happened. The proposed all way access to the A3 at Burnt Common is no more that a sticking plaster token solution.

The utility supplies also need to be addressed now, before any additional consumers are added. Winter evenings and we regularly see electricity drop to 190 volts. Not enough to start a fluorescent light tube.

What are the plans for additional health and education facilities to support the increase on population?

During my time in Send Marsh I have witnessed many planning attempts to blight the villages along the A3 with mindless developments. The latest GBC Plan has to be the most appalling attempt so far to turn pleasant Surrey villages into ghettos.

The concept of the Green Belt was introduced to give communities green space, countryside, and identity. In the quest to build houses, GBC seems to have completely ignored the concept of quality of life for those who live in the Borough and who through their efforts, contribute to the very existence and wealth of the Borough and the County.

**BEFORE** any further developments are even considered the present infrastructure needs to be addressed. Traffic management on the A3 and feeder roads from the M25 to south of Guildford can only be described as a complete farce. Road congestion both morning and evening is an utter disgrace. It has been like it for years and clearly demonstrates a complete lack of nouse demonstrated by GBC Planning.

Is GBC just going through a numbers game? “We have been told we have to build thousands of homes, so we will just stick them along the A3”. With the advent of Brexit, the whole future housing requirement must be questioned, as should why is this part of the Borough is being so heavily targeted. It really does beg the question who are the beneficiaries of this plan. The lateness of the addition of Garlicks Arch will clearly result in many people asking many FOI questions for a long time to come.

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>PSLPA16/268</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10853089 / J Goulding</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section page number
Page 110 of 409

Document page number
1169
I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan for Guildford and I wish my comments to be seen by the Planning Inspector.

I object to the enclosure of Green Belt land within proposed new village boundaries and the consequent presumption that the land then becomes available for future development. This is in clear contravention of the government's stated commitment to Green Belt protection.

I object to the number of homes, warehousing and industrial sites that the Plan intends to deliver at Garlick's Arch (Policy A43). This is a new site included with less than two weeks notice and has not been consulted on previously.

Local roads in this area are already clogged with traffic, the schools and GP surgery already oversubscribed. Send Road (A247) is almost at a standstill at peak times. How can Send and Ripley cope with development on this scale which will completely alter the balance and identity of the villages. Garlick's Arch is an area of Green Belt upon which is ancient woodland which must be protected to prevent the merging of the two villages.

I object to the proposed creation of north and southbound slip roads to and from from the A3 (Policy A43A) at Burnt Common - another late addition to the Plan.

I object to the misleading use of the word 'insetting' which implies 'putting inside of and protecting' but is actually being used in the Plan to mean 'removing or moving outside of'.

I object to the redrawing of the Green Belt boundary to exclude an area of land between Danesfield and Send Marsh Road without any notice and without any consultation with residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/65  Respondent: 10853249 / Evan Parry-Morris  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? () is Sound? () is Legally Compliant? ()

I wish to raise the following objections to the Guildford Local Plan 2017:

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:
  a) Highly restrictive vehicle access in both directions along Tannery Lane.
  b) The openness of the Green Belt will be ruined due to expansion or development at this location.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2026  Respondent: 10853857 / Norman Kidd  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? () is Sound? () is Legally Compliant? ()

I have strong objections to the latest version of the local plan as recently published and in particular as it affects Send and our local environment.
It seems to me that many of the objections raised a year or so ago, which on the surface seemed to have been taken into account of, have now been completely disregarded in the latest version and several new projects introduced, all of which have an adverse effect on the village. In particular the concept of taking Send completely out of the Green Belt classification.

In my view we do not need as many houses as the government think, what we need is less people but that is a matter for the national government to resolve with the electorate at large

I would ask that this letter of objection and my comments below be seen by the Inspector.

1. **GBC HAVE NOT FOLLOWED CORRECT PROCESS.**

Since 2014 GBC has changed every major site in Send proposed for development and now just added a massive new road junction. The 2014 proposal for 430 houses went down in April 2016 to 185 and has just gone up again to 485. These significant changes require another full consultation under Regulation 18, not the short cut of Regulation 19 which GBC are trying to get away with. This invalidates the whole process and I strongly object to GBC officials completing ignoring the views of the local population who elect them.

1. Evidence GBC have failed to provide sound evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) which shows an 80 reduction in employment space from the previous ELNA carried out by GBC in 2013. This means that industrial space at Burnt Common is no longer needed. Housing numbers from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015 (SHMA) are highly questionable. The number of foreign students has been wrongly used to inflate the need. The required 13,860 houses in the local plan is exaggerated. If the population is to grow by some 20,000 in the plan period, we actually need 8,000 homes (based on an average of 2.5 persons per home). The Green Belt does not need to be built over. 50 of new homes needed could be built on brownfield sites! GBC's Transport Assessment was not even available to councilors for the vote taken on 24 May, being published on 6 June. Infrastructure overload has received scant attention. GBC Officials seem to be blind to the concept of using brownfield sites but just take the easy of option of removing Green Belt in areas that do not generally affect them directly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2028  **Respondent:** 10853857 / Norman Kidd  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

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:** pslp173/379  **Respondent:** 10854241 / Sian Holwell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Green Belt, Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15

Send Business Park now taken out of the Green Belt altogether

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3120  Respondent: 10855297 / Susan Mansbridge  Agent:

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 infrastructure requirements do not appear to be taken on board with development of the area, when will Guildford Borough Council take a sensible view of the situation? Let us have some common sense on these plans.

With all these new proposed plans, we need raise this point, How will The Villagers Medical Centre cope with even more patients? How will The Royal Surrey Hospital cope with more parking Just can you possibly think these plans are viable?

I have been a Taxi Driver for 50 years and know the ever increasing problems of added traffic conditions.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1891  Respondent: 10855329 / Imelda Rider  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the grossly overstated future housing need that underpins the Guildford Borough Plan. I accept new housing is required, but I question the assumptions that have been used. I believe if a more realistic assumption was used, it would be possible to accommodate new housing within existing urban brownfield areas.

I strongly object to removing Send from the Green Belt. Green Belt exists for very good reasons to help protect the countryside from inappropriate development. Once areas are removed from the Green Belt and developed, there is no going back. If the GBC Plan is not reconsidered the scale of development in the Green Belt along the A3 corridor would completely change the character of the area and cause considerable congestion as the A3 and local roads would not be able to cope. The A3 is already congested without this scale of development.
I object in particular to the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch. The proposed 400 houses and commercial units would completely swamp existing local roads, schools & medical facilities. This would be further exacerbated by the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common that I also strongly object to. Current traffic levels are already too high around Burnt Common. Expanding the A3 junction would cause gridlock all day along A247 and Portsmouth Road. We are already struggling with the current situation of traffic in the area anytime of the day. I also object to the Garlick’s Arch proposal on the grounds that it was not included in the previous consultation in 2014, and was added to the current proposed plan at very late notice, preventing proper due diligence from all interested parties. I also object to the proposed commercial development, as I believe it would make far more sense to expand the current commercial Slyfield area where I understand land is available.

I object to the proposed 45 houses at Clockbarn as the existing roads (Tannery Lane) are very narrow and struggle to cope with current traffic levels. Adding further houses would cause major traffic issues all day long that would also impact Send and Send Marsh areas. In addition, permission has already been granted for a marina development that current infrastructure will not be able to cope – a second development is just nonsensical.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1807  Respondent: 10855713 / Janet Holland  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to express my deep concern and anger over the recent new building proposals for Send. I was saddened by and strongly object to Send being removed from Green Belt status. This will permanently alter the character of the village and will only open the way for yet more building development in the future. One of the main reasons we have chosen to live in Send is the fact it is surrounded by fields which gives it its rural status. With building on the Green Belt land our village feel and status will be irreversibly lost. Green Belt is exactly what it says it is and is there to protect the nature of places, provide open green spaces and enhance the lives of those that live there. Once lost, it is lost forever!

I am very concerned and strongly object to the way Guildford Borough Council have tried to 'sneak' these plans through without proper consultation. Significant changes legally require full consultation under Regulation 18. Since the last consultation major development proposals have been added to the plans and the council are obviously trying to quietly push them through. The 2014 proposal for 430 houses went down to 185 in April 2016. These have now gone up to 485! Every major site proposed for development in Send has been changed and a massive new road junction added on. I am disappointed in the council's approach which has been very underhanded and dishonest to the people of Send.

Send already struggles with the large amount of traffic driving through the village which of ten results in long queues and tail backs. The infrastructure will not be able to cope with all these new build proposals. You cannot just take a small village and dump hundreds of houses and large industrial developments onto it and expect it to work. There are not enough school places, it is already extremely difficult to get a doctor's appointment at the medical centre, the roads will be permanently grid locked and the status of village and village life will be gone forever. We do not wish to be an extension of Guildford but wish to remain a separate village with our own identity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2063  Respondent: 10856033 / R Soden  Agent:
I object to removing Send from the Green Belt as it would produce suburbia from Woking all the way to Burnt COMMON and services could not cope.

What Changes (2016)/Further Amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2064  Respondent: 10856033  R Soden  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object as schools and doctors surgeries could not cope.
I object to this 2016 draft and would like my comments to be seen by the inspector.

What Changes (2016)/Further Amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1995  Respondent: 10856513  Janet Kidd  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have strong objections to the latest version of the local plan as recently published and in particular as it affects Send and our local environment.

It seem to me that many of the objections raised a year or so ago, which on the surface seemed to have been taken into account of, have now been completely disregarded in the latest version and several new projects introduced, all of which have an adverse effect on the village. In particular the concept of taking Send completely out of the Green Belt classification.

In my view, we do not need as many houses as the government think, what we need is less people but that is a matter for the national government to resolve with the electorate at large

I would ask that this letter of objection and my comments below be seen by the Inspector.

1. GBC HAVE NOT FOLLOWED CORRECT

Since 2014 GBC has changed every major site in Send proposed for development and now just added a massive new road junction. The 2014 proposal for 430 houses went down in April 2016 to 185 and has just gone up again to 485.

These significant changes require another full consultation under Regulation 18, not the short cut of Regulation 19 which GBC are trying to get away with. This invalidates the whole process and I object strongly to GBC officials completing ignoring the views of the local population who elect them.

2. EVIDENCE
GBC have failed to provide sound evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) which shows an 80% reduction in employment space from the previous ELNA carried out by GBC in 2015. This means that industrial space at Burnt Common is no longer needed. Housing numbers from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015 (SHMA) are highly questionable. The number of foreign students has been wrongly used to inflate the need. The required 13,860 houses in the local plan is exaggerated. If the population is to grow by some 20,000 in the plan period, we actually need 8,000 homes (based on an average of 2.5 persons per home). The Green Belt does not need to be built over. 50% of new homes needed could be built on brownfield sites! GBC's Transport Assessment was not even available to councillors for the vote taken on 24 May, being published on 6 June. Infrastructure overload has received scant attention. GBC Officials seem to be blind to the concept of using brownfield sites but just take the easy option of removing Green Belt in areas that do not generally affect them directly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1999</th>
<th>Respondent: 10856513 / Janet Kidd</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</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: PSLPA16/3626</th>
<th>Respondent: 10858977 / Angela Otterson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition I attach the reasoned objections to the whole dreadful Guildford Plan which is opposed by virtually all the Villages Around Guildford and most of the Guildfordians and our local MP Sir Paul Beresford. Compiled by Andrew Procter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finally the most important objection:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Send village being removed from the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This fantastic legacy from our Victorian Philanthropists was always intended to be permanent, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. There are no special circumstances to justify abandoning this fantastic legacy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Green Belt in Send provides an ESSENTIAL Buffer, stopping Woking and Guildford becoming one conurbation. The GBC Councillors and Government gave clear election promises to protect the GREEN BELT. This plan blatantly reneges on those promises, and goes against Government Guidelines as pointed out by Sir Paul Beresford our local MP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This would be a Developers Charter to provide unlimited development all over our Village and some other villages too.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please do not make this woefully ill-conceived error, which will be irreversible.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: [Objection to GBC Local Plan 11 July 2016.doc](261 KB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1103</th>
<th>Respondent: 10859073 / Chris Owen-Crane</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 identity of Send from the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I object to the number of houses to be built, increasing the number of cars with an already congested local roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I object to the number of houses and the lack of infrastructure to support families, to include schools, GP surgeries and small narrow roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I object to GBC trying to destroy my quality of life by increasing stress levels by reducing our very valuable green spaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a Send resident I object to policies A42, A43, A43a and A44 of 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>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1427</th>
<th>Respondent: 10859489 / Jennifer Procter</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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>SEND</td>
<td>I object to all the proposals for development in Send on the grounds that none were included in the 2014 draft Local Plan and that these fundamental changes and last minute inclusions have not undergone proper consultation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the removal of Send and other villages from the Greenbelt. Send specifically and in conjunction with development at Gosden Hill is in the front line as a link village between Guildford and Woking. This plan to infill Greenbelt land will effectively join up the towns thus creating exactly the type of urban sprawl the Greenbelt was created to avoid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Interchange on the A3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 mean 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.

**The proposed development of 400 homes at Garlick's Arch**

I object to the development of so many homes on this site. There is no proven need for this number of houses. It is inappropriate and will overload facilities in the village. There are no special circumstances which would support this development.

I object on the grounds that this site at Burnt Common floods every year. Building would create problems for other areas of the village and potentially the road networks as well.

I object to this development on conservation grounds and am surprised that it should be considered.

The area covered in ancient woodland with trees dating back 400 years.

**The Proposed Industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick's Arch**

I object to this proposal because it is superfluous. The requirement for employment space need ELNA 2015 is reduced by 80% from the 2014 plan. A 40ha site with planning permission is already available at Slyfield and this development could be easily and better accommodated there.

I object to this development on the grounds that there are already a number of rural businesses adjacent providing local employment. These would disappear if this development were to go ahead.

**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.

**Clockbarn Nurseries, Tannery Lane**

**Proposal for 45 houses**
I object to this proposal as there is no requirement for these houses

I object also on the grounds that Tannery Lane is narrow and winding and this development in addition 64 homes which already have planning permission and the new Marina will create real problems for motorists as well as endangering cyclists and pedestrians

I object as this development will exacerbate problems at the Send Road/Tannery Lane junction which is already hazardous

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3099</th>
<th>Respondent: 10859809 / Mary Branson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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>Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Send village being removed from the Green Belt. There are no special circumstances that justify the change. Once this status is changed you will destroy precious countryside forever. It cannot be reversed.

I OBJECT to the plan to build 400 houses at Garlicks Arch. Guildfords housing requirement has been exaggerated, and is non transparent and undemocratic. Proper use of brown field sites would be sufficient.

I OBJECT to 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Inadequate access and insufficient consideration of traffic volume.

I OBJECT to houses and travellers pitch at Send Hill. Insufficient access and destruction of countryside. Unsafe landfill waste not considered.

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3255</th>
<th>Respondent: 10859873 / Mat Clark</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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>Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Send village being removed from the Green Belt. There are no special circumstances that justify the change. Once this status is changed you will destroy precious countryside forever. It cannot be reversed.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/19</th>
<th>Respondent: 10864481 / Claire Bright</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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>Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>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? ( )

My objection is to any building in the village of Send due to the present population and lack of further facilities to cover more residents. I object to Send Hill being built upon due to the fact that the A247 is extremely busy several times a day, as is Potters Lane. Further traffic would have to come through Send from the A25, A3, Burpham, Wisley. Traffic outside the school will cause an accident. The doctors’ surgery will be unable to manage with more patients (bear in mind that the Ripley surgery was closed some years ago). Please register this as an objection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/21  Respondent: 10864481 / Claire Bright  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This is an objection to building in the area of the village of Send. We are a village that has grown during the past 3 years to the state where traffic through the village can be unpleasant, the doctors’ surgery is more than busy and the A247 is regarded as a through road from the A3. Potters Lane is no longer a quiet lane due to the amount of traffic passing through taking a short cut from the A3. Tannery Lane is a small road and turning on to the A247 from there is dangerous.

Any further building (on land which I believe is protected) should not be permitted. Green belt land was called that for a reason and must not become brown belt. Send has grown to its capacity and must not be increased.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3277  Respondent: 10867009 / Paul Good  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Send Village being removed from the GREEN BELT. Send's green belt provides an essential buffer preventing Woking and Guildford becoming one large sprawling conurbation, and the green belt is essential to retaining its village character. More cars, more heavy lorries, more congestion, more industrial building, more houses will put unprecedented strain on our village and change its character and residential village living experience for ever which can never be regained. This disregard of existing green belt is in breach of previous manifesto promises by local and central government and contrary to previous public consultations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3278  Respondent: 10867009 / Paul Good  Agent: 

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: PSLPA16/3163</th>
<th>Respondent: 10867105 / Steve Loosley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 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 from the original plans published.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: pslip173/244</th>
<th>Respondent: 10867105 / Steve Loosley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/267</th>
<th>Respondent: 10867329 / Anna Moore</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 live in the village of Send and I <strong>strongly object</strong> to the amount of Green Belt being removed from Send/Ripley in the new local plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to Policy P2 and believe that Send should not be removed from the Green Belt.

I object to the fact that Guildford Borough council have not followed the correct process. They have changed every major site in Send proposed for development since 2014. The new proposal for 485 houses, being such a significant increase (previously 185) requires another full consultation under Regulation 18.

I object to the way in which the Garlick’s Arch development was added to the local plan. This site is new and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously. The proposed development and a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 to serve this development would be catastrophic for Send and the already congested roads would be gridlocked all day.

I object to the lack of evidence that these high numbers of houses are actually needed.

I object to all the additional houses when the local schools are already overwhelmed with new applicants. The school in Send has no capacity to accommodate additional children.

I object to all the additional houses as the local doctors surgery is already at its full capacity and this will put additional pressure on services. Infrastructure overload has received little attention.

I object to the additional amount of cars that will be on the road in the immediate and surrounding areas, causing further risk to our children as they travel to and from school.

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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3313  Respondent: 10867329 / Anna Moore  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to all the additional houses when the local schools are already overwhelmed with new applicants. The school in Send has no capacity to accommodate additional children.

I object to all the additional houses as the local doctors surgery is already at its full capacity and this will put additional pressure on services. Infrastructure overload has received little attention.

I object to the additional amount of cars that will be on the road in the immediate and surrounding areas, causing further risk to our children as they travel to and from school.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/106  Respondent: 10867873 / Dave Govey  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
As a resident of Send Village and living on the busy A247 I can see no sense whatsoever in enlarging the A3 Junction as described in A43.30 and I OBJECT to the council plans which are both short sighted and thoughtless with regard to the local residents.

I OBJECT to the removal of 15 villages, including Ripley and Send, from the green belt. This will lead to wholesale, and often inappropriate developments.

I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have not followed the correct process for Send and Ripley developments. Any significant changes to the 2014 proposals, such as the proposal development of Garlicks Arch, should have required another full consultation, which did not happen. This invalidates the whole process.

I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have failed to provide sound evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment which shows that industrial space at Burnt Common IS NO LONGER NEEDED.

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 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.

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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
My specific objections are as follows;

**I object** to the 440 additional houses proposed for the two sites (A43 and A44) which will overload our already busy local and trunk roads and put pressure on the local amenities and services, such as the Three Villages Surgery, where it is nearly impossible to see my own GP the same day.

**I object** to the proposal to redraw the green belt boundary for Send and, hence, for Send Village to be removed from the Green Belt. The Green Belt was intended to be permanent, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, and there are no special circumstances to justify abandoning it. Send's Green Belt provides an essential buffer stopping Woking and Guildford becoming one conurbation. Local councillors and central government gave a clear election promise to protect the Green Belt and this reneges on it. Developers will be quick to take advantage and there will be nothing to stop them.

**I object** to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road (A43). The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial space is not needed but if it were it should be at Slyfield. With proper use of brownfield sites this Green Belt site is not needed.

**I object** to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers’ pitches at Send Hill (A44). 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.

**I object** to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common (A43a) 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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
exercise, usage by young people. In particular young people will have less natural open space and green fields within which to exercise and socialise. At a time when childhood obesity is on the rise, allow the insetting of this land and future development will have a detrimental impact on achieving this objective as vital areas for play and exercise will be lost, impacting upon both child and adult health.

Removing the greenbelt status would jeopardise the habitats of numerous species of wildlife. The fields are home to many wildlife species such as bats, badgers, rabbits and many many more, along with wild plants which should all be protected. The council has a duty to protect woodland and the wildlife under the UK BIO Diversity Action Plan.

The NPPF states that new Green Belt boundaries should only be established in exceptional circumstances, for example when planning for larger scale developments such as new settlements or major urban extensions. If proposing a new Green Belt, local planning authorities should:

1. demonstrate why normal planning and development management policies would not be adequate;
2. set out whether any major changes in circumstances have made the adoption of this exceptional measure necessary;
3. show what the consequences of the proposal would be for sustainable development;
4. demonstrate the necessity for the Green Belt and its consistency with local plans for adjoining areas;
5. and show how the Green Belt would meet the other objectives of the framework.

I question whether the removal of the Green Belt in and around Send has been shown to meet any of the above requirements. There is no evidence presented in the Core Strategy to demonstrate that the proposed strategic extension meets the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy.

The NPPF (para 85, bullet point 6) requires LPAs to define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. The removal of the Green Belt does not relate to any physical features on the ground and does not fulfil this criterion. The lack of physical features against which the proposed boundary is drawn highlights the inappropriateness of the proposed Green Belt removal and the lack of justification for its insetting.

Whilst I wholeheartedly object to the green belt removal plans, should their inclusion in the Local Plan be forced through, the Council must clearly demonstrate that the new boundaries take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development as required by paragraph 84 of the NPPF. The Council must review the boundaries of those settlements which would be covered by the Green Belt to ensure that sites are identified for development to achieve their long term sustainability and clearly define the reason for the insetting, fully detailing the future usage of the inset land.

Importantly if the Council chooses to continue with the alteration, it is essential when submitting the Core Strategy for examination that it is considered 'sound' in that it is justified with the plan being the most appropriate strategy, when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.

Allowing the removal of Send from the Green Belt, and thereby facilitating the future development of the village, will allow the urban sprawl of Guildford and Woking to further encroach on Send. Send is not a suburb of Guildford or Woking and clear separation should be maintained by the retention of the current Green Belt boundary.

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:**
I am writing to object to the proposed plan affecting the Send and Send Marsh Areas:

Plans A42, A43 and A44: The village of Send and Send march have limited access, and no public transport which can be relied on for travel to employment. Therefore the creation of new homes within these areas will dramatically affect the already congested road network. It is noted that under the plan A43A there are new slip roads for the A3, and this is supported, however this will not by anyway relive the existing problem. The fact is during the rush hour periods and frequently on the weekends the A3 is congested from around the BP services to the M25. All new homes will still be served by the existing North bound slip at Ripley as it will take commuters closer to the M25. In fact it may encourage more of the existing A3 north bound traffic to travel through the over used village roads.

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 inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/733  Respondent: 10870177 / Sue Bolton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to make objections to the proposed housing and road developments proposed for the Send area.

1. The erosion of the green belt area when there are brown field areas in the Guildford borough and infilling has not been used.
2. Send is a village and has not the infrastructure for the amount of traffic that uses our roads at present and can not withstand the amount of extra traffic this will generate. I understand that funds have been allocated for Send Road over the next 10 years and with residential properties bordering this road has no capacity for widening and I can only assume that this money will be used to deal with all the potholes and deterioration that will ensue.
3. The proposal for slip roads will certainly increase the traffic as neighbouring areas will be driving through to join the A3
4. Why has Send and surrounding area been chosen to provide a disproportionate amount of extra housing in the Guildford borough?
5. The present infrastructure is over stretched so how can it cope with all the increased population that these developments in the proposed plan will generate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/826  Respondent: 10870177 / Sue Bolton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 Burt Common. This will send an increasing volume of traffic through Send Road Send which is already overloaded.
   There was a planned link road proposed between Woking and the Wisely turn on the M25. This was abandoned in spite of the fact a large number of houses have been built in the area since. Current housing plans ignore the lack of infrastructure which should be in place before building more houses.
2. I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. The green belt was intended to be permanent as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. Maximum use should be made of brownfield sites.

3. I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of inadequate access and dangerous junction on to send road.

4. I object to the building of 40 houses and 2 travellers sites at Send Hill because this is a country lane and there would be insufficient access and increased traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/393  **Respondent:** 10870625 / J.R. Harris  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the final draft plans relating to Send and Ripley for the following reasons:

1) I object to the increase in the number of homes being planned which was 185 in April 2016 and has now increased to 485 and this has been done without any consultation.

2) I object to the removal of Send and Ripley from the Green Belt. Send provides a strategic buffer between Guildford and Woking with lots of areas which are used for local recreation.

3) I object to the 400 houses and the 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing at Garlick's Arch. This site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been subject to consultation.

4) 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.

5) 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 area 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:** pslp173/10  **Respondent:** 10871329 / Lyn Gargan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**Green Belt, Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15**

Taking Send Business Park out of the green belt completely.
The Send Business Park on Tannery Lane has been to all intents and purposes a non-conforming user in an area of natural beauty adjacent to the river Wey navigation. To extend this use will change the very nature and fabric of the area.

The narrow road which allows access to the existing industrial site is already an issue for the community and to extend the site will cause traffic and snarl ups on an already heavily used main road through Send. A road that is used by school children to access their education, both by walking and by buses to schools outside the village. Making an even earlier start for the buses to get the children to school on time through the rush hour traffic.

Another very important consideration to take in to account is the destruction of the openness of this area, due to the Green Belt protection. In my view a wanton dismantling of an important environment that we, as residents and members of this community, treasure.

Please consider very carefully before you irreparably destroy this area for reasons that don’t adhere to the values and lives that we live.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4058  Respondent: 10872353 / Robin Williams  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. There is no justification for abandoning the Green Belt framework and its rationale; nor for the breach of pre-election promises. Abandoning Send's Green Belt status will inevitably be the first step in Woking and Guildford becoming one rambling and unacceptable conurbation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/337  Respondent: 10872641 / Theresa Gianotti  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

What right do you have to remove Ripley and Send amongst 15 other villages from the green belt when it was put in place to protect them and therefore their inhabitants. The scale of your proposed developments would seem to be completely disproportionate to the area and there will be little chance of halting further over development in the future - completely against the green belt policy. I believe the council is acting in an underhand way and misleading its constituents. The council should be protecting and valuing its 'green environment, not planning to destroy it.

- I object to a document that is over 1800 pages long and not user friendly;
- I object to all erosion of the green belt;
- I object to site A43 Garlicks Arch;
- I object to any "in-setting" of any villages from the green belt;
- I object to the disproportionate amount of development in our area of the Borough;
- I object to the last minute inclusion of new sites;
- I object to the lack of evidence for any alleged housing need numbers;
- I object to the further strain that will be placed on existing health care facilities
- I object to the further strain that will be placed on police services
- I object to the further strain that will be placed on existing roads and country lanes.
- I object to the council's disregard of governments commitment to Green Belt protection
- I object to the number of traveller sites proposed in a small area

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4016  Respondent: 10873313 / Rob Stevens  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write with regards the proposals to remove Send from the Greenbelt protection and the plans for excessive and massively impacting developments in Send and surrounding areas.

Please share with the planning inspector.

I object to the appalling suggestion to remove send from the Greenbelt. There is no good reason for this and if the Greenbelt protection were to be removed this would simply benefit the developers. Why ever would such a crucial protection to our green areas be removed? There is no justification to do so, no need and no wish from the local area. I feel let down by the council that this is even suggested as a solution for them to bypass the protection and over develop long protected areas to achieve a volume of houses not even needed in the area because they cannot make use of brownfield sites as they should.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/303  Respondent: 10873409 / Brian Weller  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of Send Road I must object to the planned junction at Burnt Common/ A3 and taking the surrounding areas out of the green belt is a mistake and a disaster for Send. It's obvious that this is going to increase traffic on an already overcrowded road, there seems to be no plans to deal with the congestion as it is already without adding more danger for pedestrians and cyclists and of course added pollution.
I must object to the inset of the green belt, what's the point of green belt if it can be removed when it suits. The protection of the green belt just about keeps Send as a village still, which is why most people like to live here in the first place. As a life time resident of Send I feel that these changes are being forced upon us without considering local people's views. Obviously we need more housing but not at the expense of the green belt and inconsiderate plans for the people living on a increasingly busy Send road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2689  Respondent: 10873761 / Tracey Sutcliffe  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objection to Regulation 19 Draft Guildford Borough Council Local Plan 2016

I object to the building on the Green Belt in Send at Garlick’s Arch, Clockbarn Nurseries and Send Hill due primarily to the removal of this land from the Green Belt, which is supposed to mean that the land is permanently protected from development. There are no extreme circumstances which explain the need for destruction of this area of Green Belt land.

The development, as far as it is actually needed, could be accommodated on urban brownfield sites, which have not been properly and rigorously looked at. Those brownfield areas would also be much closer to appropriate facilities and infrastructure.

The facilities in Send, in particular the schools and village roads, cannot support the additional housing planned for the Send sites. The village school is in the process of being rebuilt at its current size, without thought for an increased population.

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common, because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable, but shows there will be congestion due to Send being used as a cut through to the A3 and M25. The village roads around Send and Ripley, particularly the A247 through Send, already bear a weight of traffic which gives rise to long jams at busy times. A new A3 junction would cause the A247 to become completely gridlocked and a nightmare for local residents and the local school. I also object to the fact that the infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered.

I object to all of the proposed developments in Send because they were not included in the previous consultation and have been changed substantially. In particular, the largest development at Garlick’s Arch, was snuck through with only two weeks’ notice and without consultation. I also object to the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan, within the new proposed plan.

I object to all development at Garlick’s Arch, as the site is covered in ancient woodland, which dates back at least to the Tudor period. The ancient woodland is of particular conservation sensitivity.

I also object to the development at Garlick’s Arch as it is prone to flooding and is land which provides a “run-off” from the A3. It is also land which is higher than and adjacent to Send Marsh, which, as its name suggests, has also been subject to flooding in the past and could also be adversely affected by the Garlick’s Arch development.

I object to the proposed industrial development at Garlick’s Arch as the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015, shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. There is also a 40ha site available at Slyfield, a site outside the Green Belt.
I object to the Clockbarn development, due to inadequate access and to the volume of existing traffic on the A247 through Send, which this traffic will have to feed into. This would be in addition to the 64 houses given planning permission at the Tannery and to the marina development.

I object to the proposed development of 40 houses at Send Hill, due to the further destruction of Green Belt land and the fact that the subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe landfill waste, which is currently vented. The proposal to include two travellers pitches is also inappropriate due to the insufficient access to the site.

I object to the destruction of Green Belt land without proper consideration to the irreversible damage to beautiful countryside and ancient woodland, without consideration to the 2015 Town Centre Masterplan, without consideration to a proper consultation period, without consideration to the need for proper infrastructure in radically changing Green Belt villages, without consideration to the need of additional support facilities and without the consideration to the complete destruction to the face of Green Belt villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/479  Respondent: 10874817 / J.I Harris  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the final draft plans relating to Send and Ripley for the following reasons:

1) I object to the increase in the number of homes being planned which has increased from 185 in April 2016 to 485 and this has been done without any consultation under Regulation 18.

2) I object to the removal of Send and Ripley from the Green Belt. Send provides a strategic buffer between Guildford and Woking with lots of areas which are used for local recreation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2878  Respondent: 10876225 / Charlotte Hawkins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of Send my objections refer to the planned developments in the immediate area. Of particular concern is Garlick's Arch, Clockbarn Nursery & Winds Ridge developments.

- I OBJECT to any area being removed from the Green Belt. The Green Belt was intended to offer permanent protection from development. There are no special circumstances to justify abandoning it. The Government is breaking a manifesto pledge to protect the Green Belt.

- I OBJECT to the removal of Send in particular from the Green Belt. This means land which would previously have been unlikely to receive planning approval would now be at risk of development. It therefore paves the way for much greater development in the future in an area of countryside that should be protected.
- I OBJECT to the fact that removing areas like Send from the Green Belt will urbanise huge sections of the Borough - from Woking through to Guildford.

- I OBJECT to the fact there has been a failure by Guildford Borough Council to research and utilise available Brownfield sites before considering development on the Green Belt.

- I OBJECT to a disproportionate development in one area of the Borough.

- I OBJECT to a huge proportion of new homes in a small area

- I OBJECT to the fact that such a considerable development is being placed in an area with insufficient public transport provision nearby to encourage people to avoid using cars. Brownfield areas in Guildford near transport hubs should instead be developed.

- I OBJECT to the lack of consideration given to the increased traffic on already busy areas - eg in the centre of Ripley, and also by Tannery Lane in Send

- I OBJECT to erosion, or development directly adjacent to, areas of protected or ancient woodland

- I OBJECT to the lack of immediate provision for new schools or sufficient extra school places in an area that is already under pressure for places

- I OBJECT to the lack of immediate provision for the increased pressure there will be on Doctors surgeries where there is already a significant wait for appointments

I request my comments are shown to the Planning Inspector who will make the decision on this. Please confirm receipt of this email. If you need any further explanation or expansion of any of the comments please contact me.

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: PSLPA16/3782  Respondent: 10876449 / Michael Powell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy P2
I object to Policy A43,30
I object to Policy A44.1.9

I object to the Final Draft Local Plan - our schools, doctors & roads are already FULL. We need our Green Belt in providing a Healthy Environment for us all to live in!!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3584  Respondent: 10876481 / Martin Yates  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO SEND VILLAGE BEING REMOVED FROM THE GREEN BELT. Local councillors and central government gave a pre-election promise that they would protect the Green Belt, they have reneged on that promise and they know that they would not have been elected if they had told the truth, as the majority of Guildford residents want the Green Belt preserved. The Green Belt was intended to be permanent, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, and their are no special circumstances to justify abandoning it. The Green Belt is there to prevent villages from merging into each other, to prevent over-development and to keep the rural aspect of the environment. The villagers of Send do not want their village to become an over populated urban sprawl.

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of the sheer volume of traffic that will be created, Tannery Lane is narrow and winding and access in inadequate. Not only that but the junction with Send Road is already hazardous. Planning permission has already been granted for 64 apartments and a Marina, which means even more traffic will be generated.

I OBJECT to building 400 house and 7000 sq metres of Industrial space at Garlics Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road. This area contains Ancient Woodland which should be protected as it is irreplaceable. Brown Field sites should be used for the houses and Industrial buildings should be built at Slyfield. GBC have grossly exaggerated the housing requirements, and refused to explain where they got their numbers from.

I OBJECT to development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill, This lane is very thin with inappropriate access. The land is a former landfill site, and contains unsafe waste, which is well documented. This is also an exceptionally beautiful part of Send Village which would be spoilt.

I OBJECT TO the A3 interchange as this would cause excessive traffic to come through Send, which is already overloaded with heavy traffic at all times of day, not only rush hour, this would cause terrible traffic jams and gridlock, and vehicle fumes and noise would be detrimental to the health of the villagers.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/27  Respondent: 10876833 / J. C. ROBSON  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 object to Policy P2: I object to Send village and its surroundings being removed from designated greenbelt.

I also object to Policy A 43 to build additional housing at Garlick's Arch and Burnt Common.

I also object to Policy A 44 additional proposed housing 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: PSLPA16/3242  Respondent: 10877249 / Ann Hamilton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The removal of Send from the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2827  Respondent: 10877665 / Audrey Ivatts Audrey Ivatts  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 developments at Clockbarn Nursery, Garlick's Arch and Send Hill for a number of reasons:

2) The substantial loss of Green Belt land which will result if these developments take place

2) The large increase in road congestion, noise and pollution

3) The loss of the semi-rural nature of Send and Ripley

4) The lack of adequate provision for schools and health care facilities
5) The lack of infrastructure improvements to help deal with the large increase in road vehicles caused by having so many more people living and working in the area

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4155</th>
<th>Respondent: 10877665 / Audrey Ivatts Audrey Ivatts</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 Village being removed from 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: PSLPA16/4158</th>
<th>Respondent: 10877665 / Audrey Ivatts Audrey Ivatts</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With specific reference to the above points, I object to the proposed development at Clockbarn Nursery, Garlick's Arch, and Send Hill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/1275</th>
<th>Respondent: 10878433 / John Townsend</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/3223</th>
<th>Respondent: 10878529 / Phil Beddoes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 two other sites in Send ...... both of which are accessed via very very narrow country lanes without footpaths in part, which are presently heavily used and parent a significant hazard to users on foot.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3676  Respondent: 10878561 / Amy Dowsett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 various plans put forward in the Local Plan relating to the village of Send.

Send is a village within the green belt and I strongly object to it's removal, whether in it's entirety or in pieces, from the green belt. There are enough brown field sites within the Borough that could and should be used for building without having to steal our precious green belt and destroy our village forever.

I strongly object to the building of a vast amount of houses and industrial units in Send as it will increase the population by at least 25% without there being the infrastructure to support this type of increase. During the past 25 years, there has been a lot of housing built within the village and the local amenities are already stretched. Our roads are at a standstill during rush-hours, and combined with roadside parking and the narrow width of many of the roads, the extra traffic created by the local plan will make living in our village unbearable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1934  Respondent: 10878657 / Ann Dowsett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 various plans put forward in the Local Plan relating to the village of Send.

Send is a village within the green belt and I strongly object to it's removal, whether in it's entirety or in pieces, from the green belt. There are enough brown field sites within the Borough that could and should be used for building without having to steal our precious green belt and destroy our village forever.

I strongly object to the building of a vast amount of houses and industrial units in Send as it will increase the population by at least 25% without there being the infrastructure to support this type of increase. During the past 25 years, there has been a lot of housing built within the village and the local amenities are already stretched. Our roads are at a standstill during rush-hours, and combined with roadside parking and the narrow width of many of the roads, the extra traffic created by the local plan will make living in our village unbearable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
A resident of Send/Ripley I wish to make the following points:

I object to all erosion of the Green Belt.

I object to any "in-setting" of ANY villages from the Green Belt.

I object to the amount of development in one area of the borough.

I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools.

I object to the limited consultation period.

I object to the last minute inclusion of new sites with less than 2 weeks notice.

I strongly object to the lack of any evidence for the alleged housing need numbers.

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 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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3492  Respondent: 10881217 / Ben Stevens  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 Draft Local 2016 Plan and in particular, I wish to object very strongly to the removal of Send from the Green Belt. This green countryside between Woking and Guildford is the reason that it is such a pleasant and attractive place to live and work even though the roads are often very congested.

I object to the building on the Green Belt at Send at Garlick’s Arch, Clockbarn Nurseries and Send Hill. I cannot see how this could be justified by any “special circumstances” and I would like to add that Green Belt is meant to be permanent and not continually eroded.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan.

The “housing need” figure of 13,860 is far too high and results in the completely unnecessary development of our Green Belt. The way students, economic need and affordability are calculated inflates the housing need. Students are only part time residents in Guildford needing one bedroom in shared housing units and they will not be wanting to live in houses in the villages.

I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.

I also 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 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 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.
I object to the vast 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 targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

I believe that these housing developments and the proposed changes would change the nature of this beautiful area forever – an area I have loved growing up in and one I would eventually love to invest in myself when I am able to buy a property. Our villages are being asked to accept a disproportionally high number of Guildford’s housing needs and I do not feel that this need is evenly shared throughout the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Marsh, Ripley and Burnt Common will become just another sprawling Goldsworth Park, featureless, without character and totally unattractive.

What we need are imaginatively planned areas of residential regeneration for mid high rise development in the centre of Guildford. Conversion of property above current retail buildings would provide much needed residential accommodation and rejuvenate the high street. Come on you planners! Let's have some new, exciting ideas for the younger generation living in the area, not more of the same-old, same-old!

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPA16/1028  Respondent: 10893921 / Jim Browne  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I am writing in reference to the proposed changes to the green belt in the Guildford Local Plan.

I strongly object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq. metres of industrial space at Garlicks Arch, this area to prone to flooding and is home to ancient woodland, woodlands that helps minimise noise from the A3. The Environment Agency has the area at higher risk of flooding then the council!

I strongly object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane does not provide sufficient or safe access to support this development. At places the lane is the width of a car with limited visibility to see other cars and road users coming towards you.

I strongly object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common, diverting large amounts of traffic from the A3 and M25 through Ripley and Send with the resulting impact of increased air and noise pollution.

I strongly object to not protecting the green belt, Iobject to removing Send, Ripley and Clandon from the green belt together with the sites at Wisley Airfield and Garlicks Arch and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances to remove these sites and villages from the green, belt, as required by the national planning policy.

Can my comments please be shown to the planning inspector and can I have confirmation that my letter has been received.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPA16/3095  Respondent: 10894337 / Elizabeth Pearce  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT and am appalled at the Council once more wanting to pass an application that is on GREEN BELT land.

My objections are as follows
I OBJECT to the 40 houses planned west of Winds Ridge & Send Hill & the Traveller Site, for several reasons

I OBJECT as the land is in Green Belt & the proposed inset is not appropriate due to it’s permanent green belt status.

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!

I OBJECT as the road is already too narrow to take existing traffic and it has poor vehicular visability on exiting at the Potters Lane junction, increasing housing and therefore traffic in this area, by an estimated 90+ cars will make this situation far worse and dangerous.

I OBJECT as there is no room for long vehicles, particularly in relation to caravans and additional lorries associated with Traveller sites and the access road is not big enough for increased traffic.

I OBJECT as some of this land is also farmed and grazed and there is a nearby nature reserve and any substantial building work will be detrimental to the area.

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 – as identified by Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978,SN-HP dated 5/1/2005 - 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.

I believe if GBC go ahead & build on this land, knowing these potential dangers, then that in itself is a very negligent of the council.

Also I OBJECT as the Traveller Accommodation Assessment research, carried out in June/July 2012 by Millfield Services, cannot be so as the Sittingbourne based market research company was dissolved in 2011.

I also OBJECT as there seems to be a conflict of interest with Hilda Brazil who is part of the liaison group for the Traveller Community with Surrey CC and who is playing an active part in this Local Plan.

The land outlined for the 2 Traveller Sites is adjacent to private land owned by Linda Brazil.

If the traveller sites are built, this will open up this piece of land for further traveller Sites.

This is a Trojan Horse, pushed forward by an interested party.

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 of industrial space at Garlicks Arch.

Guildfords Housing Requirements seem to be rather vague and ill defined and very likely over exaggerated.

The Local Plan seems to be without adequate corroborative information as to how the Housing Requirement assessment numbers were reached, nor does it provide the arithmetic to substantiate how such numbers were arrived at.

When this issue was raised by others, they were, according to Council Meeting Minutes advised that ...such opportunity was long gone....and such questions were out of time. Such tactics are questionable and not transparent.
This inability to provide the public with credible data gives rise to a very strong probability of a successful challenge to the Local Plan as it seems to fails even the most basic "test of transparency" required at law. This failure gives rise to the risk of Appeal involving high court cost which will likely wipe out GBC Legal Dept budget to the detriment of ratepayers.

I also OBJECT to this proposal on the grounds of the impact of the increased traffic on the area. Already the area is gridlocked in the morning & evening rush hour & the new plans will create even more of a cut through to Woking.

The local roads going through Send & Ripley will not be able to cope & there is no room to widen the roadways.

It will add to congestion.

There is also no evidence to show that new Industrial Units are needed, there are already several empty ones in the area!

I also OBJECT due to the environmental impact and pollution to the area. This proposal does not take such an environmental impact into sufficient consideration.

I also OBJECT to the new interchange on the A3 at Burnt Common as this would mean even more traffic through Send with traffic from the proposed 5000+ new houses in the area.

The surrounding roads will not be able to cope. The infrastructure even if put in place first is impractical, as some of the roads are not able to be widened and just by putting in phasing traffic lights, as suggested at the local meeting by members pf the GCC will not be sufficient.

I also OBJECT as with this number of houses, the local hospitals for the area will not be able to cope at all with the increased demand, it will be a really dangerous situation.

I also OBJECT to the Insetting of the green belt land behind Heath Drive, Send Rd & the vicinity of St Bedes Junior School as this will mean that even more future developments will be proposed, causing further strain on the villages infrastructure.

I also OBJECT to removing Send lakes from the SNCI Designation.

At present a dedicated team tend to the lakes & it is an asset dearly loved & used by the villagers, as well as being a magnet for wildlife. This could be put at risk, meaning the lakes are not so well tended & the risk of flooding would be higher.

I am left to believe that this application to build on huge amounts of Greenbelt Land has been put forward solely as a sweetener to the Developers who are donating land to allow for the proposed 4 way junction on the A3.

I am disgusted that the Council are backing these schemes and not taking into account the harmful impact on the surrounding areas & population and the volume of housing is wholly disproportionate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2845</th>
<th>Respondent: 10894593 / Anthony Stanton-Precious</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

Re : Objection to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt.
I want to strongly object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt, the Village of "Send" was always considered to be a permanent non negotiable Green Belt Zone and that should remain and be honoured.

1) I object to the development in Send Hill as this area is a Pumped Sewerage System which already is overloaded and at full capacity, besides the fact the land is totally unsuitable land as it is contaminated with previous landfill.

2) Clockbarn Nursery is un-suitable to develop as it safety route onto the main road will be hazardous; especially opposite a recreation ground with children playing.

3) I object to any development at "Garlick's Arch" as historically its an ancient woodland site; rare these days, and subject to flooding which under current predictions will flood more frequently in the future with obvious consequences.

4) I object also to the changes at the A3 Roadway Burnt Common Interchange as the increase traffic attracted from other local developments would have a direct effect in traffic congestion in and through the village of Send.

We all need to take a sensible view that these proposals need to be stopped forthwith otherwise the consequences will have a life long damaging effect, we want Send Village to stay within the GREEN BELT.

Would you please ensure you acknowledge receipt of this email, thank you.

Thank you for your honest and serious consideration to our objections... we live here and need to look after the future of our village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2849   Respondent: 10894881 / Wendy & Graham Enderby   Agent:

Document:   Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Send being removed from the Green Belt. As lifelong residents of Send, having grown up here, married here, bought property here and raised our children here who in turn have grown up here, married here, bought property here and raised our grandchildren here, we are utterly dismayed at the proposals outlined in the Local Plan which is destined to destroy our village and community forever.

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. - Tannery Lane is far too small to accommodate the volume of traffic which will be generated by the proposed 64 apartments at the Tannery and the Marina let alone another large development which will then set a precedent for future development off what is essentially a narrow country lane. The junction with Send Road is already extremely hazardous and the extra volume of traffic will make it even more dangerous. I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlicks Arch. The ancient woodland should be protected and a flood site is hardly suitable for housing. The industrial units would be out of place in our village. They would be unwelcome and unnecessary especially with a large brown field site already available at Slyfield. The development would place an unrealistic burden on our already overstretched local amenities. I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. The destruction of this beautiful area and devastating impact on wildlife would be a tragedy. The site is surrounded by effectively single track roads unable to sustain any more traffic. I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Send Road, Portsmouth Road and A3 are gridlocked now during peak times. An interchange would encourage even more traffic from the Woking and surrounding area through Send never mind from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Burpham, 1850 at Blackwell Farm and the proposed developments at Garlicks Arch, Tannery Lane and Send Hill, all of which we have already objected to. The scale of proposed developments of some 6400 houses plus commercial space has to be a hugely disproportionate plan for this area. Removing Send from the Green Belt leaves the prospect of other mega developments being approved which is completely unacceptable and receives our strongest objection. In 2014 our MP
stressed that the Government is not requiring Guildford Borough Council to reassess its Green Belt and that Guildford Borough Council alone has made the choice to consider this option. A letter from Nick Boles MP to Sir Paul Beresford MP makes it clear that ‘exceptional circumstances are required for any changes to Green Belt boundaries unmet housing need is not such a circumstance’. Why is Guildford Borough Council ignoring this advice?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3240  
Respondent: 10895009 / Holly Broughton  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Green Belt status being removed from Send, Send Marsh, Ripley and the Clandons. The effect will be that we will become part of the urban sprawl of Woking. The 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: PSLPA16/1584  
Respondent: 10895745 / AD Carver  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt

As I understand the Green Belt was always intended to be kept as such to provide a division between Villages, towns etc.

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery.

Tannery Lane has an exceptionally narrow and winding road, in places only room for one car and if you meet a lorry there is no room for maneuver.

Also a very hazardous junction coming from Tannery lane to join the Send Road, the sight vision is dreadful with parked cars either side of the junction onto the main road.

I object to the building of 400 houses and an Industrial space at Garlick’s

This site in particular is covered with woodland and pasture and certainly never intended for building purposes.

The site floods dreadfully, water coming off the A 3 into the stream which then floods the fields.

We have photographic proof of this as it is Cobham Sporting Gun Club site and has been for the best part of 30 years and floods often.

The Industrial proposal should be sited at Slyfield which would be ideal to extend and keep in one place.

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 pitches on Send Hill called the Paddocks
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 travelers site.

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 lorrys 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

causinf 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:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1590  Respondent: 10897633 / A Aldridge  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 Send and surrounding villages from the Green Belt which separates them from Guildford and Woking. One of the reasons for the formation of the Green Belt was to provide a 'lung' for London; now, with the increasing concern regarding the poor air quality and pollution in London, it is counterproductive to remove areas from the Green Belt and build on them, thus creating more pollution.

I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial development at Garlick's Arch opposite the junction of Send Marsh Road and Portsmouth Road. This construction will create a great deal of additional traffic on the A247, and the local infrastructure will not support it. Traffic will be greatly increased in Send Marsh Road, which is a winding residential road. There has been no consultation on this proposal.

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. The J247 will be used as a cut through from Woking to the A3 and M25, by heavy commercial vehicles as well as cars, and at Send is mainly a residential road. There has been no consultation on this proposal.

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn. The junction of Tannery Lane with Send Road is already dangerous and these extra houses. together with the 64 houses and Marina at the Tannery will bring Send to a standstill.

There have been repeated election promises to protect and preserve the Green Belt. These are not being honoured by Guildford Borough Council, which seems determined to destroy the amenities of a country area and, in doing so, its political credibility.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1919  Respondent: 10897665 / Sue French  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to land in Send being removed from the Green Belt. This is my first and foremost objection. GBC Councillors were elected on the back of promises they made to protect the Green Belt and they should not now renege on their election promises.

It is government policy to protect the Green Belt and there are no proven exceptional circumstances in Send which allow it to be used for housing, industrial warehousing or slip road construction to and from the A3. Housing numbers destined for Send are grossly exaggerated and not proven. Brownfield sites could be found for new housing and for industrial use and road building.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I currently live in Ripley, but also have previously lived in Send, so know both villages well.

I am extremely concerned, in particular about the proposals to significantly change the Green Belt boundaries around both Send & Ripley.

Whilst, acknowledging some relatively minor changes to the Green belt may be deemed necessary, the current proposals are excessive & in my opinion totally unjustified.

The purpose of redrawing the Green Belt boundaries is presumably to allow further development. However, the changes including the proposed “inset” will potentially lead to a very significant increase in development in the future.

This is totally inappropriate for both Send & Ripley village areas.

My comments on such a proposed Draft Local Plan include the following:-

- The existing infrastructure could not cope with the additional pressures from such proposed extensive developments. For example, the existing traffic on the roads through both Send & Ripley & the congestion at peak periods is already significant.
- The roads are already fairly narrow & increase in traffic flow will cause all sorts of problems, including increased danger to pedestrians & cyclists.
- One long-standing concern for both residents of Send & Ripley is the traffic through the villages that seeks to connect to/from the A3/M25. This has been a potential issue for many years. The proposal to significantly add further local development as proposed will only dramatically increase the traffic flow & this would be intolerable & unacceptable.

There appears to be no significant infrastructure Improvements proposed that would be required to mitigate against such an increase in local development.

- In addition to the traffic problem, there are many other issues relating to infrastructure that would be of concern. These include the increased risk of flooding, lack of places in local schools, pressure on local medical facilities & health care etc. In addition, pressure on parking, particularly near local shops or schools is already a major issue of concern, additional development will only make the situation far worse.
- There seems to be a lack of credible, independent & valid evidence to support the proposals in the local plan. It would appear that there is little evidence to support the need for such large increase just in our immediate area.
- The proposals put a disproportionate amount of proposed new development in our area of the Borough.
- The proposed changes to the Green Belt, as outlined in the draft Local Plan will significant harm & be of detriment to the local areas. It will allow significant development, which the Green Belt was designed to generally prevent. It should be remembered that the Green Belt was designed to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land between settlements of villages open & undeveloped & to prevent linear development leading to the joining together of adjacent communities.
- Under Green Belt policy, there is a general presumption against development unless in exceptional circumstances. Guildford Borough Council do not appear from the evidence provided, to have demonstrated any exceptional circumstances that would justify the significant potential development that is proposed on current Green Belt Land.
• Surrey is apparently the most densely populated County in England, yet the Draft local plan is expected to accept a disproportionate amount of development, compared to other parts of the country. This point must be acknowledged.
• The loss of existing significant Green Belt open areas will be detrimental & spoil the existing countryside, which is one of the reasons why many residents decided to live here in the first place.
• Overall, the proposals will have a negative & harmful impact on both Send & Ripley villages.
• I also understand that only a very limited time has been given with regards to consultation and that some sites have been included at the last minute. This would seem particularly unfair to the residents of the Borough.

In conclusion, I object to the significant proposed changes to the Green Belt particularly in both Send & Ripley areas. The two villages are adjacent & significant development proposal in one will affect the other, as they have common interest & concerns & share facilities such as medical, schools and also some roads/traffic. This proposal is excessive to the extreme and I wish to register that I feel the revised Local Plan is still unacceptable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2326  Respondent: 10898433 / Karen Lynch  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Guildford Borough Council’s Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites

It is particularly disturbing that despite numerous pledges to the contrary from the Guildford Borough Council that the final draft Local Plan has been changed so fundamentally introducing many new sites and a staggering proposal to remove the village of Send entirely from the Green Belt without any proper consultation.

Let me start by objecting to the removal of the village of Send from the Green Belt which is a draconian proposal that has only appeared in the latest plan. The country side between Woking and Guildford offers amenities to the community that would be lost forever if the area was taken out of the Green Belt. There is no justification for this as there are numerous brownfield sites in the Borough that can be developed before resorting to this.

I object in general to all of the proposed development sites in Send as they were not included previously in the 2014 consultation and it seems to be a case of the Council making it up as they go along and hence it has bungled significant developments into Send where the housing proposals in particular far exceed the housing needs of the community. I object to the fact that these proposals have not been properly consulted on and all sites have changed substantially from the previous Local Plan as has the number of houses now being proposed to be built.

I object in particular to the fact that the only area for proposed new housing removed from the previous draft proposal is that behind [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]. This smacks as more than a touch of ‘NIMBY’ism. Even though he is not a member of the (Conservative) Guildford council, I find it extremely hard to believe that this change to the plan is not related to the fact that he is a member of the Cabinet.

I object to the proposed site off Send Hill to develop 40 houses and make space available for 2 Travellers pitches. Send Hill’s road network is totally inadequate for the existing residential needs in that it is a narrow width single track road and is incapable of coping with any heavy construction traffic let alone an increase to residential traffic. There is also no justification for this development as 40 new houses would totally swamp the existing residential area and change the community forever. I also object to this site as a location for the development of 2 traveller pitches as the access to this site will be totally inadequate and they are totally out of character with the surrounding community. In addition,
previously there have already been crime issues reported relating to travellers who have passed through the area and still continue to pitch their caravans on the B2215.

I also object to the fact that if the development of the Send Hill site were to go ahead then it would introduce an element of danger to the school children who use Send Hill to go to school every day. Send Hill is a totally inadequate road network to accommodate heavy construction traffic and this increased congestion caused would be significant and dangerous. The traffic situation during school drop off and pick up times is already a concern in the area. The proposed new housing, with additional vehicles, would make this even worse.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. This proposed development is not justified by any special circumstances and the fact that the Green Belt is meant to be permanent and not continually eroded. The fact that the site is also prone to flooding makes it an inappropriate site for development.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. This development should not be located here but moved to the Slyfield Industrial Estate where there is sufficient space for the additional 7,000 sq m of industrial space on its already zoned site. I object to this new proposed development being placed so close to residential communities.

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common as it would cause significant congestion into the local road network, in particular the A247, which struggles to cope with existing traffic loads. There is already significant congestion on the road network during peak travel hours in both the morning and afternoon and this new junction onto the A3 would increase this congestion throughout the remainder of the day. I also object to the fact that the air quality would dramatically deteriorate in the surrounding residential areas of Send village from this significant increase in traffic levels.

I object to the Plan as it is ill considered and not properly consulted upon with the changes from the previous plan being so material to the village of Send. I also object to the fact that local schools and doctors surgery in Send, which are struggling to cope with existing demand from residents, will be totally overburdened and unable to cope with the additional demand that would arise from this proposed increased housing. I also object to the fact that the infrastructure requirements have not properly considered and will be totally inadequate to deal with the new proposed housing and industrial developments in the village of Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3775  Respondent: 10898465 / John Lynch  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It is particularly disturbing that despite numerous pledges to the contrary from the Guildford Borough Council that the final draft Local Plan has been changed so fundamentally introducing many new sites and a staggering proposal to remove the village of Send entirely from the Green Belt without any proper consultation.

Let me start by objecting to the removal of the village of Send from the Green Belt which is a draconian proposal that has only appeared in the latest plan. The country side between Woking and Guildford offers amenities to the community that would be lost forever if the area was taken out of the Green Belt. There is no justification for this as there are numerous brownfield sites in the Borough that can be developed before resorting to this.

I object in general to all of the proposed development sites in Send as they were not included previously in the 2014 consultation and it seems to be a case of the Council making it up as they go along and hence it has bungled significant
developments into Send where the housing proposals in particular far exceed the housing needs of the community. I object to the fact that these proposals have not been properly consulted on and all sited have changed substantially from the previous Local Plan as has the number of houses now being proposed to be built.

I object to the proposed site off Send Hill to develop 40 houses and make space available for 2 Travellers pitches. Send Hill’s road network is totally inadequate for the existing residential needs in that it is a narrow width single track road and is incapable of coping with any heavy construction traffic let alone an increase to residential traffic. There is also no justification for this development as 40 new houses would totally swamp the existing residential area and change the community forever. I also object to this site as a location for the development of 2 traveller pitches as the access to this site will be totally inadequate and they are totally out of character with the surrounding community.

I also object to the fact that if the development of the Send Hill site were to go ahead then it would introduce an element of danger to the school children who use Send Hill to go to school every day. Send Hill is a totally inadequate road network to accommodate heavy construction traffic and this increased congestion caused would be significant and dangerous.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. This proposed development is not justified by any special circumstances and the fact that the Green Belt is meant to be permanent and not continually eroded. The fact that the site is also prone to flooding makes it an inappropriate site for development.

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common as it would cause significant congestion into the local road network, in particular the A247, which struggles to cope with existing traffic loads. There is already significant congestion on the road network during peak travel hours in both the morning and afternoon and this new junction onto the A3 would increase this congestion throughout the remainder of the day. I also object to the fact that the air quality would dramatically deteriorate in the surrounding residential areas of Send village from this significant increase in traffic levels.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. This development should not be located here but moved to the Slyfield Industrial Estate where there is sufficient space for the additional 7,000 sq m of industrial space on its already zoned site. I object to this new proposed development being placed so close to residential communities.

I object to the Plan as it is ill considered and not properly consulted upon with the changes from the previous plan being so material to the village of Send. I also object to the fact that local schools and doctors surgery in Send, which are struggling to cope with existing demand from residents, will be totally overburdened and unable to cope with the additional demand that would arise from this proposed increased housing. I also object to the fact that the infrastructure requirements have not properly considered and will be totally inadequate to deal with the new proposed housing and industrial developments in the village of Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
It is foolish to plan future development on the flood plain. Areas will be cut off by flooding because the entire area is low-lying and there would be no alternative routes. It is sometimes difficult to find a route at present when there is flooding; it would be worsened by further development. The local lanes and roads are unsuitable for heavy traffic. These plans will not improve our quality of life, nor would the extra pollution which would result from the increase in traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3659  Respondent: 10899137 / Justina Buswell  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I Object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. This is designed to separate villages such as Send from towns such as Woking and Guildford, preventing urban sprawl and being the ‘lungs’ of cities. Local councillors and central government gave reassurance in the election that Green Belt would be protected and this is contrary to those promises.

2. I Object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nurseries. This is totally inappropriate use of this land. There is inadequate access, Tannery Lane is a small country lane and should remain as such. This area can already be hazardous, especially for vehicles trying to join Send Road, and this volume of traffic is already destined to increase the building of 64 apartments at The Tannery and the Marina on the canal. This lane will not be able to take any more traffic and should not be increased in size to accommodate any extra vehicles.

3. I Object to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road. This site is covered in ancient woodland, which should be preserved. The site is prone to extensive flooding. The industrial space, if required, should be sited at Slyfield and the extra housing is surplus to Guildford’s housing requirement.

4. I Object to the development of 40 houses and travellers’ pitches at Send Hill. Again this is sited on a single track country lane, in a village location with insufficient access. This area was used for landfill and would be unfit for development due to the nature of the landfill.

5. 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: PSLPA16/3964  Respondent: 10899137 / Justina Buswell  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I Object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. This is designed to separate villages such as Send from
towns such as Woking and Guildford, preventing urban sprawl and being the ‘lungs’ of cities. Local councillors and
central government gave reassurance in the election that Green Belt would be protected and this is contrary to those
promises.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/513  Respondent: 10899233 / Frederick Hookins  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 P2. the removal of Send from the Green Belt, this I believe to be against Government policy.
Since the suggestion that Send be removed from the Green Belt Aldertons Farm has been neglected the hedges have not
been cut, the fences are falling down. and the fields have not been cut probably hoping for planning permission.

I object to policy A 43 Land at Galick’s arch Burnt Common as this is not required, also the woodland on this site as
most of it is ancient woodland and planning permission should not be granted, also this land floods each winter and could
cause flooding in Send Marsh, and possibly the A3,

I feel that Guildford Borough Council have not followed the correct process the number of houses has changed from 430
in 2014 and went down to 185 in 2016 and has now go up to 485 these significant changes require another full
consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/821  Respondent: 10899233 / Frederick Hookins  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 removed from the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1332  Respondent: 10900609 / Beverley Gear  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the final draft local plan and I want my comments below to be seen by the Inspector.
I object to the way that Guildford Borough Council has altered their original plans for the developments in Send and in doing so, by using regulation 19 they are attempting to shortcut the process. Having not followed the correct procedure, this must NOT be allowed.

I object to Send and Ripley being removed from the Green Belt. If this is allowed to happen, it will set a precedent and the majority of Surrey could lose its status. Election promises were to protect the Green Belt!!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1957  Respondent: 10903681 / Linda Freeland  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing in protest to the Local Plan as this relates to the villages of Send and Send Marsh because it seems to take no account of the wishes of local residents, many of whom, including my family, will be adversely affected. Here are just some of the issues:

- rush hour traffic is already at a standstill throughout Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common and an extra 490 plus homes will add massively to this problem
- building on the green belt was supposed to be a last resort rather than something taken for granted - 90% of residents were against this in previous local polls
- schools are already struggling to find places, and the Villages medical centre appointments are already at capacity
- air pollution will become a serious problem affecting the health of all local residents, especially young children
- why does there have to be so many houses in such a small area when many other villages are getting off with almost no additional development
- our green belt environment is home to many different species of wildlife, all of them under threat if this housing goes ahead

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3268  Respondent: 10904449 / C J Stephenson  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to lodge my complaint regarding Send village being removed from the green belt area.

I object on the grounds that this green belt area was intended to be permanent and there should not be any issues regarding the removal of it. The road structure will cause no end of problems with the extra traffic and totally destroy our villages. We need to preserve the village life and community.

It will also cause problems with the doctors, it's difficult to get an appointment as it is.

The schools would be another problem, to say nothing of the already over congested traffic issues.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/99  Respondent: 10904833 / Elaine Roberts-Toomey  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15 to inset Send business park from green belt because its inappropriate development in an area with very poor access, the most narrow and restrictive road in the area and it you see the impact a single box van causes from either direction never mind a juggernaut then you will realise the futility of this application, its an area of outstanding natural beauty, and is also an old non conforming user in an area it should never have been developed in.

Finally, I cannot believe I voted for you. Your lack of support for locals makes your positions on the local council untenable. Please resign your position, as come the next election I will be voting for any one but you guys.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1068  Respondent: 10905185 / D White  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the manner in which Guildford Borough Council has presented this latest plan. I consider the plan is misleading and contradictory to other documents presented by Guildford B.C. especially the Summer edition of "About Guildford" where statements are made and then immediately contradicted.

For example:-

You state that the number of development sites has been reduced. YET you added more sites at short notice, Garlick's Arch and Winds Ridge/ Send Hill AND ENLARGED the Send inset area, thereby allowing and encouraging larger developments.

You state that there will be NO development along the A3 between Junction 10, M25 to the Hogs Back. YET YOU PROPOSE (including Wisley Airfield) some 6800 dwellings.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1005  Respondent: 10915777 / V.L Goatley  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15 to inset Send business park from green belt because its inappropriate development in an area with very poor access, the most narrow and restrictive road in the area and it you see the impact a single box van causes from either direction never mind a juggernaut then you will realise the futility of this application, its an area of outstanding natural beauty, and is also an old non conforming user in an area it should never have been developed in.

Finally, I cannot believe I voted for you. Your lack of support for locals makes your positions on the local council untenable. Please resign your position, as come the next election I will be voting for any one but you guys.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the above-mentioned villages being withdrawn from the Green Belt as they provide an essential buffer from Woking and Guildford becoming one large conurbation. Central government and local councillors both gave election promises to protect the Green Belt from further erosion and have reneged on this.

I OBJECT most strongly to the development of Garlick's Arch opposite Send Marsh Road's junction with the Portsmouth Road for housing and industrial development. This is already a very busy junction. Slyfield would be a more suitable site for industrial development. Further housing would add to the already serious problem of lack of school places, would lead to even long waiting time for doctor's appointments.

I OBJECT to the proposed new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common as this would greatly increase the traffic through Send and surrounding area.

I OBJECT to the proposed development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill - this site is too near the cemetery and the site contains documented unsafe landfill waste. The roadway is single width providing insufficient access. (Again more houses would have an effect on schools and the Villages Medical Centre.)

I OBJECT to the proposed building of houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Again there is inadequate access as Tannery Lane is very narrow with many tight bends. Again, further houses would have a detrimental effect on schools and medical facilities.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of Wisley airfield site as it has already been rejected by Guildford Borough Council. The building of so many homes and the necessary infrastructure it would require would put an enormous strain on local roads and again facilities, schools, hospitals etc.

I OBJECT to the suggestion of 2,200 homes on Gosden Hill site at Glandon and Burpham. Again, this would require major infrastructure works and would greatly increase the volume of traffic on local areas of Glandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send.

All the suggested developments would require significant improvements to the A3 and local roads and would contribute to the destruction of our rural villages!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1319</th>
<th>Respondent: 10915905 / David Anness</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the removal of Send and other villages from the Green Belt and to any of the developments which reduce the current Green Belt I thought we had a government commitment to defend the Green Belt and overwhelming local opinion, expressed in the Council elections, supporting the retention of the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I object to the lack of evidence and justification for the housing need numbers. These cannot be based on any sensible analysis of local demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I object to the scale of the development at Wisley, Garlick's Arch and Merrow because there is no provision for appropriate timely investment in infrastructure (Roads, Schools, Hospitals etc). Anyone living locally would confirm that the road infrastructure is inadequate now, never mind having to cope with the extra volumes resulting from the Proposed Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. I object to in particular to the scale of development at Garlicks Arch and Merrow which will produce significant extra traffic volumes into and from Woking via Send Road and Potters. Neither of these roads can safely or effectively handle increased traffic flows.

The objections above demonstrate a democratic deficit between the views of the local population and the unjustified scale of development in the Proposed Plan which places no value on existing amenity (i.e. Green Belt) and contains no practical plans for infrastructure enhancement.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3806  Respondent: 10915905 / David Anness  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 Send and other villages from the Green Belt and to any of the developments which reduce the current Green Belt boundaries. I thought we had a government commitment to defend the Green Belt and overwhelming local opinion, expressed in the Council elections, supporting the retention of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/270  Respondent: 10916897 / Christopher Bennesch  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 2016 Draft Local Plan. I list below my following specific objections

1. All erosion to the Green Belt
2. To site A43 Garlicks Arch
3. To site A43a ramp at Clandon which will increase traffic problems.
4. A45 The Talbot overdevelopment in a conservation area
5. A57 The Paddocks, this is unlawful.
6. Lack of provision for new schools
7. Lack of provision for Doctors surgeries.
8. Limited consultation period.
9. Last minute inclusion of new sites

10 Lack of evidence for the alleged housing need numbers.
11 I totally OBJECT to the removal of any villages from the Green Belt.

Please record EACH of my TWELVE objections and acknowledge receipt of this email.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I wish to raise my objections to a series of ridiculous proposals in the recently proposed Guildford Local Development Plan.

**I STRONGLY OBJECT to the removal of Send Village from the designated Green Belt.** The Green Belt was meant to be a long term planning process that ensured stability of the environment for the benefit of local people and avoid urban sprawl. Instead the proposed plan compromises these laudable objectives for short term gains at the expense of the local communities. The continual breaking-up and moving around of designated Green Belt areas is a travesty of the original intent and severely undermines the countryside that remains in Surrey. If the proposed plan is carried out Send will become part of growing urban sprawl and the whole character of the area will be ruined. This is not what local people want and need.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I wish to object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan and the limited consultation period. I do not believe that Guildford Borough Council have followed the correct process and I object to the last minute inclusion of new sites with less than 2 weeks notice.

I strongly object to the removal of the villages of Ripley, Clandon and Send from Green Belt protected status. I believe you have no basis to do that and that it will permanently destroy the identity of our villages, making roads through and surrounding those villages permanently congested.

I particularly object to the idea that the plan will be effectively merge all the villages along the A3 from the M25 to the Hogs Back. It will destroy the open amenity of the borough and further congest the A3. This road is regularly a source of gridlock and this already has a detrimental effect on surrounding roads as vehicles search to find alternative routes. As a resident in Send I regularly witness major traffic hold-ups on the Send Road which acts as a link between Guildford and the A3 and Woking. The photos are a typical sight during rush hour in Send NOW and will only get worse.

I object to the planned building of 400 houses and the industrial site on the Green Belt at Garlick's Arch site at Burnt Common, Clockbarn Nurseries and Send Hill because it is not justified by any special circumstances - I understood that Green Belt land is intended to be considered an all but permanent demarcation; it is not meant to be a temporary arrangement subject whims of a local council.

I feel particularly strongly about (against) the development of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nurseries as I work at the offices further along Tannery Lane. The road is clearly little more than single track in places and even at 30mph (the signage currently used) is dangerous to pedestrians walking up and down it, with limited paving available at the head of the road only. At the entrance to Tannery Lane a combination of residences and a motor business mean that a number of vehicles can regularly be seen parked on both sides of the Lane, as indeed are they often along Send Road. This is a very often a very difficult junction to get in and out of during the working week and would be
made much worse by the addition of 64 houses. In the opposite direction the road is much more of a single track, with little opportunity of expansion. This really hasn't been thought through at all. Given that I believe planning permission has already been granted for the Marina along Tannery Lane - which will undoubtedly generate traffic - I do not see this as at all feasible.

The huge development at Garlick’s Arch is also poorly planned. Aside from the area having a particular conservation sensitivity, covered as it is in ancient woodland, the site is prone to flooding. The idea of putting 7000 sqm of industrial space there seems particularly inappropriate, especially with the nearby Slyfield site still relatively under-utilised and with space available.

During the planning meeting held in Send recently a number of speakers decried the 'solution' being offered for development of the A3 in this area. Apparently the new interchange would offer nothing to route traffic away from those roads in the vicinity which currently direct traffic to the A3. Indeed this interchange would serve only to further burden the roundabout complex at Burnt Common.

I object to the way that a "need" for student accommodation has been added to the "housing need" figure of 13,860 - a fluctuating figure as students only need the housing for 8 months of any year and in any case have no intention of living in the villages. Housing of this nature should be located on what is a very spacious University Campus where I am sure much of the revenue would be directed.

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.

It seems to me that GBC is determined to target Send as a site for development. It is palpably not suited to such plans as anyone who is prepared to visit the village at rush hour would witness. Send is a pleasant village to those who currently live there but with its amenities are already stretched as its stands (transport, doctors surgery and schools). As residents of Send we are equally determined to stand fast in our objection to ill considered further development and strive to protect the area we call home. It has a rich heritage, its Green Belt status has attracted a loyal following who have paid a premium to retain its beauty. We will continue to do so.

Finally, could you please confirm receipt of my objections.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2834</th>
<th>Respondent: 10921633 / Emma Loosley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the 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: PSLPA16/2835  Respondent: 10921633 / Emma Loosley  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to all the proposed 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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/268  Respondent: 10921633 / Emma Loosley  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/9  Respondent: 10921793 / Rachel Vowles  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing with my objection to the new local plan affecting the village of Send.

I have written previously to object, and I do not feel that this plan addresses any of the issues that I raised at that point.

The village is currently overwhelmed with traffic at peak times during the day, and any further traffic, in particular larger vehicles and lorries, will bring the roads to a standstill. There are many residents required to park on the road side which means it is very difficult for cars to pass at times, nevermind industrial vehicles. Even more worryingly, with 2 schools and a park on the main village road, I am surprised by the current lack of speed restrictions and protection to those walking on the pavements or needing to cross the road - this will only get worse as the number of cars increases.
potentially by 2x the numbers of house you are proposing. I already do not feel safe walking along the pavements in the village with my children as they are very narrow and the volume and speed of traffic is an accident waiting to happen, of which I have heard of many near misses from other parents at the school. The additional traffic will not only cause issues to the main road through Send but also the narrow lanes around the village in particular Send Hill.

The amenities in the village will also not be able to cope with the increased population. It is already incredibly difficult to get a doctors appointment at the Villages Medical Centre, and you are proposing 1000+ additional residents.

Finally, I'm objecting in regards to the proposal to build on greenfield space, when there are brownfield sites available that should be considered ahead of spoiling the countryside that makes this county so special.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4017  Respondent: 10923745 / Marwan Khalek  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am a resident of Send and I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the proposed a number of the proposed developments contained in the Local Plan. I wrote to the Council back in September 2014 in response to the then draft plan (copy attached) with some specific and general objections and concerns. Regrettably, not only has the Council failed to properly address my concerns and objections, it has issued a Local Plan that includes additional new developments that were not the subject of the prior consultation. I therefore wish to re-iterate those objections in full.

In addition, I don't believe that the case for the effective removal of Send from the greenbelt has properly been made or factually supported by the Council. The housing needs have been grossly exaggerated, the effect of local infrastructure has been totally understated, the effect on local roads and traffic have all but been ignored and the question as to why all of this new development, to the extent it is needed, could not be accommodated using existing brownfield areas within the borough has not been properly answered.

More specifically I object to;

1. The removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2140  Respondent: 10923873 / Dennis Gordon  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Send being removed from the Green Belt.
The village Send provides a green buffer between Woking and Guildford. If this is not protected then all of the land in and around the village will be vulnerable to development. This would destroy the character of the village of Send. Guildford would merge with Woking through a series of urban estates.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/507  Respondent: 10924641 / Ben Yates  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• It is effectively an old non-confirming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation.
• There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions.
• Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2847  Respondent: 10927969 / Nadine Gibson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
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 plans for Send.

I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt, Local councillors gave an election promise to protect the Green Belt and this reneges on this.

I object to the Building of 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of Industrial Space at Garlicks Arch, the site floods and is ancient woodland.

I object to 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill, this road is too narrow to cope with this.

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common as Send would become gridlocked as it is already struggling, noise and pollution levels would be too great.

Please show my concerns to the planning officer and I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this email.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2465  Respondent: 10930081 / Helen Court  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
I object to the building on the Green Belt at Send at Garlick's Arch, Clockbam Nurseries and Send Hill because it is not justified by any special circumstances and the fact that the Green Belt is meant to be permanent and not continually eroded.

I object to the proposed sites in Send (all of them because they were not included in the previous consultation in 2014. Unlike the rest of the borough, Send has not been properly consulted and the proposed sites have been changed substantially.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
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 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 targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A 247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4054  **Respondent:** 10933569 / Rosamund Ebdon  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I am a resident of Send Hill, my address 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] and I am writing to object to the local plan for Send village and the surrounding area.

I object to the proposals in the local plan for Send village on the grounds that Send is in the Green Belt and the proposed inset is inappropriate. Send should not be removed from the Green Belt. It provides an essential buffer between Woking and Guildford and the nature of the village and the well being of its residents would be destroyed. The Green Belt does not need to be built on. 50% of new homes needed could be built on brownfield sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3959  **Respondent:** 10934689 / Adam Fox  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**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 Send Village from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provide a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford. The green belt was intended to be permanent.
I object to the building on the Green Belt at Send at Garlick’s Arch, Clockbarn Nurseries and Send Hill because it is not justified, the 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: pslp173/102  Respondent: 10934689 / Adam Fox  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Green Belt, Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

• It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
• There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
• Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1353  Respondent: 10935009 / Richard Winton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have lived here all my life and it is getting really sad, more houses, more people, more cars, why should I have to move because of Guildford Borough Council? Have you tried going out on the local roads between Send, Ripley and Clandon in the rush hours from 07.00-10.00am and 4.00-7.00pm. Have you tried to park your car in Ripley lately during the day it’s chaos.

Since you allowed Waitrose at the end of my road it has been a nightmare for traffic.

I know you have to build houses, but why not build them in areas closer, or as I think a part of Guildford, such as Merrow, Burpham, Worplesdon, Jacobs Well, Fairlands or Onslow Village.

We must keep our villages, we like visiting Guildford Town but we don't want to be a part of Guildford Town.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2069  Respondent: 10935137 / Jack Winton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Guildford Borough Council seems to be intent on spoiling our villages, Send, Ripley and Clandon. want to live outside Guildford, not inside.

The roads between all these villages are country roads not suitable for a lot more traffic. Garlick’s Arch alone (400 houses) could produce 1600 extra cars on the road.

The north facing slip road is a no brainer attracting more traffic through Send and West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2157  Respondent: 10936577 / James Pigram  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the plan of having a four-way A3 interchange at Burnt Common. The reason to this is that Clandon Road is already extremely busy and dangerous every day with vehicles coming off the A3 and also there are long time congestion coming from Send to the roundabout at Burnt Common. The reduction of 80% in housing needs in the 2015 compared with the 2013 ELNA is not reflected in the traffic modelling.

I object to have a 7,000 Sq m industrial development at Garlick’s Arch. There is no demonstrated reason for having an industrial development when we have Slyfield close by. Glarlick’s Arch is also containing ancient woodland, our richest land based habitat which needs proper protection.

I object to the planned development in Send as it is a countryside village which separates both Woking and Guildford. Having more housing will make the two towns combined. Send should remain in the green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3929  Respondent: 10936929 / William McGowan  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. The Green Belt was intended to be a lasting arrangement under the National Planning Policy Framework. There are no exceptional circumstances that warrant departing from that arrangement. Send’s Green Belt provides an essential buffer stopping Woking and Guildford comprising one conurbation.

It is a betrayal of the trust that was placed by residents in local councillors and central government who gave clear undertakings to protect the Green Belt. These proposals represent a breach of representations made to, and the mandate given by, residents who elected them. From an ecological perspective, the erosion of the Green Belt, as would be the case if developments were to occur in Send, would threaten wildlife habitats and stand contrary to the environmental protection granted by the Green Belt status. Further impacts on amenities to residents and the landscape aesthetics of the
Green Belt would be irreparable if such developments were to take place, forever destroying both the personality of Send village and the lifestyles of residents

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2824</th>
<th>Respondent: 10937025 / Louise McGowan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 all the proposed sites in Send because they were not included in the previous consultation in 2014. As a result, the infrastructure requirements have to been properly considered for the level of development proposed, to the detriment of the existing wildlife and residents. &quot;Sustainable development&quot; in my opinion has not been adequately defined in the Local Plan and the serious long term impacts that could result from the removal of Send Village from the Green Belt have not been adequately addressed and therefore should not proceed.</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: PSLPA16/3839</th>
<th>Respondent: 10941057 / Tim Green</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 erosion of the Green Belt in clear contravention of the Government’s and Conservative councillors’ election manifesto promises to protect the Green Belt. In particular, I object to Send being removed from the Green Belt (Policy P2) as Send provides a buffer between Woking and Guildford.</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: PSLPA16/1273</th>
<th>Respondent: 10942625 / Fleur Ottaway</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 removal of Send from the Green Belt, I object to the building on the Green Belt at Send at Garlick's Arch, Clockham Nurseries and Send Hill because I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford's urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs. I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Section page number**

Page 167 of 409

**Document page number**

1226
I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

I object to all the proposed sites in Send because they were not included in the previous consultation in 2014. Unlike the rest of the borough Send has not been properly consulted and all its sites have been changed substantially.

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks' notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick's Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

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 targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A 247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1207  Respondent: 10944065 / Freya and John Risdon  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send  
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 Send, Ripley and Clandon from the Green Belt because the villages and their countryside provide a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.

• I object to 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.

• I object to the exaggerated "housing need" figure of 13,860 which is far too high and results in the completely unnecessary development of the Green Belt. The way students, economic need and affordability are calculated inflates the housing need.

• I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford's urban brownfield areas, much closer to existing transport hubs.

• I object to all the proposed sites in Send because they were not included in the previous consultation in 2014. Unlike the rest of the borough, Send has not been properly consulted and all its sites have been changed substantially.

• I object to the 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 also object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

• I object to the large proposed development 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 Marsh Road, which is already at 100% capacity especially during the rush hours.

• I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing in Send. Doctors' surgeries and schools will be unable to cope.

• I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 and our road, Send Marsh Road, which are already at 100% capacity especially during the rush hours.

• I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the

The NPPF states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development "should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking." Standing at the head of the draft plan, Policy S1 ought to set a clear instead, no definition of "sustainable development" is given.

• The policy also fails to set out any principles for applying sustainable development in practice to local planning decisions, which often have serious long-term impacts.

• Please show my comments to the Planning Inspector, and please confirm receipt of my letter.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
5. A44 – I object to building on green belt land. The land is already filled with documented unsafe land filled waste. So very very unsuitable to build on. No way is there sufficient access by road. Send will become gridlocked.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2000  Respondent: 10947265 / M.T. Peponis  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objection to planning permission:

I object to industrial space of Burnnt Common.

I object to using the GreenBelt at Garlick's Arch to build houses and warehouses (not included in Rep 18), it is not required. It is hard enough to travel on the A3 and Send is getting clogged by traffic.

Send cannot take the new traffic. I object also I5 policy A44 1.9 (Send Hill) also not included in rep.18- not consulted.

I object to all new houses and light industry by Send and Ripley due to lack of consultation, due to traffic and pollution.

Keep us on the Green Belt please

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/31  Respondent: 10947265 / M.T. Peponis  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I live in Send village and I object to Clock Barn Nursery (Tannery Lane policy) A42 for 60 home (33% more). I objected before when it was 45 and object 33% more now. It makes traffic worse for me in Tannery Lane and A247 junction, I use Tannery Lane several times a week and I’m registered disabled. I object to use of the green belt I’ve lived in for 72 years.

I object to Garlicks Arch (Send, Marsh) (Policy A43) 400 homes and gypsies –[Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]. It will restrict my access and I do not want travellers moving in – I have written before about this to object. It will spoil out semi rural village – my mother pushed my pram down Kiln Lane and it is a famous beauty spot – with blue bells in spring. We want to be separate to Ripley and remain green belt -. I will no longer have such clean access with traffic and feel [unreadable words] from where they used shot and kill birds. I want it left green belt.

Burnt Common (Policy A58) London Road I object and understand a warehouse – wasn’t this already put aside? This should be green belt. It should link up to existing sites at Slyfield – Guildford where there is space left.

It will cause heavy traffic and I rely on use of Dr [unreadable word] at send and use this road for me and my husbands serious medical condition – we are both registered disabled. Again it links up what is best left separate.
Green belt – Policy 2 (p: 4.3-15) again it had been deleted in 2014 (whats’ going on here!) why was it changed from Max to Min in 2016 plan – can’t believe you propose a business park. This should remain green belt. It [unreadable word] such over use of roads: there are MANY other places that are not already ones lived. What used to take me 8 minutes and get you to the Surrey [unreadable word] now could take one ½ hour. Often losing the beauty of the green belt for the unnecessary greed of property developers.

Please leave our villages alone.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/376</th>
<th>Respondent: 10951489 / Lorna M Cave</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 2 at para. 4.3.15 to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt. Once again, Tannery Lane cannot cope with more traffic and the junction with the A247 is so dangerous. It is in an area of beautiful countryside and close to the Wey Navigation which is used by young and old to enjoy family walks etc..

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3607</th>
<th>Respondent: 10952161 / Alison Humberstone</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 write with regards the impact the local plan will have on Send.

Please share with the planning inspector.

I live in Send and my family have been here since the early 1900s.

The traffic in the village is now at an unacceptable level. It can take 10 minutes to get off my drive in the morning due to the traffic, often at standstill back from the traffic lights. We have also seen a number of accidents.

To proceed with or even suggest these developments in Send are crazy as the village cannot cope with the traffic levels today. It is basically a one Road in and out village and Send Road is over capacity.

I am furious I have to even write to you to ask you to stop this suggestion of removing the village from the Greenbelt. It is in the greenbelt to protect the green areas from development and retain them for future generations to enjoy. Now you want to remove this protection because it's inconvenient to you making your quotas for new development? I am so upset by this as the council should be supporting the protection not seeking to remove it. There is no good reason for this and if the Greenbelt protection were to be removed this would simply benefit the developers. Why ever would such a crucial protection to our green areas be removed?
My suggestion would be that with some reduction in scale from the current proposals for Wisley Airfield, a sympathetic development with a smaller number of houses at one end you could achieve additional housing without unnecessary impact to walkers and horse riders and removing a great amenity for local residents.

I object to the proposed houses at Clock barn nurseries site. Tannery lane is tiny and cannot cope with the traffic today and to add more houses and therefore more cars to Send is ridiculous. This makes no sense and needs to be stopped.

I object to the proposed development at Garlicks Arch. An area which floods, is covered in lovely old woodland should not be removed as it's in the way. Keep Send in the Greenbelt and protect these lovely places.

I object to the proposed development in Send Hill. If such pitches are needed utilise brownfield sites and don't ruin the Greenbelt. I would not propose to build a home on the Greenbelt as I would expect to be turned down flat. That should be the expectation and the reality. Travellers sites should not be provided in the Greenbelt.

I object to a new interchange at Burnt Common. Send has too much traffic heading to Woking already and this would just cause more traffic through the village. Simply don't build all these new houses proposed and its just will not be needed. The council members will no doubt know the area and the traffic in the morning heading to Burnt Common. It can take half an hour some mornings from Send Road. This would make an already bad situation into traffic hell.

I feel utterly let down by the council. Send is a lovely village which is why I chose to love here and I don't have the money to just move because the council have decided to ruin it to meet some numbers from central government, sacrificing the village to build a certain number of houses some faceless bureaucrat says we need. Please help stop this, don't encourage this. You need to fight for the Greenbelt and the local villages and find a better way without ruining or making miserable the lives of local residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
4. I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. This green belt area is currently a popular walking area for dogs and runners and is not suitable for such as a development due to the single access road. Also, the subsoil of this site is not suitable as it contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC.

5. I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. This proposed development as the potential to allow cars to use this for a direct access to Woking, including the new planned developments at Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill and Blackwell Farm. This will increase the volume of traffic in Send Road as traffic that currently exits and enters the A3 through Ripley (using Newark Lane as access to Woking) will now use Send Road. We experienced an awful traffic situation when Newark Lane was closed for bridge repairs and therefore, we would not want to see this repeated if more traffic coming from the A3 at Burnt Common. The road can not cope with the increased traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2318  Respondent: 10955369 / Karen Church  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write with reference to the draft local plan and its impact on the Green belt and in particular the villages of Ripley and Send. I am a resident in Send Marsh and moved to this area three years ago specifically because it was in the green belt and therefore should be protected from over development. Whilst I can understand the need for some expansion in the housing stock and I am encouraged by the number of brownfield sites in the local plan, the proposed 400 houses and 7000 sq m of industrial units and warehousing at Garlick’ Arch, Burnt Common on green belt land is completely over the top. It is not in keeping with the housing density of the surrounding area and there are no plans to increase any services to support the potential 800 people and their children that could live there. The road network around Ripley and Send cannot support the extra traffic that this number of properties would generate. There are already long queues through all the villages with the current population. 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. There is mention of improvements to the M25 junction but no details are given. As the majority of Guildford borough is within the green belt, are the Governments figures for the number of houses that are required to be built reduced?

In short, I object to any green belt land being used for development and in particular the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon being inset from the green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3942  Respondent: 10955809 / Sarah Roach  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object strongly to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. The current Green Belt provides a very clear buffer stopping Woking and Guildford merging into one large conurbation. I see no justifiable reason for election promises being broken.

The local plan also proposes the development of Clockbarn Nursery and Garlick’s Arch, to which I object. The additional traffic congestion and demand for additional school places will pose significant demand on already stretched local services and further undermine the quality of life that the current residents enjoy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2224  Respondent: 10958081 / B Panting  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt.

The Conservative Government gave promises in this regard, when elected for a second time. Completely the opposite has occurred.

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery.

Send is already a nightmare driving through it and with more traffic joining it from the various side roads this would make it even more dangerous.

I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq meters of industrial space at Garlick's Arch opposite Send Marsh Road.

On mornings when there has been an accident on the M25 and the A3 becomes blocked, all the traffic surges through Send and Ripley. I am now a pensioner and will not go out on the roads between 7.15 and 9.00 as it can be very frustrating. The area would not be able to cope with the considerable increase in traffic. Especially with the lorries. It is very dangerous even now, when confronting them through Clandon. In addition extra schools and an increase in medical requirements would be needed. More land to be consumed.

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 traveller's pitches at Send Hill

Here again the infrastructure just cannot cope with the increase of any more people or traffic.

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because the area is already so overloaded with traffic and people.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3987  Respondent: 10959681 / James Bryer  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt.

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery.

Send is already a nightmare driving through it and with more traffic joining it from the various side roads this would make it even more dangerous.

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 traveller's pitches at Send Hill

Here again the infrastructure just cannot cope with the increase of any more people or traffic.

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because the area is already so overloaded with traffic and people.
I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt. The village and its countryside provides a very important and necessary definition between Woking and Guildford. Green Belt policies were introduced in 1935 for very good reasons, all of which remain important and relevant today. They were designed to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; to safeguard the countryside and to assist in encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these reasons are relevant today and any new development should be focused on the immediate Guildford area and NOT in the surrounding countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3115  Respondent: 10961921 / Mark Johnson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 allow 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 development requirements can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs. The Green Belt is meant to be permanent. The impact of significant increases in traffic through Send’s relatively narrow streets caused by this level of new development would be very serious, with the potential to cause daily traffic problems and safety issues where narrow lanes join the main A247 road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2238  Respondent: 10964705 / Sarah McGraw  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to formally object to the Local Plan for Send because of a number of very important reasons.

Firstly, there is simply not the local infrastructure to support building 400 houses at Garlick's Arch. The impact on traffic flow as well as local services (GP surgery, schools) is very significant and does not appear to have been considered.

Secondly I am quite frankly terribly disappointed to hear that all of a sudden Send village has been taken out of the Green Belt. There are no valid reasons why this has happened and it appears to have been done in a very underhand way.

Thirdly, I object to the proposed interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. As a local resident (I live on Burnt Common Close) I cannot see how Send village would be able to cope with all the increased vehicles. The traffic lights in Send would be overwhelmed and the roundabout at Burnt Common would be near to gridlock at rush hour.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4076  Respondent: 10967489 / Jenny Jackson  Agent:
I object to the removal of Send and Ripley from the Green Belt because the villages and countryside provide the necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.

2. I object to the complete failure of GBC to include the (sufficient) brownfield sites within the urban area which should be used for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt. Also the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within this version of the Plan. Developments at Garlick’s Arch, Clockbarn Nurseries and Send Hill are completely unjustified by any special circumstances – the Green Belt introduced in the 1940’s intended retaining this very countryside for future generations and in perpetuity. Guildford’s urban brownfield areas are inevitably much closer to existing transport hubs.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3318  Respondent: 10968481 / Vivienne Ottaway  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 several aspects of the local plan which is currently out for consultation. These objections relate to the proposals about developments in Send and Ripley and the surrounding area:

- I object to Send village being removed from the Green Belt - the Green Belt was intended to be permanent and the Green Belt in Send is an essential buffer between Woking and Guildford to stop them becoming one connerbation. There was a clear election promise locally and nationally to protect the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2137  Respondent: 10969409 / Alistair Gibson  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 plans for Send.

I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt, Local councillors gave an election promise to protect the Green Belt and this reneges on this.

I object to the Building of 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of Industrial Space at Garlicks Arch, the site floods and is ancient woodland.

I object to 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill, this road is too narrow to cope with this.

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common as Send would become gridlocked as it is already struggling, noise and pollution levels would be too great.
I write to object to the GBC 2016 draft local plan proposals, proposals that clearly have not been fully considered.

I understand the need to increase available housing across Surrey, but the number of new houses proposed does seem excessive, and the GBC 2016 draft local plan proposals will create significant problems. The community of Send, Ripley and Clandon clearly does not want building of this scale to take place, and perhaps more importantly, there is insufficient infrastructure around these villages to support this development.

The community already has an extremely limited health centre and schools, which would both need considerable investment should more houses be build. But perhaps an even greater concern however is the vast increase in traffic that would be brought to the area, and the totally inadequate road infrastructure which simply would not cope. The building of industrial sites and new north facing slip roads to/from the A3 at Burnt Common would only increase traffic travelling through the area, particular in a north/south direction through both Send/Old Woking and Clandon, and make this significantly more of a problem. The only way these villages could feasibly cope with this increased volume of traffic would be to build a major and much wider roadway (potentially a dual carriageway), including cycle paths, from central Woking through to the A246/A25 junction at the bottom of Newlands Corner.

Failure to put this road infrastructure in place, before any development that led to an increase traffic, would be both negligent and potentially criminal, as it could easily result in legal action being taken against Guildford Borough Council should the number of road accidents increase following any development in the area.

As a result of these concerns:

1. I object to the building of new north facing slip roads to/from the A3 at Burnt Common due to the increase in traffic travelling through the area, and the lack of a sufficient road infrastructure to cope with this.
2. I object to the building of c.400 new homes and an industrial site at Garlick's Arch due to both the lack of local facilities, and the increase in traffic within the area, and the lack of a sufficient road infrastructure to cope with this.
3. I object to the building of c.2000 new homes at Wisley airfield due to the increase in traffic within the area, and the lack of a sufficient road infrastructure to cope with this.
4. I object to the lack of prior provision for an adequate road infrastructure.
5. I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools.
6. I object to the lack of immediate provision for new health / doctors facilities 7. I object to the disproportionate amount of development in this particular area of the Borough.
7. I object to the scale of the GBC 2016 draft local plan proposals due to the resulting significant loss of Green Belt land.

I sincerely hope that, after full consideration has been given, sense will prevail and the GBC 2016 draft local plan proposals for Send, Ripley and Clandon will be scrapped.
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 inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2844  Respondent: 10970721 / John Sherborne  Agent:

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 proposed developments in Send;

Road communications in the area are already inadequate, the A247 being frequently at a standstill, solid traffic from the a25 junction to old Woking occurs with the slightest perturbation. Any further development in the area is going to make this worse. Increasing access to the A3 will be an even more serious negative affect as it draws more traffic into the area.

Send Hill development is completely inappropriate, and would destroy a large swathe of unspoilt countryside. Developing green belt land is entirely contrary to the spirit of the green belt concept.

The access roads are single track roads, and are already congested.

Send is a small village, and struggles with the traffic passing through to Woking already, introducing additional commercial traffic can only make this situation worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2314  Respondent: 10971649 / Mark Herbert  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of Send my objections refer to the 2016 Draft Local Plan and specifically the planned developments in the immediate area. Of particular concern is Garlick's Arch, Clockbarn Nursery & Winds Ridge developments.

- I object to the removal of Send and Ripley from the Green Belt which is intended as a permanent status and gives the area its identity.
• I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough when all the required development can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas.
• I object to the disregard for the impact of proposed developments on local infrastructure, specifically relating to schools, medical requirements and volume of traffic on local roads.
• I object to the disproportionate development in one area of the Borough.

I request my comments are shown to the Planning Inspector who will make the decision on this. Please confirm receipt of this email. If you need any further explanation or expansion of any of the comments please contact me.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/17  Respondent: 10972833 / Robin L. Smith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Green Belt - Policy 2 at Paragraph 4.3.15

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

• It is a non-conforming user (i.e. does not belong there) in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
• Severely restricted vehicle access in both directions of Tannery Lance
• Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

I am greatly saddened and angry that a local authority continues to pursue policies that are fervently opposed locally - one has to wonder what is the real driver for such rigid persistence?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2462  Respondent: 10984161 / Tony McGraw  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please forward my objections to the planning inspector(s) deciding on the Send plans mentioned below.

I would also like confirmation that this email has been received and forwarded, please.

I object strongly to Send being removed from the Green Belt. This green belt has been looked after for many years for the benefit of future generations as well as our own. The government and local councillors have promised to protect the green belt, because it is so valuable. There is no going back once an area has been concreted up!

I object strongly to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common, because the traffic burden would overwhelm the current roads and infrastructure. The main roads in Send are already extremely busy, fast and excessively noisy -
especially Send Road and Portsmouth Road. A huge amount of traffic between Woking, Guildford, the A3 and M25 already passes through Send. The new interchange would significantly worsen the problem.

I object to the Building of 400 houses and 7000sq metres of industrial space at Garlicks Arch. There is sufficient space on brownfield sites in the borough and this Green Belt land should be protected. There is not the infrastructure regarding roads and schools. Currently secondary school spaces are a challenge to obtain without 400 more houses in the area. Traffic I have mentioned above.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3026  Respondent: 10987745 / Ian Pigram  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Send being be removed from Green Belt, a valuable and irreplaceable buffer between Guildford and Woking which provides extensive recreational facilities. Any planning ideas such as the proposals for Send completely neglect the whole idea of Green Belt which is intended to be permanent as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. There are no special circumstances to justify this irreversible move. Brown field sites should always be used, such as those at Slyfield. Our children and children's children will thank us if we maintain an intact Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/139  Respondent: 10990465 / Victoria Bean  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I live at [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] and I am completely opposed to the proposed building of hundreds of houses in Send. This would completely change the villages of Send and Ripley and the proposal has not been thought through properly for many reasons.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4182  Respondent: 10990785 / Valerie Golding  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I 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 at the whim of a pro-developer prone council.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

With reference to the Draft Local Plan published by Guildford Borough Council, I wish to OBJECT to the following proposals:

I Object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt

The Green Belt was created to protect open spaces and prevent the indiscriminate growth of individual communities and loss of community identities. Politicians frequently promise to protect the Green Belt but this proposal is a clear breach of these hollow promises. There are no special circumstances that justify this breach of public faith in their representatives and officers.

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery.

Tannery Lane is a narrow and twisty lane unsuited to large volumes of traffic, and it's junction with Send Road is already hazardous for vehicles leaving the lane. Send Road is already subject to traffic problems at peak periods - an increase in traffic exiting Tannery Lane will add to these problems, especially in view of other proposals in the Draft Plan (see below).

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq. meters of industrial space at Garlick's Arch.

The industrial space is not needed, but if it were this is not a suitable location for it. There is an established industrial zone at Slyfield, and any additional requirements should be located there.

If 400 houses were built on this Green Belt land the character of the local community would be totally transformed. Existing roads would not be able to cope with the additional traffic - they are already severely congested at peak times - especially if the proposed sit at Gosden Hill Farm proceeds plus the proposed me A3 interchange at Burnt Common.

There are already difficulties in obtaining appointments at the local Medical Centre and the local primary and secondary schools are already over-subscribed.

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common.

Existing traffic volumes proposals for Garlick's Arch, Gosden Hill Fa Burph, together with numerous smaller developments in th 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.

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses an 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:
I am writing to you to object to the Local Plan for development in and around Send, Send Marsh, and Ripley.

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch for 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space. The infrastructure of Send Marsh and Send cannot cope with such a surge in the local population, most notably, the strain on The Villages surgery, and also the two schools - in Send and Ripley First School. The roads would also be unable to cope with the additional traffic from both the additional houses and the proposed industrial site, as traffic in the area from the M25 and A3 already leads to severe congestion throughout the day (e.g. the rush hour commuter route of traffic cutting through Send to and from Woking via the A3; also, the mid afternoon school run for Send's two schools). It is also the case that the industrial site is not required, as the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows an 80% reduction in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan.

I object to the 4-way A3 junction at Burnt Common, on the same grounds as above; that is, that Send simply cannot cope with the additional traffic it would bring. Not only would there be increased risk of gridlock, but also of accidents. Of course, the danger to both drivers and pedestrians is of the highest priority, but also, an accident on the narrow road in Send would lead to miles of gridlock.

I object to the proposed 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm, as these will also add to the already severe traffic congestion in the area, with traffic heading through Send and Send Marsh via the A3, often so as to access the M25 via Junction 10.

I object to Send being removed from the Green Belt (Policy P2). The National Planning Policy Framework (Point 80) states that one of the reasons for the Green Belt land is 'to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another'. Send and Send Marsh clearly fulfil this role, as they prevent the merging of Guildford and Woking into one large urban sprawl.

I object to the proposal to build 45 houses at Clockbam Nursery, on Tannery Lane. This area floods regularly. Furthermore, there is only a very narrow, single track, winding road, where vehicles often have to reverse in order to let oncoming traffic pass. There is simply not the infrastructure to accommodate any more houses on this site. Moreover, just as Send and Send Marsh act as a buffer between Guildford and Woking, so this particular area acts as a buffer between Send and Send Marsh.

I object to Policy A44. 1.9 ha, which is the proposed development of 40 houses and 2 traveller's pitches at Send Hill. The road already experiences heavy traffic, and could not cope with the additional amount of traffic expected. I also object on the grounds of the feared impact of the nearby nature reserve. I also object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 (dated 17th February 2004) identified that there is "potential risk from landfill gas migrations", which presents a health hazard.

I object to the Local Plan on the grounds of Guildford Borough Council (GBC) having greatly increased the number of proposed houses since April 2016. This significant change in the proposal therefore requires another full consultation under Regulation 18, and not of Regulation 19 which GBC are trying to utilise in order to rush the process through.

This is a beautiful area of Surrey, which is preserved as part of the Green Belt. Even without this consideration, I trust that you will see that Local Plan, with its potential for severe and dangerous strain on local services and infrastructure, is wholly impractical, and will destroy the area and the quality of life of its residents. It is with great concern that I demand that the proposed developments be abandoned.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am writing to you to protest about the plans for building on Green Belt sites in and around Send and Send Marsh.

I object to Send being removed from the Green Belt (Policy P2). The National Planning Policy Framework (point 80) states that one of the purposes of Green Belt land is ‘to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another’. Send village and its surrounding Green Belt land acts as the necessary buffer between Guildford and Woking.

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses in Tannery Lane, an area already unsuited to further development, due to both its frequent flooding and the narrow and winding lane. The lane simply cannot take the traffic an additional 45 houses would bring.

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 and especially in the evenings 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.

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.

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch for 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space. This area is prone to flooding. It also has ancient woodland, just the kind of specific area the Green Belt was established to protect. The industrial space is also unnecessary, based on the current Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA). This shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan.

I also understand that Slyfield actually has a large area which would be much more suited.

I object to the Plan due to the fact that the infrastructure of Send and Send Marsh simply cannot cope with the increased traffic and also the strain on local services such as the schools and the surgery. I urge you to abandon the Plan forthwith.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the proposal to remove Send from the Green Belt, ie insetting, specifically to land behind Heath Drive and Send Road as well as land near Send Hill and St Bede’s Junior School’s current location. This is on the grounds that our village, as well as Ripley village, is in danger of becoming part of a larger conglomeration, as land is gradually turned in to housing estates and put to industrial use. Once these initial proposals are improved there will be no stopping developers taking yet more land for their lucrative businesses.

I also object because the local wildlife is also being threatened by all the proposed developments. Foxes, badgers, deer, owls, bats are just some of the local fauna at risk of being driven from their homes and breeding sites.

I further object on the grounds that the Wey Navigation is a beautiful part of our county and views from the water and towpath are going to be compromised. This is a loss to local residents as well as those who visit Send, many arriving by boat or on foot along the towpath.

I particularly object to the land behind St Bede’s School and near Send Hill being removed from Green Belt status when it was stated at the time of permission being granted for the relocation of the school that this land would return to Green field when the current school was demolished.

I object to the fact that Send Lakes will lose their SNCI status. These are at present well tended and a joy for many people locally. I object because the area surrounding the lakes is rich in wildlife, both flora and fauna and removing the special status could easily lead to lack of maintenance, also increasing the risk of flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2438  Respondent: 11008417 / Sara Thorne  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to raise my OBJECTIONS to the Guildford Draft Local Plan.

I OBJECT to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. There is no requirement or justification for this. The Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, was intended to be permanent and there are no special circumstances (and none provided) to justify abandoning it. The plan will irreparably damage the nature and character of Send Village and Send Marsh - this is very much "the thin end of the wedge" and in removing Send's Green Belt the plan is essentially removing Send as a Green Belt buffer between Guildford and Woking. Roads that are already congested will become more congested still and more dangerous, local services already strained will break and the character of the place where we (not the planners, not the developers) live will be fundamentally altered with no reasonable cause.

I OBJECT to the consequences of the draft plan insofar as they affect Send which are plain to see. Any problem within wide radius (traffic accidents, roadworks, flooding for example) lead to the main road quickly becoming gridlocked in either or both directions. The new houses, industrial development and A3 interchange will make this a permanent state of affairs. These are roads that people live on and alongside pavements where children walk to school - the effect of these proposals will be to create these as commercial thoroughfares inappropriate for the community.

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane is far too twisted and narrow to take any more traffic - with the already-increasing amount of traffic along Tannery Lane and Send Road, the junction between these two roads is already very dangerous. With the prospect of more to come from already-approved planning permissions. Tannery Lane cannot take any more volume. I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7,000 sq meters in industrial space at Garlick's Arch. There is no justification for this - it is an inappropriate location with the single access provides
insufficient access. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland - there are existing brownfields sites (e.g. Slyfield) more appropriate for any such development if indeed it is needed. The local infrastructure cannot take the additional strain on services and the roads cannot take the increased commercial traffic that would result. The fact that this proposal was only included at the last minute - effectively removing Send from the Green Belt altogether - smacks at best of ill-planning and "making it up as we go along” and at worst of something more sinister.

I OBJECT to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. As a consequence, Send would have to take traffic from the proposed new housing developments in the locality, much to this traffic to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford. As noted above, the Send Road - often gridlocked already- will be permanently overloaded and there will be an inevitable over-spill into Send Marsh and Potters Lane which will be in danger of becoming rat-runs and busy alternatives. These are roads that people live on and along which children walk and cycle to school. The proposals will make for a dangerous cocktail for no good reason.

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. There is no justification for all the additional housing that is being proposed and as far as I am aware no explanation has been provided. Again this is an inappropriate location because of the narrow width single access road providing insufficient access. Any development would spoil this are set in beautiful countryside and furthermore the subsoil of the proposed site contains unsafe landfill waste registered with you, Guildford Borough Council.

I OBJECT because Guildford Borough Council have not followed the correct process. Since 2014 the Council has changed every major site in Send proposed for development and now not only increased again the proposal for new houses to 485 but also added a la-e and character-changing road junction. Surely there should be another full consultation under Regulation 187 Indeed, the major proposed development at Garlick's Arch (Policy A 43) is new and has not been consulted upon previously. It gives little confidence that due process is being followed as the ramifications of this proposal for the community of Send cannot be under-estimated.

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. There is no justification for all the additional housing that is being proposed and as far as I am aware no explanation has been provided. Again this is an inappropriate location because of the narrow width single access road providing insufficient access. Any development would spoil this are set in beautiful countryside and furthermore the subsoil of the proposed site contains unsafe landfill waste registered with you, Guildford Borough Council.

I OBJECT because Guildford Borough Council have not followed the correct process. Since 2014 the Council has changed every major site in Send proposed for development and now not only increased again the proposal for new houses to 485 but also added a la-e and character-changing road junction. Surely there should be another full consultation under Regulation 187 Indeed, the major proposed development at Garlick's Arch (Policy A 43) is new and has not been consulted upon previously. It gives little confidence that due process is being followed as the ramifications of this proposal for the community of Send cannot be under-estimated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPA16/3716 | Respondent: 11008417 / Sara Thorne | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send |

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. There is no requirement or justification for this. The Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, was intended to be permanent and there are no special circumstances (and none provided) to justify abandoning it. The plan will irreparably damage the nature and character of Send Village and Send Marsh – this is very much “the thin end of the wedge” and in removing Send’s Green Belt the plan is essentially removing Send as a Green Belt buffer between Guildford and Woking. Roads that are already congested will become more congested still and more dangerous, local services already strained will break and the character of the place where we (not the planners, not the developers) live will be fundamentally altered with no reasonable cause.

I OBJECT to the consequences of the draft plan insofar as they affect Send which are plain to see. Any problem within wide radius (traffic accidents, roadworks, flooding for example) lead to the main road quickly becoming gridlocked in either or both directions. The new houses, industrial development and A3 interchange will make this a permanent state of affairs. These are roads that people live on and alongside pavements where children walk to school – the effect of these proposals will be to create these as commercial thoroughfares inappropriate for the community.
I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane is far too twisted and narrow to take any more traffic – with the already-increasing amount of traffic along Tannery Lane and Send Road, the junction between these two roads is already very dangerous. With the prospect of more to come from already-approved planning permissions, Tannery Lane cannot take any more volume.

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7,000 sq meters in industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. There is no justification for this – it is an inappropriate location with the single access provides insufficient access. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland – there are existing brownfields sites (e.g. Slyfield) more appropriate for any such development if indeed it is needed. The local infrastructure cannot take the additional strain on services and the roads cannot take the increased commercial traffic that would result. The fact that that this proposal was only included at the last minute – effectively removing Send from the Green Belt altogether – smacks at best of ill-planning and “making it up as we go along” and at worst of something more sinister.

I OBJECT to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. As a consequence, Send would have to take traffic from the proposed new housing developments in the locality, much to this traffic to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford. As noted above, the Send Road – often gridlocked already – will be permanently overloaded and there will be an inevitable over-spill into Send Marsh and Potters Lane which will be in danger of becoming rat-runs and busy alternatives. These are roads that people live on and along which children walk and cycle to school. The proposals will make for a dangerous cocktail for no good reason.

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers’ pitches at Send Hill. There is no justification for all the additional housing that is being proposed and as far as I am aware no explanation has been provided. Again this is an inappropriate location because of the narrow width single access road providing insufficient access. Any development would spoil this are set in beautiful countryside and furthermore the subsoil of the proposed site contains documents unsafe landfill waste registered with you, Guildford Borough Council.

I OBJECT because Guildford Borough Council have not followed the correct process. Since 2014 the Council has changes every major site in Send proposed for development and now not only increased again the proposal for new houses to 485 but also added a large and character-changing road junction. Surely there should be another full consultation under Regulation 18? Indeed, the major proposed development at Garlick’s Arch (Policy A 43) is new and has not been consulted upon previously. It gives little confidence that due process is being followed as the ramifications of this proposal for the community of Send cannot be under-estimated.

I OBJECT to the draft local plan for the reasons given above. The disregard for the Green Belt, for the local community and for the consequences to these of the draft plan make it inappropriate and ill-conceived.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

*Attached documents:*
Perhaps you should listen and take heed of the residents in this area that pay your wages and not treat us with an arrogance and dismissiveness that is appalling.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3572  **Respondent:** 11011713 / Mary Warren  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I would like to make the following points about the current Guildford Local Plan with particular regard to Send Village.

- I object to the latest version of the local plan because of the inclusion of several developments which were not on the previous versions and which were inserted only 2 weeks prior to the publication of the so-called 'Final Version'. In particular, I object to the proposed development at Garlicks Arch associated with a new junction on the A3. These developments were not available for consultation and have been put in at the last minute.
- I object to the stated need which requires building 13,860 houses in the Guildford area. This figure has never been fully explained and was based on pre-Brexit calculations.
- I object to the unreasonable and unfair allocation of these houses, most of which are proposed to be built on Green Belt land around and in the villages which surround Guildford. This would lead to a vast conurbation in South West Surrey, the equivalent of the area around Croydon. Guildford would cease to be an attractive place to live and work leading to the detriment of its reputation. At the last election, the Conservative Government made a manifesto pledge to protect the Green Belt. Why can this pledge be easily broken when the 7 day NHS is sacrosanct?
- I object to the removal of the villages from the Green Belt. Green Belt land is not just to make the villages pretty. It provides agricultural land, water catchment and flood control (Guildford is an area which floods easily), a carbon sink for air pollution, and benefits to public health and well being. It is vital to the rural economy and to the life of the villages.
- I strongly object to the Garlick's Arch proposal. This is an area of ancient woodland and permanent Green Belt. There is no reason to develop this land when there are suitable development sites close by at Slyfield. The need for industrial use is unclear. Send is surrounded by office blocks, not all of them filled. There are a lot of sites where the businesses have closed in Guildford town centre. Why can these not be used instead?
- The road infrastructure, the water system and drainage are at full capacity. In particular, traffic in Send Barns Lane is at a standstill at busy periods of the day. The surrounding roads are narrow and not suitable to the volume of traffic which currently uses them as a cut through. The A25 through West Clandon is extremely narrow in places and lorries and cars cannot pass each other without mounting the pavement.
- I object to the new junction on the A3 which will disgorge even more traffic on to the roads making the traffic problem unacceptable.
- I object to the failure to explain where children from these new houses will go to school. St. Bedes is being redeveloped on the Send School site and it was stated clearly in the planning process that there would be no increase in the number of places for children at the new school!
- I object to the proposed development of traveller's sites and houses at the top of Send Hill. This is an area of land which was previously landfill (not quarry as laid down in the local plan) and has been recognised as a health hazard from contaminated industrial waste with unacceptable methane levels.
- I also object to this development which is sited on a very narrow road which meets Potters Lane at a blind corner where there are already several accidents each year.
- I object to the development of the Clockbarn Nurseries in Tannery Lane. Tannery Lane is an extremely winding and narrow road completely unsuited to heavy traffic. Traffic from Tannery Lane has to exit either on to Polesden Lane which is also very narrow or on to Send Road where there is already considerable congestion and the junction is very dangerous.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1941  Respondent: 11013761 / Daniel Morgan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I request that my comments are shown to the local planning inspector on the below sites and issues:

I OBJECT to Send Village being removed from the green belt. I purchased my house on the basis of the green belt areas and the permanency of this. There are no circumstances in which this should be abandoned. Send's green belt is an essential buffer between Woking and Guildford.

I OBJECT. To the 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, due to inadequate access and traffic volume.

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and industrial space at Garlick's Arch. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. There are brown field sites that need development instead, and industrial space in this location is not appropriate.

I OBJECT to the Send Hill site of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches. Is it totally in appropriate due to the narrow width single access country road with insufficient access. Any development would spoil the high amenity area set in countryside. I also object as this site was not included within the first consultation and therefore should not be included in this second follow up, without starting the process from the start. This update consultation should be the first but refined, and should not include fresh sites.

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at burnt common. Send would then become a main road for access to the a3 over and above what is in place already. I live on Send Barns Lane so suffer the road as is, any further congestion be and pollution would hugely impact on our lives and house value. Together with the new sites a proposed at Wiseley Airfield, Gosden Hill and Blackwell Farm would be excessive.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3686  Respondent: 11013761 / Daniel Morgan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

> I OBJECT to Send Village being removed from the green belt. I purchased my house on the basis of the green belt areas and the permanency of this. There are no circumstances in which this should be abandoned. I regularly walk with my children round the local countryside, along footpaths and through fields. We all enjoy the scenery, the wildlife and the tranquility it provides. We moved here because we wanted to live in a village setting with countryside. Planning such vast building works would ruin the landscape, destroy habitats and tarnish the very essence of what makes Send a lovely place to live. Send's green belt is an essential buffer between Woking and Guildford.

> I OBJECT to the 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, due to inadequate access and traffic volume. This is right opposite a very popular and well used play park; added traffic in an already busy location with poor visibility would pose a serious threat to pedestrians - especially children around the park and shops who would find it difficult to cross Send Road safely.
I OBJECT to building 400 houses and industrial space at Garlick's Arch. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. There are brown field sites that need development instead, and industrial space in this location is not appropriate. The number of houses proposed would flood the existing, already overstretched services. The Villages Medical Centre is already very busy and the local primary school is just recovering from a period of huge change and has finally received a positive Ofsted inspection. As a primary teacher myself, I would be concerned about the demands such an increase in intake would place on this school.

I OBJECT to the Send Hill site of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches. Is it totally inappropriate due to the narrow width single access country road with insufficient access. Any development would spoil the high amenity area set in countryside. I also object as this site was not included within the first consultation and therefore should not be included in this second follow up, without starting the process from the start. This update consultation should be the first but refined, and should not include fresh sites. The presence of travellers sites would significantly impact the value of surrounding housing - Send Hill homes are premium and this would be negatively affected by travellers' pitches so close by.

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Send would then become a main road for access to the a3 over and above what is in place already. I live on Send Barns Lane so suffer the road as is, any further congestion and pollution would hugely impact on our lives and house value. Currently, large loads travelling on the road cause the whole house to shake. I regularly walk my two children to and from the park and school - the pavements are very narrow in places and the traffic often includes large lorries, heavy loads and at times, traffic travelling at speed, despite the 30mph limit. It is not safe and further traffic would increase the danger to pedestrians. Together with the new sites proposed at Wiseley Airfield, Gosden Hill and Blackwell Farm, this would be excessive.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill; to build on this area of green belt is totally unsuitable due to the location. Send Hill is a narrow road and the increase in traffic will only make it more dangerous, with the access at Potters Lane it is single track only. The proposed site is an old land fill site which makes it unsuitable to build on. The site is also well away from the centre of the village and there are no public transport links to the shops or the medical centre. To put Traveller’s sites in Send Hill would not be integrating them into the village life but further increase their sense of isolation. The site is also a haven for wildlife, being populated by deer, bats, badgers, foxes etc.

1. I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common; this seems a total and unnecessary waste of time and money and will only facilitate further traffic to pass through the village. We do not need it.

Thank you for taking the time to read my objections, in principle I am not opposed to new housing projects being built in Send, but these should be on current brownfield sites and on infill areas. The Parish Council should be responsible for granting permission to agree these smaller developments that will be more in keeping with the overall growth of the village and its facilities at a manageable level.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the sheer scale of development proposed as it is obvious that the current infrastructure would not be able to regularly use the A3 and A247 and these roads already get jammed at peak times or when there is a traffic hold up.

To permit the scale of building proposed will fundamentally alter the nature of the Village facilities will be stretched beyond breaking point including schools and medical

The plans are clearly against the wishes of the majority of the residents.

Elected to represent the views of local people, who are clearly against the scale of the proposed building plans, the council should be pushing back against the diktats of central government.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• Respect my privacy and appropriately sanitize out my personal details (including email address) prior to any publishing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3936  Respondent: 11027137 / I Pennells  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Whilst I appreciate some small developments are required, I would like to object to extent of the development proposals on the following grounds:

With respect to all sites in the village of Send and close proximity (A25, A35, A42, A43, A43a, A44) Send village is already undergoing considerable change, with the redevelopment of Vision Engineering’s site. Surely this large development should be completed to allow the impact on the village be assessed before other large developments are approved? In addition, developers are routinely purchasing single properties and replacing them with multiple dwellings.

The layout of Send village does not allow for the existing arterial roads to be widened to allow, in a lot of cases, for roads to be comfortable 2-way roads. A lot of the roads are not full width, often requiring vehicles to take it in turns in passing. Increasing traffic exacerbates this issue potentially making drivers to take unnecessary risks. Currently, a number of the roads are often used by large vehicles that are not suitable for the narrower roads causing unnecessary risks to all other road users. Except for the through road through the Send village and Send Marsh, the majority of roads are not lit and do not have pavements discouraging residents to walk short distances rather than use a car adding to the congestion.

I object to Send village being removed from the Green Belt. The green belt is to provide a buffer between Send village becoming joined to Guildford and Woking. Send Village would be at risk in losing its village identity.

I object to the Local Plan due to the village would be impacted on for years to come if planning permission was granted. Local existing neighbours would also be disturbed for years during the construction. Local amenities would also be put under unnecessary demand and pressure as outlined below:

Community facilities

• These developments will put additional pressures on existing facilities including the education facilities and medical facilities which are already stretched.
• Groups and clubs held for all ages will be stretched, and in some cases may not be suitable to accommodate the additional demand.
• The children’s recreation facilities are located directly next to Send Road. Any increase in the traffic on this road will directly increase the pollution exposure to those using the recreation facilities.

Utilities

• Additional demands on the currently stretched telecommunications, resulting at times, in intermittent internet services.
• Additional demands on existing utilities such as water, gas, electricity, sewage which may also lead to intermittent services.

Traffic
• Damage only collisions have been observed with vehicles using Tannery Lane cross roads junction and the signalised cross road with Send Marsh Road. The developments in the area will further increase the risk of additional collisions.
• During the rush hours, traffic is already heavily congested throughout village especially at the junctions and on the approaches to the roundabouts at either end of the village.
• Additional pressures on the already over stretched local transport network especially the A247 increasing the pollution, congestion.
• Additional pressures on parking in the village and surrounding area
• The only public transport (buses) serving for the residents of Send has experienced cuts in the last bus review. The bus service does not run at sensible frequencies and at times to allow commuting and linking in with adjacent public transport facilities such as the train stations in Guildford and Woking. Surely by reviewing and improving this service would increase patronage to make the service self-funded and reduce traffic on the already heavily congested local roads.
• Link roads surrounding the village such as Send Hill, Potters Lane, Tannery Lane, Wharf Lane, and Papercourt Lane are not wide enough to accommodate two-way traffic flow safely and are often used by large agricultural equipment accessing adjacent land. This is further exacerbated in residential areas where additional vehicles may be parked on the road side or undertaking unexpected manoeuvres accessing properties.
• Congestion and narrow lanes with increased traffic flows may unnecessarily delay already over stretched emergency services.
• Limited footway facilities for non-motorised users to access the development sites and community facilities increasing the risk of collisions
• Limited cycle facilities to access adjacent towns and community facilities forcing cyclists to share narrow road space with motor vehicles. Often causing risk to both parties with drivers trying to pass cyclists on blind corners.
• Any incidents on the surrounding A3, especially the northbound forces an increased traffic flow through the village. Especially when closures are implemented, something that is happening with increased frequency. This brings the entire village to grid lock.
• The increased traffic flow on Send Road would be likely to necessitate the roads parking restrictions increasing. This would directly affect existing local resident and businesses.
• The A3 section between Burnt Common and M25 already has a bad safety record and is subject to regular highly disruptive congestion. The increased traffic volumes, particularly using the A3 is likely to increase the use of the Potters Lane junction with the A3. This is likely to directly affect the safety of this section and risk increasing disruption through increased incidents.

Retail

• Insufficient retail facilities are provided for the village. Increasing the number of dwellings further will put further demand on them. Residents currently are required to either travel to a supermarket in adjacent towns or rely on deliveries.

Environment

• Flooding is a regular occurrence in the area especially recently during the winter months in 2013. Draining flood water is limited in already saturated areas. Building on these areas increases further flooding through restricting permeable surfaces to drain excessive rainwater.
• Increased pollution through additional traffic and construction

Crime and Public Safety:

• The village already suffers from regular targeting by travelling criminality. Growth of the village will only serve to make it an increased target for such.
• The growth both in residential and commercial will put more strain on existing emergency services. The associated increased congestion would only serve to make their response targets harder to achieve and as such putting residents and public safety at direct risk.
• No reference appears to be made to any consultation with any services around counteract these risk.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to the Guildford draft plan and its impact on the villages of Send and Ripley. In particular I object to plans a25, A35, A42, A43, A43a, and A44. There are many reasons for objecting to each plan individually, but in fact they should be considered as one entity since they will have a detrimental effect on the villages in their entirety.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I have been a resident in Send for over 20 years and have seen how strongly local people feel about the proposed changes to our village. This included raising a large proportion of the objections to the previous plan as well as electing two Borough Councillors who primary objective is to save Send’s Greenbelt status. However, it appears that none of these objections have been taken into account at all. If anything Send seems to have been unfairly penalised for this activity with the inclusion of even more development in the latest version of the plan, making things even worse for our village.

Overall the proposed changes will have a huge detrimental effect, with particular impact on traffic and other facilities, in addition to the removal of the irreplaceable Greenbelt protection that parts of our village enjoy. I have detailed my objections to specific policies below, but having drawn a - somewhat rudimentary- map of all the proposed development the impact of the changes can be seen in their entirety (See attachment) This map does not illustrate the additional impact on traffic and other infrastructure from other proposed developments such as Gosden Hill, which will compound the issues with local roads and other facilities which are struggling to cope with the local population as it is. In addition, there appears to have been minimal effort to development existing brownfield sites in and around Guildford. This is evidenced by recent redevelopment of land such as the old Fire station and the Waitrose in the centre of Town. Both these sites, and many others, could have been used for residential development instead of more retail space, with far less impact on the local infrastructure and none of the Greenbelt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I have been a resident in Send for over 20 years and have seen how strongly local people feel about the proposed changes to our village. This included raising a large proportion of the objections to the previous plan as well as electing two Borough Councillors who primary objective is to save Send’s Greenbelt status. However, it appears that none of these objections have been taken into account at all. If anythingSend seems to have been unfairly penalised for this activity with the inclusion of even more development in the latest version of the plan, making things even worse for our village.

Overall the proposed changes will have a huge detrimental effect, with particular impact on traffic and other facilities, in addition to the removal of the irreplaceable Greenbelt protection that parts of our village enjoy. I have detailed my objections to specific policies below, but having drawn a - somewhat rudimentary- map of all the proposed development the impact of the changes can be seen in their entirety (See attachment) This map does not illustrate the additional impact on traffic and other infrastructure from other proposed developments such as Gosden Hill, which will compound the issues with local roads and other facilities which are struggling to cope with the local population as it is. In addition, there appears to have been minimal effort to development existing brownfield sites in and around Guildford. This is evidenced by recent redevelopment of land such as the old Fire station and the Waitrose in the centre of Town. Both these sites, and many others, could have been used for residential development instead of more retail space, with far less impact on the local infrastructure and none of the Greenbelt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I have been a resident in Send for over 20 years and have seen how strongly local people feel about the proposed changes to our village. This included raising a large proportion of the objections to the previous plan as well as electing two Borough Councillors who primary objective is to save Send’s Greenbelt status. However, it appears that none of these objections have been taken into account at all. If anythingSend seems to have been unfairly penalised for this activity with the inclusion of even more development in the latest version of the plan, making things even worse for our village.

Overall the proposed changes will have a huge detrimental effect, with particular impact on traffic and other facilities, in addition to the removal of the irreplaceable Greenbelt protection that parts of our village enjoy. I have detailed my objections to specific policies below, but having drawn a - somewhat rudimentary- map of all the proposed development the impact of the changes can be seen in their entirety (See attachment) This map does not illustrate the additional impact on traffic and other infrastructure from other proposed developments such as Gosden Hill, which will compound the issues with local roads and other facilities which are struggling to cope with the local population as it is. In addition, there appears to have been minimal effort to development existing brownfield sites in and around Guildford. This is evidenced by recent redevelopment of land such as the old Fire station and the Waitrose in the centre of Town. Both these sites, and many others, could have been used for residential development instead of more retail space, with far less impact on the local infrastructure and none of the Greenbelt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I would like to register by objection to the following aspects of the GBC Local Plan. In general my concern is that the plan threatens to destroy the identity of both Send and Ripley villages, part of the development will be on Green Belt land and it will make the already highly congested roads in the area even worse.

Specifically I object to the following:

1. The number of homes (693pa) that the Plan intends to deliver.
2. The enclosure of protected Green Belt land within the proposed village boundaries (for which there will be a presumption for development in the future).
3. The Garlick’s Arch (Policy A43) proposal to build 400 houses and 7,000sq metres of light/general industrial/storage distribution space on the Green Belt.
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.
5. The wholesale destruction of the Green Belt in this area (including the planned development of 2,000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow – Policy A25) in clear contravention of the central government’s stated commitment for Green Belt protection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/282  Respondent: 11031937 / Patrick Ollington  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 by Guildford Borough Council (GBC) for the following reasons:

1. Not protecting the Green Belt

I object to the proposal to remove (“in-set”) Ripley, Send and Clandon from the Green Belt. Erosion of the Green Belt is wholly contrary to the Government’s manifesto policy and to the Council’s planning policy. The 2015 Government’s manifesto included a commitment to "prioritise brownfield development” and to protect greenfield land around towns and cities. The manifesto commitment stated that “We will ensure that local people have more control over planning and protect the Green Belt. We will encourage more neighbourhood planning and protect the Green Belt. Neighbourhood planning gives more power to local people, allowing them to play a much stronger role in shaping their areas”. The policy commitment to protect the Green Belt should be upheld. Not to do so would be a betrayal of the commitments made by the Government and to democracy.

The Green Belt must be protected against the many forms of development, otherwise more farmland and woods will be consumed by urban sprawl, especially around large cities. With the increasing global pressures from climate change and population growth, our farmland and woodlands will become more valuable in future, not less. GBC’s proposal for more development in the Green Belt assume that this land is only valuable if built on, an assumption that is fundamentally flawed. The Green Belt is needed now more than ever.

1. Disproportionate size of sits in relation to rural locations

I object to the allocation of land to the strategic sites of Garlicks Arch (Ripley/Send border), Gosden Hill (Clandon) and Wisley Airfield. The proposed development of these sites will have a disproportionate impact on the surrounding local villages. They will have a permanent and negative impact on each of these communities.
1. **Unbalanced allocation of development in one area of the Borough**

Between the M25 and Burpham, a distance of only about 5 miles it is proposed that over 6,500 houses are built. This represents over 40% of the housing proposed in the Local Plan. I object to this area being hit so hard by the allocation of development, which is disproportionate to the rest of the Borough.

1. **Gerrymandering**

The concentration of Green Belt development is not only disproportionate to the rest of the Borough but has been disproportionately applied to Wards that are not lead by a Conservative borough councilor. For example, the Ward of Lovelace (Liberal Democrat) accounts for 15% of the Borough’s population but has been allocated 35% of the proposed house building. The Ward of Send (Guildford Greenbelt Group) has also been given a disproportionate amount of house building. The coincidence of this is statistically significant and demonstrates at best a form of punishment to Wards who did not elect a Conservative borough councilor and at worst a form of gerrymandering.

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.

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.

1. **I Object to the site A43 Garlick’s Arch**

Garlick’s Arch is a 100 acre site of Green Belt and ancient woodland which should be protected.

1. **Congestion on the A3 and M25 trunk roads**

I object to the development of the strategic sites due to the A3 and M25 already being at capacity during peak hours. Highways England has no plans to look at improving the A3 before 2020. It is therefore not sustainable to identify sites for further development which will worsen the congestion on these motorways and trunk roads.
1. **Congestion on the local village roads and lanes**

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day. For example, the Newark Lane and Rose Lane junction in the center of Ripley, which at peak hours, is regularly gridlocked due to the volume of traffic, made worse when Ripley High Street (B2215) is used as a detour/ slip road when the A3 is jammed. I object to further development which will cause even greater congestion in and around our villages.

1. **Unsuitability of our local roads for heavy vehicles and more traffic**

Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. For example, part of Newark Lane which was resurfaced for the 2014 Olympics cycle route and has been used subsequently for other cycling events, has had to have regular “fixes” to crumbling road surfaces and recurring potholes due to traffic volumes far in excess of the road surface quality used. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

1. **Poor air quality concerns**

Further congestion, particularly in built up residential areas will only lead to greater levels of air pollution. I object to further development, which will result a fall in the air quality.

1. **Lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites**

I object to the lack of planning and implementation of infrastructure. For example at Garlick’s Arch. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ quality of life will significantly deteriorate in many ways. Local services such as medical centers and schools, which are already overstretched, will not cope.

1. **Sites being planned in unsustainable locations**

Many of the strategic sites e.g. Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch, are in unsustainable locations. They do not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. I object on the grounds that these sites are not sustainable.

1. **Parking issues in local villages caused by larger population**

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems, to which I object.

1. **Local healthcare facilities will be overwhelmed**

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. I object to the further stress it will put upon existing overstretched health services.
1. Local schooling facilities will be overwhelmed

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new schooling, existing schools will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. I object to the further stress it will put upon existing overstretched schools.

1. No protection of the environment and heritage assets

I object to the lack of protection of the environment and heritage assets.

1. I object to the lack of any evidence for the alleged housing need numbers

Nowhere in the Plan document can I find an explanation for why new houses need to be built other than the obvious that there are too many people. But this is addressing the problem in the wrong way. The problem of overpopulation is due primarily to the massive influx of immigrants. Successive Governments have failed either to listen or act on public opinion on immigration into the UK. Some in the last government have at last acknowledged that they failed spectacularly to control the numbers of people entering the UK from Eastern Europe and elsewhere resulting in serious problems of overcapacity. It is sheer madness and foolishness to try and resolve the problem of overpopulation by creating even more problems building more houses and destroying the green belt to achieve this.

GBC should not punish local residents for the errors of central government. Its residents will applaud GBC for standing up to central government and the constituents will have the confidence to re-elect GBC in the future if they properly support their constituents.

1. I object to the limited consultation period

The Council, having sneaked this proposal in at the last minute without any consultation whatsoever with the community, has only allotted six weeks to register objections to a document over 1,800 pages, this is half the usual time. The document is far too long and complex for most people to understand, and as such I consider it more than as a PR exercise and not fit for purpose.

Lord (Paul) Bew, the crossbench peer who chairs the Committee on Standards in Public Life, stated that public office holders must be seen "to be demonstrating the seven principle of public life - selflessness, accountability, objectivity, integrity, honesty and leadership". I hope that GBC will listen to all the comments by the community they serve, including the local parish councils and local councilors and demonstrate that they are truly serving their community with these principles and protect the green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/272  Respondent: 11032705 / Mike Tarrant  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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, Send I object to the proposed developments at:

A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane

A43 Garlicks Arch

(And the outline planning application 16/P/00783. For 9 houses on the site of MG Garage/DAG Scaffolding.

Which if granted could be a Trojan horse access for the much larger development, Garlick’s Arch.)

A43a New Slip Roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common

A44 Winds Ridge and Send Hill

I object on the grounds of building on ‘Green Belt’ land, which are the lungs of London. And are meant to prevent Urban spread in the countryside and the linking of settlements.

I see no exceptional circumstances to take Send and Ripley out of the Green Belt. Especially as Villages to the East of the A3 maintain this status.

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.

The increased pressure on local facilities, Doctors, Schools etc. that 485+ homes would bring. Send does not need, nor do we want a 25% increase in population.

Warehousing and Industrial units are included in Policy A43. I question why was the Cassidy Slyfield Ltd. North Slyfield site, allocated in 2014 By Guildford Council for Industrial and Warehouse use, withdrawn from the Local Plan recently. Surely expanding an existing Brown field industrial area is better than creating a new one on Green Belt Land!

I see these developments solely as commercial gain for the developers and of no benefit to the existing residents of Send, Ripley and the surrounding area. In fact the level of development proposed will be detrimental to those of us living here.

Please take into account my objections when making your decision.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1621</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 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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>Lobect to the building on the Green Belt at Send at Garlicks Arch, Clockbarn Nurseries and Send Hill because it is not justified by any &quot;exceptional circumstances&quot; and the fact that Green Belt is meant to be permanent and not continually eroded.</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: pslp173/71</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 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Local Plan proposes an increase of 500 homes in Send, that is nearly 30%. (40 at Send Hill, 60 at Tannery Lane and 400 at Garlicks Arch). In addition, within a few kilometres there are proposals for another 4500 homes (2000 at Wisley and 1500 at Gosden Hill Farm). Add to this the proposal to build 10 hectares of industrial/warehousing at Burnt Common. Add to this the proposal to build north and southbound interchanges onto the A3 trunk road at Burnt Common. This is not sustainable for such a location as Send and Ripley as there is not the capacity to upgrade the infrastructure to accommodate such increases. Existing residents, roads and facilities will overwhelmed. The consultation of Guildford's Local Plan in 2016 produced over 33,000 comments and one third of these came from Send. Send appears to have been allocated additional development in this latest submission despite a reduction of the overall housing numbers in the borough, plus an increase of industrial/warehousing development. Guildford Borough Council have requested a consultation and comments from local residents. They must take on board the comments and modify the submission accordingly.</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: PSLPA16/1436</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 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
I am writing to you to protest about the plans for building on Green Belt sites in and around Send and Send Marsh.

I object to Send being removed from the Green Belt (Policy P2). The National Planning Policy Framework (point 80) states that one of the purposes of Green Belt land is ‘to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another’. Send village and its surrounding Green Belt land acts as the necessary buffer between Guildford and Woking.

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses in Tannery Lane, an area already unsuited to further development, due to both its frequent flooding and the narrow and winding lane. The lane simply cannot take the traffic an additional 45 houses would bring.

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 and especially in the evenings 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.

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.

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch for 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space. This area is prone to flooding. It also has ancient woodland, just the kind of specific area the Green Belt was established to protect. The industrial space is also unnecessary, based on the current Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA). This shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan.

I also understand that Slyfield actually has a large area which would be much more suited.

I object to the Plan due to the fact that the infrastructure of Send and Send Marsh simply cannot cope with the increased traffic and also the strain on local services such as the schools and the surgery. I urge you to abandon the Plan forthwith.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1280</th>
<th>Respondent: 11035809 / Trevor Osborn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 writing to object to the 2016 Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan. I find the plan has not addressed my concerns regarding infrastructure capacity such as traffic on the A247 and pressure on the Villages medical centre. I re-send with this letter my original objection to the 2014 consultation.

I object to building 485 homes in Send Parish and the scale of development proposed for Send. I object to sites A42, A44 and A43 and building 400 houses at Garlicks Arch.

The population will increase by more than 25% leading to congestion on roads and pressure on the medical centre.

I object to A43a and building a new on/off slip road to the A3 at Burnt Common as it will increase traffic and air pollution along on main A247.
I object to removing the Send Lakes from SNCAI status. Bats, Herons, Kingfishers and Hedgehogs are all part of the wildlife that can be seen in and around the lakes. The local plan should encourage through policies preserving SNCAI status as a part of the local plan’s environmental sustainability. It should not be removing it.

I object to removing Send from the Green Belt. Keeping Send in the Green Belt is an important buffer between Woking and Guildford to preventing the two settlements merging.

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 Send Village being removed from the Greenbelt on the grounds that Green Belts should be kept open and permanent. We need to preserve the Green Belt for future generations.

To quote the National Planning Policy Framework: “Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.”

I object to the removal of Send from the Greenbelt on the grounds that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. There are categorically no proven, justified, or exceptional circumstances to do so.

Also from the National Planning Policy Framework: “As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

I object to the removal of Send from the Greenbelt and the proposed development of over 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch, this is a ridiculous proposal how do you expect the local community to accept this? Where will these people send their children to school, go to the doctors etc etc - the local public services are stretched enough as it is.

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery - Tannery Lane is too small to cope with the extra traffic and the junction with Send Road is already very dangerous and cars have to pull out into the oncoming traffic to get out as it is.

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. This is beautiful countryside you would be destroying & the access on a small country road is insufficient to say the least.

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 to 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: PSLPA16/3969  Respondent: 11037313 / Debbie Greener  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It is with great sadness that I find myself writing this letter. I should not have to defend the Green Belt - it is there to protect our countryside & preserve it for future generations and it is disgusting that you think you can ignore this.

I object to Send Village being removed from the Greenbelt on the grounds that Green Belts should be kept open and permanent. We need to preserve the Green Belt for future generations.

To quote the National Planning Policy Framework: “Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.”
I object to the removal of Send from the Greenbelt on the grounds that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. There are categorically no proven, justified, or exceptional circumstances to do so.

Also from the National Planning Policy Framework: “As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/397  Respondent: 11042369 / Huw Williams  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/15  Respondent: 11044161 / Kerry Denholm-Price  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **Green Belt, Policy 2, paragraph 4.3.15**

The Policy 2, paragraph 4.3.15 changes are clearly intended to provide the option in future to approve further development in and around the existing business park and I object to the proposal, to remove Send Business Park from the Green Belt in its entirety, for the reasons specified below.

1. The business park is already a non-confirming user in an area of outstanding beauty and natural amenity which runs alongside an area of the Wey Navigation rich in wild life. The proposed changes in Policy 2, paragraph 4.3.15 would remove the protection that the surrounding natural area is afforded by the current designation.
2. Tannery Lane which is the only access road for the business park would be unable to cope with even a small increase in traffic irrespective of that being an increase in number of daily vehicles using the road or in the number of industrial vehicles using the road. The road is width restricted in both directions for the majority of its length being single vehicle width and not suitable for the majority of its length for even smaller industrial vehicles to pass each other. The lane
3. The main access point into Tannery Lane is close to recreation area very well used by local children and an increase in vehicles using this area to access Tanner Lane would present a danger to the users of the area in particular children.
In conclusion I object to the proposed local plan and consider it to be unfit for purpose. The changes contained in the current draft which are impacting Ripley, Send Marsh and Send disproportionately, have been poorly thought out in terms of impact on critical factors such as flood control, traffic and local infrastructure, natural habitat damage and reduction in access to natural amenities for the population and critically have failed to provide an 'exceptional circumstances' justification for the removal of Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Dear Sir / Madam

Re: Local Plan Objections

1. I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.

2. I 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.

3. I object to the exaggerated "housing need" figure of 13,860 which is far too high and results in the completely unnecessary development of the Green Belt. The way students, economic need and affordability are calculated inflates the housing need.

4. I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford's urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.

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.

7. 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.

8. I object to the development at Garlick's Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks' notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

1. I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick's Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

2. I object to the development at Garlick's Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

3. I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles.
emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

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.

2. 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.

3. I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

4. I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

5. I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
It is also very misleading by using the term 'insetting' for most of the villages as many of the public do not appreciate that this is removing the villages from the valuable green belt which was put in place to protect the sprawling of development.

Although at this stage of the plan the council have only highlighted a few development sites for each village they will be very aware that by taking these important villages out of the green belt there will be a raft of planning applications submitted which will then have a presumption in favour to approve (as the villages are no longer protected by the green belt)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3717  Respondent: 11048417 / Dilek Bozan  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch – development at existing brownfield site areas rather than over ancient woodland on Green Belt land would be far less destructive and would avoid additional risk of flooding in an area where water drainage and flooding are already issues. Living adjacent and below this planned development and knowing that we are already in a flood risk area I feel this proposed development would cause future problems. Additionally the natural buffer offered by this strip of woodland between the housing in Send Marsh and the ever increasing traffic of the A3 is extremely important for both air quality and noise reduction.

The development of this area, necessitating the loss of an extremely valuable relief of green belt woodland, additional flooding risk and increased traffic local to an already dangerous junction, against, utilisation of existing brownfield sites does not seem necessary or beneficial.

I object to the proposed removal of Green Belt Protection for Send - the Green belt status should be left in place as per the National Planning Policy framework to provide permanent protection against over development and the risk of conurbation and transformation of villages into sprawling areas of mass population.

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery – Tannery lane is not a road which can safely accommodate an increase in traffic, further development along this lane will increase existing over-use.

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 negatively impact the existing area.

I object to the new A3 interchange at Burnt Common – increased traffic caused by the interchange will cause over congestion and increased pollution in the surrounding villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2484  Respondent: 11048481 / Patrick Oven  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
In objecting to the removal of Send and neighbouring villages from the Green Belt, policy P2, proposal to build 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of warehousing at Garlick's Arch, policy A43, and building of 40 homes and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill, policy A44, I would add the following:

Send has continued to grow over the past few years, and will continue to do so, despite being in the Green Belt. That development has been sensible and sustainable. The old Sex and Sons Foundry has gone and been replaced by about 12 houses in Walnut Tree Place and some additional houses and flats on Send Road by the entrance. Skene Close, comprising 6 detached houses, replaced the former 2 houses that had formerly been on the site last year. Vision Engineering, having shown there were exceptional circumstances, have been allowed to develop a new single storey factory on their Green Belt land between Send Road and the Wey Navigation. In completion of the new factory, the old one is to be demolished and over 40 homes are to be built on the site. Send has thus continued to grow, but in a controlled, sensible and sustainable way. To remove it, and the neighbouring villages, from the Green Belt is unnecessary, and defeats the whole object of the Green Belt and the intention to preserve it in perpetuity. Ripley too, has continued to grow whilst remaining in the Green Belt. Numerous houses have been built on brownfield sites behind the High Street on both sides and in Rose Lane.

I have no objections to such brownfield development. Hence, I would raise no objection to the proposal to build 45 houses at site A42, Clockbarn Nursery, which appeared in the amended Local Plan, but seems inexplicably to have been omitted from the draft plan before you. Why is Guildford so determined to build on green field sites, and remove area from the Green Belt, when there are clearly brownfield sites like Clockbarn available? Interestingly, the amount of houses proposed for Send Hill, policy A44, is 40. Just less than that which was proposed for the abandoned, brownfield Clockbarn site! This illustrates just how little thought has gone into this plan. I cannot comment on other areas of the Borough, but one suspects similar is occurring elsewhere and that your attention will be drawn to clearly unnecessary development, or unnecessary removal of ares from the Green Belt, by those with the relevant local knowledge.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/164  Respondent: 11048673 / Claire Bell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
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 inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

I can not believe that a single local people would believe that the changes in Send and Ripley were fair and I object as strongly as I possibly can.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3836  Respondent: 11049185 / Alan Holden  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Specific Objections to the Draft Plan relating to Send
2. I 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.
3. Garlick’s Arch contains ancient woodland and is subject to flooding already. To build and tarmac over land here would either increase the flooding issue here or move the flooding on to nearby properties.
4. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough. The existing planning permissions within the village do not appear to have been taken into account in the figures set out by the council.
5. I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available and with plans for enhanced road access to make it more accessible.
6. The proposed new interchange on to the A3 will increase the traffic problems in the Send/Ripley area. The A3 and A247 are both at capacity (and probably beyond) and any small incident on either road can cause massive disruption on the surrounding roads. An accident or roadworks on the A247 can cause gridlock throughout the roads surrounding Send. The A3 is frequently at a standstill from the University interchange north to Burpham or Burnt Common and often as far back as the M25 in the event of accidents. The Transport Evidence in the Draft Plan is incomplete and shows that the A247 will suffer further congestion as Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.
7. Many of the local roads, including large sections of the A3 and A 247, are in a state of disrepair with the road surface in an appalling condition in places. Further traffic would cause more damage to the surface, and the current practice of patching only increases traffic problems through congestion - but does not relieve them.
8. I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas which are much closer to existing transport hubs.
9. 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 - there exists a suspicion that this might be due to Send having had the temerity to elect a councillor from a group hostile to the council’s proposed plans for the Green Belt. If correct and evidenced, then this would be further grounds for prosecution of individuals for misconduct in public office.
10. I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic, especially large vehicles. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more, and probably will not be able to cope with what will be generated from those developments already given permission without casualties.
11. 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.
12. The sewage network in Send is already at overcapacity due to previous development being allowed by the council without due consideration of the amenities. Thames Water or their contractors are regularly called out to the main sewer through Send to unblock it and a number of properties along Send Road (including ours) have had waste spills in the gardens because of blocked sewers.
13. The heavy traffic through Send has been blamed by contractors from Thames Water for collapses within the main sewer along the A247. The increased use of the road by HGV traffic has increased the vibration on the road and the sewer is in sandy substrata which is susceptible to problems from vibration.
14. Any increased risk of flooding in the Send area raises the prospect of houses becoming unusable, uninsurable and unsaleable as a result of the wilful destruction of the delicate Green Belt. This is negligent at best and a criminal dereliction of duty while in public office at worst.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp173/658  **Respondent:** 11049185 / Alan Holden  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. The allocation of development to Send and the immediate surroundings is out of all proportion to what the area should be allocated for the size of the ward in the borough.
2. The proposed changes affecting Send take no account of the A3 being already at or over capacity. Highways England recently objected to the Royal Surrey County Hospital adding additional parking spaces to the hospital site as the A3 is over capacity and the proposals for Send would create similar or worse numbers of vehicles to that mooted for the holy car park. There are apparently no immediate plans for the next 10 years at least to upgrade the A3 in this area - and given that any incident on the A3 can lead to gridlock on the A247 through Send with the current traffic levels, no development should take place in this area.
3. Any development in and around Send will need to take into account the lack of public transport at commuting times of day and allow for multiple vehicles for each house or development- leading to an exponential increase in traffic in an already busy and over stretched road area and would lead to further instances of gridlock.
4. There is no provision for schools, road improvement or other services such as GP services in the Send area where such services are already at breaking point. Until the services are improved there should be no further development.
5. Surface flooding is already a problem in the Send area. While much of the village is slightly above the current flood plain, this is marginal and roads are subject to surface flooding as a result of existing development. Any further development in and around the village will increase both the flooding and surface water flooding risks.
6. We have recently received notification from the local water supplier that water supplies are under pressure after a drier than usual winter. That is with current levels of building. Any further building and development in the area will both increase the demand for water while increasing the flood risk and decreasing the amount of water entering the ground and thus leading to aquifer depletion and drought risk. Overall, the changes to the Local Plan are disproportionately increasing development in Send and the surrounding area at the expense of the Green Belt while ignoring the large stock of brownfield sites within Guildford itself. Those sites should be used before any development on Green Belt or before removing areas from the Green Belt for development. We strongly object to these changes to the Local Plan and urge that they be rejected and the development moved to brownfield sites, of which the borough has an ample sufficiency.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp173/561  **Respondent:** 11049729 / Belinda Nicoll  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Send Business Park now taken out of the Green Belt altogether

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:
• It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
• There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
• Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is 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>PSLPA16/4334</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>11070977 / Anthony Maine</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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? ( )

I write to register my objection to the planned changes to Send and Send Marsh outlined in the revised Draft Local Plan.

The retention of the Green Belt is, I feel, the most vital issue in the Local Plan. It must not be slackened to allow expansion, but kept to protect the character and rural distinctiveness of the countryside and to keep villages as just that, villages and not large sprawling towns.

I object to the proposals to remove Send from the Green Belt, together with site on the Land lest of Winds Ridge and Send Hill (A44). National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for Send or the land to be taken from the Green Belt.

Removing the green belt status from Send serves no purpose other than to facilitate the future development of the village and I strongly object to the proposals. It is not acceptable to set in motion through underhand methods the loss of this valuable, heavily used recreational space that the local populace of all age groups currently enjoy.

The loss of significant swathes of greenbelt land will have a very detrimental impact upon the social, leisure and recreational activities that the local population currently use this land for – football, walks, rambling, dog walking, exercise, usage by young people. In particular young people will have less natural open space and green fields within which to exercise and socialise. At a time when childhood obesity is on the rise, allow the insetting of this land and future development will have a detrimental impact on achieving this objective as vital areas for play and exercise will be lost, impacting upon both child and adult health.

Removing the greenbelt status would jeopardise the habitats of numerous species of wildlife. The fields are home to many wildlife species such as bats, badgers, rabbits and many many more, along with wild plants which should all be protected. The council has a duty to protect woodland and the wildlife under the UK BIO Diversity Action Plan.

The NPPF states that new Green Belt boundaries should only be established in exceptional circumstances, for example when planning for larger scale developments such as new settlements or major urban extensions. If proposing a new Green Belt, local planning authorities should:

• demonstrate why normal planning and development management policies would not be adequate;
• set out whether any major changes in circumstances have made the adoption of this exceptional measure necessary;
• show what the consequences of the proposal would be for sustainable development;
• demonstrate the necessity for the Green Belt and its consistency with local plans for adjoining areas;
• and show how the Green Belt would meet the other objectives of the framework.
I question whether the removal of the Green Belt in and around Send has been shown to meet any of the above requirements. There is no evidence presented in the Core Strategy to demonstrate that the proposed strategic extension meets the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy.

The NPPF (para 85, bullet point 6) requires LPAs to define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. The removal of the Green Belt does not relate to any physical features on the ground and does not fulfil this criterion. The lack of physical features against which the proposed boundary is drawn highlights the inappropriateness of the proposed Green Belt removal and the lack of justification for its insetting.

Whilst I wholeheartedly object to the green belt removal plans, should their inclusion in the Local Plan be forced through, the Council must clearly demonstrate that the new boundaries take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development as required by paragraph 84 of the NPPF. The Council must review the boundaries of those settlements which would be covered by the Green Belt to ensure that sites are identified for development to achieve their long term sustainability and clearly define the reason for the insetting, fully detailing the future usage of the inset land.

Importantly if the Council chooses to continue with the alteration, it is essential when submitting the Core Strategy for examination that it is considered ‘sound’ in that it is justified with the plan being the most appropriate strategy, when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.

Allowing the removal of Send from the Green Belt, and thereby facilitating the future development of the village, will allow the urban sprawl of Guildford and Woking to further encroach on Send. Send is not a suburb of Guildford or Woking and clear separation should be maintained by the retention of the current Green Belt boundary.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
or Burnt Common and often as far back as the M25 in the event of accidents. The Transport Evidence in the Draft Plan is incomplete and shows that the A247 will suffer further congestion as Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

3. Many of the local roads, including large sections of the A3 and A 247, are in a state of disrepair with the road surface in an appalling condition. Further traffic would cause more damage to the surface, and the current practice of patching only increases traffic problems through congestion - but does not relieve them.

4. I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford's urban brownfield areas which are much closer to existing transport.

5. I object to all the proposed sites in Send because they were not included in the previous consultation in 20. Unlike the rest of the borough Send has not been properly consulted and all its sites have been changed substantially - there exists a suspicion that this might be due to Send having had the temerity to elect a councillor from a group hostile to the council's proposed plans for the Green Belt. If correct and evidenced, then this would be further grounds for prosecution of individuals for misconduct in public office.

6. I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic, especially large vehicles. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more, and probably will not be able to cope with what will be generated from those developments already given permission without casualties.

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 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. The sewage network in Send is already at overcapacity due to previous development being allowed by the council without due consideration of the Thames Water or their contractors are regularly called out to the main sewer through Send to unblock it and a number of properties along Send Road (including ours) have had waste spills in the gardens because of blocked sewers.

   o The heavy traffic through Send has been blamed by contractors from Thames Water for collapses within the main sewer along the The increased use of the road by HGV traffic has increased the vibration on the road and the sewer is in sandy substrata which is susceptible to problems from vibration.

1. Any increased risk of flooding in the Send area raises the prospect of houses becoming unusable, uninsurable and unsaleable as a result of the wilful destruction of the delicate Green This is negligent at best and a criminal dereliction of duty while in public office at worst.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• There are currently major delays and traffic queues through Send and at all junctions at both morning and evening peak times which can extend throughout the day as soon as any road works are introduced in the local area.

• The nearest secondary school is becoming increasingly oversubscribed from Guildford residents leaving a reduced number of places for residents of Send. This is leading to a situation in a couple of year’s time when there will be no places allocated to children in Send. Provision of good quality school places to meet the current population requirements has been promised for years and is yet to be delivered. The planned increase in population will only add to this.

• The Village’s Medical centre already covers a large population over several small villages and the current situation regarding obtaining appointments is unacceptable due to heavy demand. The planned increase in population will only add to this.

As with all proposals within the local plan they are based on providing the best option to housing developers by providing the largest number of dwellings in one block to maximise the opportunity for their profit.

The focus and responsibility of the council must be to meet the housing need in the most sympathetic and sustainable way and ensuring the villages are not lost under new towns and all character is lost. The local plan needs to be re-drafted under these terms and opportunity for small development identified that will fit within the villages and where the village can influence the development rather than the development have a major detrimental affect n the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

As a local resident I feel I must make a strong objection to these proposed developments in the Send and Send Marsh areas.

I wish to object to the following:

• I object to all erosion of the green belt
• I object to site A43 Garlicks Arch
• 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
• I object to site A45 The Talbot – I consider this to be over development in a conservation area
• I object to site A57 The Paddocks
• I object to any removal of any villages from the green belt
• I object to the disproportionate amount of development in one area of the borough. The roads around this area are not capable of carrying the amount of traffic which this sort of development would bring; Send is already burdened with traffic and local transport problems. There is also a lack of parking at local stations already without adding additional cars.
• I object to the limited consultation period
• I object to the last minute inclusion of new sites with less than 2 weeks notice
• I object to the lack of evidence for the alleged housing need numbers
• I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools and doctors surgeries The local state schools are already oversubscribed and this will only get worse and Doctor’s appointments are already over-subscribed
I AM STRONGLY OPPOSED TO THE ABOVE AND RESPECTFULLY REQUEST GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE TO RE-CONSIDER THIS IN THE LIGHT OF ALL THE VALID ARGUMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN PUT BEFORE THEM.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3718  Respondent: 11107265 / Carmen O'Connor  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write with my comments and objections to Guildford Borough Council’s Local Plan and request that the Planning Inspector reads this email and is shown these comments so they are taken into account during the decision process. I also request that I receive confirmation reply that this email has been received and read by those with the authority and responsibility to do so.

I also request that these comments are not merely read thoroughly, but also listened to, heard and taken into account as with all the objections from other residents who have taken the time to write to you as you have requested them to do.

Finally, that answers are respectfully given to the questions posed below.

I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt

- As I understand it, the Green Belt was intended to be permanent and required by the National Planning Policy Framework whereby no special circumstances to justify abandoning it could exist. I have been informed that historically local councillors and central government gave clear election promise to protect the Green Belt, so to change this clearly reneges on those promises. Where is the integrity in that? How do you imagine this builds honest partnership with the people who elect you from these communities and trust you to do good for this country?

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery

- There is clearly inadequate access for such potential traffic volumes. Tannery Lane is a country lane – the clue is in the name, it’s a lane – and it is absurd to think this road, plus access and exit can cope with such an influx of traffic both during the construction phase and after completion, especially when planning permission has previously been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina.
  - Access onto Send Road from any access point is already hazardous too and this will only exacerbate the situation further.
  - Send Road is already too overwhelmed with traffic as a busy cut through from Woking to the A3/Guildford/M25 and reverse – it cannot cope in its current state, so why overload it in this way?

I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch

- I have been advised that this site is subject to flooding so it does not seem an appropriate site itself, nor for the immediate surrounding area
- Also this site is deemed to be of ancient woodland. Our historical woodland is part of the rich history of this great country – I absolutely object to our history and living breathing nature being torn down and destroyed for the sake of more human greed and consumption. Surely there is space at Slyfield for further industrial expansion in an appropriate environment, where it would not impact negatively on ancient woodland and village life?
• This location is also opposite Send Marsh Road, which would likely become a cut through for those heading to Woking on the A247. Already this road is full of potholes and unsuitable for increases in traffic volume which would be inevitable. The infrastructure is not in place and I absolutely object to this site as part of the Local Plan.

**I object to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common**

• Send would have to take the traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. How on earth does Guildford Borough Council think Send can take this? It is not feasible. As previously stated, Send Road is already too overwhelmed with traffic as a busy cut through from Woking to the A3/Guildford/M25 – it cannot cope in its current state, let alone take any further influx during development, construction, completion, nor post phases.
• I also object because this would further worsen the already excessive noise and pollution levels to the village of Send.

**I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers’ pitches at Send Hill**

• I have been advised the subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill. It is irresponsible of GBC to even consider putting housing on such land and people’s lives at risk – I absolutely object to this.
• Access to the school is on Send Hill, already traffic is overloaded on this road at drop off and collection times. It is also often used as a cut through when there accidents on the northbound A3 – of which happens frequently. Once again the roads cannot take any further increase in traffic, not to mention the additional noise and pollution.
• Additionally this could give rise to making our children more vulnerable to traffic accidents and this is totally unacceptable.

**I also object on the following points:**

• I object on the basis that it seems insufficient consideration has been given in general to the infrastructure needs for our villages and the matrix of roads/lanes connecting them.
• I object because I don’t see any provision for increase in bus services to the villages – something our elderly and disabled population would highly benefit from now let alone without further development.
• I object because there seems to be insufficient consideration to the amount of school places required to cater for the influx in housing planned, places and teaching staff currently available and the wide gap between these two figures. George Abbott is a bus ride away – what provisions for secondary school places are being given the go ahead for more locally?
• I object because there seems to be little consideration to the fact that crime may increase with the increase in homes planned – what provision and budget for crime prevention has been made?
• I object because there doesn’t seem to be any increase in funds for fire services.
• I object because what provisions have been made for the increase in demand for health services? The Villages Medical Centre is already overwhelmed and it can take at least a week before being able to see a doctor when trying to make an appointment. This is unacceptable in its current state let alone without further homes being developed in the area.
• Along Send Road (A247) there is a primary and junior school, there is also a playground. Why is Guildford Borough Council willing to make our children more vulnerable by seeking to increase traffic along the A247?

**Questions which I believe remain unanswered to the community of Send and the surrounding villages follow:**

• How is the budgeted £150,000 per annum over the next 10 years for the development of the A247 between Woking and I assume the A3 (although could extend further??) deemed sufficient to satisfy the needs in regard to development programmes planned by Guildford Borough Council?

Ø At the last consultation meeting in Send the council representative in charge of infrastructure couldn’t even answer how that £150,000 per annum would be allocated and spent, nor had he even liaised with his counterpart at Woking Borough Council which he admitted during the open forum of the meeting. This seems ludicrous and utterly irresponsible when traffic on the A247 will affect and be affected by traffic flows linked to Woking. See above the
proposed amount of houses proposed around Send and it doesn’t take someone even with GCSE maths to work out that is almost 6.5k homes, conservatively there will be 1.5 cars per home and that equates to nearly 10,000 additional cars on our tired roads on a daily basis, solely in this small area. That doesn’t even include visiting/travelling through/industrial traffic. THE INFRASTRUCTURE CAN’T TAKE IT AND WHAT WILL £150K PER ANNUM DO FOR THE SIMPLE A247 – NOT ENOUGH!

- How are the current deficiencies in infrastructure eg road repairs, funding for schools, health professionals, etc going to be addressed before any further housing development is given the go ahead in the area?
- What impact is Brexit imposing on the Local Plan – will the needs change with the changes that are inevitable because of Brexit? What directive has come out from the new National Government re the Local Plan and are these being taken into account?
- Why is 70% of the Green Belt in this area being targeted yet only 30% of Brownfield sites?
- Why is Guildford Borough Council including Send Hill in the proposal and therefore willing to build on unsafe landfill which could potentially put people’s lives at risk?
- Why is Guildford Borough Council prepared and willing to put children’s lives at potential risk by increasing traffic flow by the schools plus recreation ground, without including risk assessment and assurance to prevent this?
- Why will Guildford Borough Council not disclose their calculations for the area’s housing requirements to the public? What are they?
- Why will Guildford Borough Council not disclose the names of development investors to the public? Who are they?
- What provisions and budgets will be granted for services in the community including increases in policing, fire, medical and overall health services?
- How was it possible for the Garlick’s Arch proposal to be included in the latest Local Plan when it had not even feature as part of the previous one – how did this come on to the table and when, at what hour was it brought into the fold and how was it approved as a potential site?
- As the Garlick’s Arch site is subject to flooding - what will the knock on effects to others be eg in Send Marsh?
- What surveys have been and will be done to ensure endangered species of wildlife will not be disturbed and affected, but instead protected as their rights state?
- What surveys have been and will be carried out to ensure ancient trees and land is not destroyed and affected, but instead preserved?
- How does Guildford Borough Council’s plans dovetail with Surrey County Council’s, including highway planning, infrastructure, healthcare, schooling, policing, etc?

I request that satisfactory answers/solutions be provided and demonstrated to the community re these outstanding questions and I look forward to receiving them myself too by return email – thank you.

It only leaves me to say that decent human beings just want to live peacefully and quietly in these villages. Many have worked hard all their lives and contributed greatly in many ways including financially to the good of this country. I was already aware, but really noticed at the last consultation meeting in Send that many of the community are elderly in this village and will have undergone deep sacrifice through war years to survive and hold their lives together – something many of us will not even be able to comprehend. I request that whoever holds the decision on the planning matters truly considers this with their heart.

Receive money from overseas greedy developers who’s primary benefit is themselves, whilst they care little for the impact their greed has on our communities and daily existence. Or choose less greed, less wanting and instead support the great people of this country who have endured hardship and now are just choosing peacefulness and the ability to survive a crazy busy nonsense world. I’m a 46 year old woman also just trying to survive this crazy world and I just want to live peacefully and quietly in the village Send is. We can all do with less and we can all do with going at a slower pace, leading simpler lives – it’s not all about the next best new thing or bowing to what others think we need.

Thank you for taking the time to read this and all other objections and comments submitted. The community you have requested comment from has taken the time to respond, I hope this will be listened to, heard, authentically and respectfully taken into account, and that action is then taken in a manner which upholds our great British values including integrity, honesty, fairness and that living in a democracy benefits those who live in these communities day in day out, not the greed of a small few.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/296  Respondent: 11159809 / Hilary Road  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Once again the plan for Send has returned to bring overwhelming dismay and grave concern to the people of this Village. The Planning Committee received 32,000 objections to its proposals, a large proportion of which are from Send. Are they of no consequence? I realise that they come not from powerful corporate bodies, but they do come from families who are council tax payers, who live in, and have regard for the area, and whose lives are most deeply affected by these changes.

I object that the new plan has taken no account of the repeated objections of the people of this Village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1908  Respondent: 11164225 / David Avery  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I formally write to convey my objection to your Local Plan. It is really time that Guildford Borough Council start listening to the residents of Guildford and stop decimating our villages. The Guildford Borough Council planning committee are motivated by financial incentives, back handers by any other name in order to pass these outrageous planning applications. A point worth noting is that of the current Vision Engineering factory construction: The planning was passed with the majority of residents OBJECTING and without any special conditions being satisfied but the planning committee accepted financial kickbacks from Vision Engineering in order to pass the application. The planning committee need to learn by their mistakes and realise that these actions are both abhorrent and totally unacceptable behaviour. They should visit this site so as they may learn how to read construction drawings and how an A3 2D site plan converts into the monstrosity that exists today. You can’t keep overloading our villages with more and more houses and with totally unsuitable industrial units, when there are much better locations within the borough, namely brownfield sites. The construction of a new marina is another example of the Guildford Borough Council not listening to local people and the interests of the majority vs. their financial gain.

For the avoidance of doubt:-

1. I OBJECT to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt.
2. I OBJECT to the building of 45 houses at Clock Barn Nursery
3. I OBJECT to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch
4. I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers’ pitches at Send Hill

? Local Councillors and central government gave a clear election promise to protect the Green belt, so do it!
? The roads and infrastructure can’t cope with any more, after the outrageous acceptance of a new marine and 64 apartments, again against the majority of resident’s wishes.
? There are far more appropriate brownfield sites to build 400 houses and there is industrial space at Slyfield site. Why have Guildford’s housing needs and supporting evidence not been made available?

? Yet again the local roads and infrastructure cannot support the development of 40
houses in this inappropriate location.

5. I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Send village just can’t cope with the traffic now, so what do you think the opening of a new interchange would do to traffic through the village?

? Simple Cause and Effect analysis would have highlighted that adding a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common just becomes a magnet for traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. The majority of that increased traffic would go through Send causing overload and gridlock. It’s gridlocked into Woking when there are roadworks in Old Woking!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/504  Respondent: 11164225 / David Avery  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation.
- You’ve already allowed a marina to be built and again against local objections.
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

You allowed both the Vision Engineering eye saw to be built and the building of a marina within Send village green belt when the majority of the residents of Send objected. The council needs to stop accepting financial incentives from developers/owners in order to get planning permission granted. Listen to the residents of Send and STOP wrecking our village. I don’t suppose that any of the proposed building projects are anywhere near those on the council’s planning committee? How would you like a B&Q warehouse (Vision Engineering), marina or caravans located near your home and in your village? STOP!!!!

The roads in Send just can’t cope now, get the council’s planning committee to visit (not during school holidays) Old Woking and see the grid lock of cars in the morning and evening. Does the council’s planning department have access to any traffic analysis simulation tools? These may help them investigate the consequences of their clueless local plan on the roads, resources, green belt and local residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2776  Respondent: 11550561 / Karen Lord  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I have been a resident in Send since 1986, joining my husband who has been a Send resident all his life. The village has seen development but nothing on the scale that has been proposed in this 2016 Local Plan. It really has alarmed my family and all our community, at the proposed developments around our home.

I strongly object to Send village being removed from the Green Belt. This is something that has always strengthened our community and enjoyment of our village, having the countryside around and giving us a natural green break between local towns. We are so close to being absorbed into the urban landscape. I strongly object with any erosion of the Green Belt as its design was to be permanent. I voted for the Conservative party at the last election and one of the main reasons was because of the promise to protect the Green Belt. I do hope the Conservative party/GBC do not break this promise.

I strongly object to the Garlick’s Arch site as we as a village were not properly consulted. I attended the last Local Parish Council meeting before the Local Plan was launched and felt the Burnt Common site put forward on the Draft was quite enough to be challenged. I attended this meeting to keep informed and act as a responsible and pro-active member of the Send community. It was very underhanded that the Local Plan Draft was changed at extremely short notice at the GBC special executive meeting, where the Burnt Common site was removed and a supplementary information sheet added to replace it with Garlick’s Arch, a development of over double the housing at 400, as well as 7000sq metres of industrial units!

I object to the Garlick’s Arch site with the change of this land, as it is ancient woodland, of local beauty and also floods, which I have seen. I object to the 400 houses and the 600+ cars that these will add to the local infrastructure. The local roads are already heavily congested at commuting times let alone with so much more added, and also the pressure on local facilities. This local woodland offers an environmental buffer between the A3 and Portsmouth Road, helping absorb the heavy traffic emissions. Without this, the pollution and rainfall will become even higher issues.

I object to the 7000sq metres of industrial units at the Garlick's Arch site. Is there not space yet at Slyfield or Brownfield sites that are more appropriate for industrial units rather than virgin Green Belt land? Also I believe from the last Employment Land needs Assessment of 2015 that this showed a reduction of 80% in required employment from the previous Local Draft Plan.

I strongly object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Send will be a cut through and have to take the extra traffic from Woking and Guildford and also the A3 and M25 for the proposed developments at Blackwell Farm, Gosden Hill, Wisley Airfield, and Burpham. Our main road, the A247 is already struggling, with regular crawling traffic/gridlock. The pollution and noise levels are already very high.

I strongly object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill because some the road is single access and some parts winding and extremely narrow, to add even more traffic to an already struggling road would be dangerous. I have witnessed at least three traffic road accidents on the Send Hill/Potters Lane junction. I have been gridlocked many, many times with traffic unable to pass along Send Hill and then blocking Potters Lane. I have seen horses go out of control because of the narrow and high banks of the Send Hill road (towards Potters Lane). It cannot be walked safely as a pedestrian (on local school trips, out with the Guides, walking to the church someone has to walk ahead to block the traffic coming up to allow the children to walk safely. Also I believe, the land is an unsafe landfill site. It’s a beautiful area of countryside that I walk and enjoy on a regular basis. Also this affects our local cemetery that is a place of beauty and peace; this will be compromised.

I strongly object to the Clockbarn Nursery site with 45 houses because again of the very inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is like many of our Send back roads, very narrow and twisting. It is already very hazardous for traffic from Tannery Lane to join the Send Road (which I had unpleasant experience of when working at Tannery House). Traffic has to dangerously edge out, as there are always parked cars by junction, and often gridlocks Send Road. We already have the marina development going ahead and 60+ apartments, and I feel that this in it's own right will cause enough traffic concerns. Also at this junction is our Send Recreation Ground, which has been highly maintained and extremely popular. I object to any more pressure being put on this road junction as it will be a detriment to our Park, with safety, noise and pollution.

Appx d I have also read and heard about the GBC's refusal to disclose their housing requirement calculations and that these have been greatly exaggerated. I object to having local plans being suggested without the GBC written evidence to
back up the housing requirement. I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly thought through, as Send's are not good enough to deal with the proposed housing levels. There will be irrevocable pressure and damage on the surrounding flora/fauna and infrastructure; roads, doctors, schools will not be able to handle this.

Send I do appreciate that housing in the Guildford borough is needed but would ask that GBC put every effort looking into Brownfield sites in the urban area before the open countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/979  Respondent: 12124385 / P Davie  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

General Policies relating to Send Parish. Sites (A42, A43, A43a, A44)

1. Send Removal from Green Belt: I OBJECT to removal of Send from the Green Belt as this will remove part of the necessary buffer between Guildford and Woking, increasing the risk that a large conurbation will form. There are no exceptional circumstances that justify the removal.
2. Building on Current Green Belt land: I OBJECT to the proposed development sites current Green Belt sites at Clockbarn Nurseries, Garlick’s Arch, and Send Hill since there are no special or exceptional circumstances which justify removal of their Green Belt status.
3. Due process: I OBJECT to the proposed development sites at Clockbarn Nurseries, Garlick’s Arch, and Send Hill since they were not included in the previous Draft Local Plan consultation exercise in 2014. Send sites were all substantially changed without the proper two-stage process of consultation being followed, unlike the rest of the Guildford Borough.
4. Traffic levels and associated environmental issues, I OBJECT to the proposed Burnt Common interchange that will increase both traffic movement levels through the Parish and the level of traffic related pollutants over wide areas in the Parish.
5. Housing Numbers: I OBJECT to development of sites at Clockbarn Nurseries, Garlick’s Arch, and Send Hill since the number of houses proposed (485 + 2 traveller pitches) will increase the number of houses in Send by 25% which is incompatible with maintaining Send’s current rural nature.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2890  Respondent: 12210849 / Jason Doran  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing today with some objections to the proposed local plan.

In particular, I object to the density of new housing in the Send area over the next 15 years. I believe that this will damage the rural feel of Send and surrounding areas and the infrastructure in place is not adequate to sustain this increase. I do however support the development of the Wisley airfield area as this would allow for families that live and work in the London/ M25 corridor to travel without having an impact on the A3/ local send roads area. (Number of
houses – The GBC Spatial Strategy which plans delivery of 693 homes per year from 2018 for 15 years totaling 10395. This annual number is higher than the number which originally raised concern during the 2014 consultation. The sites in or adjacent to Send will deliver almost half of this number. (reference Policy S2 on page 26**)

I object strongly to the removal of Send from the Green Belt area. I believe this will cause an unacceptable build up in the area and again destroy the rural feel of the area (Village will be Inset from the Green Belt – Under this policy Send will be inset from the Green Belt which means that all areas within the settlement boundary will no longer be afforded Green Belt protection. The GBC suggest that exceptional circumstances exist to justify the amendment of Green Belt boundaries in order to facilitate the development that is needed. (reference Policy P2 on page 48**)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1896  Respondent: 13681185 / Jonathan Edwards  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I reside in Orchard Way in Send, Woking and I wish to formally lodge a strong objection to the proposal to build new housing developments on 'green belt' land in the Send and Ripley area.

I wish to go on record and formally object to the late amendment to the Garlick’s Arch proposed development that was added to the local plan without sufficient notice for considered consultation, evaluation, and a review of the evidence that a development is necessary.

I wish to formally object to the lack of supporting evidence that demonstrates demand for that such a disproportionately large housing estate on a green belt site adjacent to local country villages.

I wish to formally object to the planned A3 junction adjacent to Garlick's Arch and the proposed changes to changes to the Burnt Common are as this will have a severely negative impact on the local rural area and the surrounding villages that will not be able to manage the significant increase in motor vehicle traffic in already congested single lane rural roads. The proposal will encourage vehicles to join or exit the A3 that will lead to significantly more through traffic passing schools (Send First and Clandon primary) increasing the risk of injury or worse to local school children.

I wish to formally object to additional housing developments when local schools are already at capacity and over subscribed with new applicants. The school in Send where my daughter attends is currently being rebuilt, with no further capacity to take additional children and has not announced plans to expand further to accommodate additional places. There is also insufficient secondary school places in the borough and surrounding boroughs with children already struggling to gain a place at their first choice school.

I wish to formally object to all the additional houses as the local doctors' surgery is already at capacity and this will put additional pressure on the services impacting on its ability to provide an effective and efficient service to the community.

I wish to formally object to the additional vehicular traffic that will use an already congested local network of country roads that pass through the villages in and the surrounding areas, causing further risk to our children as they travel to and from their village school.

I also wish to formally object to the proposed housing development and traveller pitches off of Send Hill. This is completely unnecessary with sufficient pitches already in existence across Surrey and the South East. The geographical layout of Send Hill is insufficient to cope with the potential increased traffic flow as the road is insufficiently wide enough to accommodate such demands. The woodland surrounding the area proposed is also home to bats and local wildlife that would be placed in danger if this unnecessary proposed development was permitted to go ahead.
There are sufficient brown field sites that are prime for redevelopment without the need lose these green belt areas forever. We chose to live in Send and raise out children in the borough of Guildford due to the principles of preserving green belt area in Surrey. To permit these proposals would wholly inappropriate and cause irreparable damage.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1994  Respondent: 15062145 / Philippa Hackett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Send being removed from the Green Belt.

The village Send provides a green buffer between Woking and Guildford. To develop in the Green Belt requires special circumstances there are none to justify developing the land in and around Send so Guildford Borough Council have come up with another plan, to remove Send from the Green Belt therefore freeing up the area for development. Guildford Borough Council should not be allowed to abuse the Green Belt in this way in order to just suit them elves. The Green Belt was set up to control urban growth from unscrupulous Councils and Developers permanently. If this is not protected then all of the land in and around the village will be vulnerable to development. This would destroy the character of the village of Send. Guildford would merge with Woking through a series of urban estates.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/23  Respondent: 15062625 / Stephen Groves  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

OBJECT to the proposal to inset Send Business park from the Green Belt because it will be situated in an area of outstanding beauty within the countryside adjacent to the Wey Navigation and there is highly restricted access to along Tannery Lane in both directions. Children regularly use Tannery Lane as a cycle route away from the main roads in order to get to Send Park, and this will increase the risk to other road users, especially on bicycles. Further development of this area directly ignores the openness of the greenbelt and the value to which it provides within our community.

I request that my comments and objections are shown to the Planning Inspector and also request a confirmation to that you have received this objection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/775  Respondent: 15062657 / Wendy Corrigan  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
## Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Green Belt is meant to be permanently protected, not continually eroded.

I object to the proposed developments in Send, Garlick's Arch, Clockbarn Nurseries and Send Hill because there are no special circumstances and the "housing need" figure of 13,860 is excessive - resulting in completely unnecessary development of Green Belt land.

I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt, because the village and its countryside forms a much needed separation between Guildford and Woking.

Furthermore, Guildford's urban brownfield areas are much closer to existing transport provision, and all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in these 'non green belt' areas.

I object to all the proposed development of all sites in Send which were not included in the earlier consultation in 2014. Unlike the rest of the borough, Send has not been properly consulted and the proposals for these sites have been changed substantially.

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common as it would result in Send Road (A247), which is already extremely busy, being constantly gridlocked. In addition, the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and indicates that Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25 causing unrelieved congestion.

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch which, as an area of ancient woodland, is a site worthy of special consideration and conservation. It includes trees which existed in the 16th century, and these would necessarily be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

I object to the development of 400 houses at Garlick's Arch, because it was without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I object to the proposal for industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick's Arch. This totally without justification as the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment in 2015 shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for a large area of industrial space it should be made available at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site.

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access for the resulting volume of cars, lorries etc. Tannery Lane is narrow and winding and totally unsuitable for any increase in traffic. The junction with Send Road is already extremely hazardous for vehicles joining the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. This road cannot take any more - ACCIDENTS WILL HAPPEN.

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill. This Green Belt amenity is within an area of unspoilt countryside which would be irrevocably blighted. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing inadequate and unsuitable access. The subsoil of this area contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented.

I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels and have not been properly considered. Roads, doctors surgeries and schools will be unable to cope.

I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt adjacent to the A3. This will ruin the open amenity of the borough, and most importantly, inevitably result in daily gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 - THESE ROADS ARE ALREADY AT FULL CAPACITY.

I object to the large proposed development of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm. This will destroy large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land and again result in even more congestion on the A3 and surrounding roads including Send.
Finally, I object to the failure of Guildford Borough Council to acknowledge that there are sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area. These should be used for development in the first instance, before open countryside and the Green Belt are destroyed forever. Also, why it has failed to include the 2015 Town Centre Masterplan within its proposals.

Please confirm receipt of this letter and ensure that my objections 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: PSLPA16/2017  Respondent: 15063745 / John Pryce  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )


I wish to place on record my objections to the current GBC Draft Local Plan 2016.

1. I strongly object to the 'insetting' of Send, Ripley and Wisley, thus removing the protection afforded by the Green What remains of the Green Belt should be sacrosanct, held in Trust for future generations.
2. I strongly object to late inclusion of Garlick's Arch in the Plan. There is no justification for putting 400 houses and 7,000sq.m. of industrial space on this farmland. The site includes some ancient woods which must be preserved. The associated links to the A3 would cause excessive traffic through Send, with which it could not be compatible. The A247 is already at a standstill in the morning rush-hour. The Council promised to use 'Brownfield' sites and this is what they should do.
3. The addition of 485 houses in Send, plus 2,000 at Wisley will require considerable new infrastructure, school places and Doctors Surgeries, for which there is no immediate provision in the Plan. I object to the lack of any real evidence for the need for this amount of new housing in this area.
4. I object to the proposal to build 45 new homes on the Clock barn Nursery site, since this is on the floodplain. Tannery Lane is very narrow and the increased traffic would cause major problems.
5. I object to the proposal to build 40 homes and 2 travellers pitches on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This Green Belt area is one of outstanding natural beauty which would be totally spoilt by this development. I also understand that the site subsoil contains hazardous land-fill waste, which may make the development economically unviable.

In conclusion, the Plan does not serve the interests of the local residents in Send, Ripley, Wisley and Clandon. The Council is going directly against the stated Conservative Government policy to preserve the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/17  Respondent: 15067393 / Anthony Fairbairn  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Policy P2 why is Send being removed from the Green Belt? There is no sound reason for this

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/381  Respondent: 15067393 / Anthony Fairbairn  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Green Belt, Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15
Send Business Park now taken out of the Green Belt a/together
I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/380  Respondent: 15067425 / Anita Fairbairn  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Green Belt, Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15
Send Business Park now taken out of the Green Belt a/together
I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1292  Respondent: 15067585 / Ann Elms  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
THE FINAL DRAFT LOCAL PLAN (SEND) OBJECTIONS

Please make sure that my views are made known to the Planning Inspector.

Below are the key points I wish to make in connection with the Final Draft Local Plan: Procedural objection

Since 2014 when Guildford Borough Council aired for public comment, nearly every major proposed development site in Send has been changed. Regulation 18 should have been used requiring another full consultation instead of these brief six weeks since there are very significant changes to what is proposed for Send.

I object to the inclusion of major changes to the developments in Send which should receive full consultation instead of six weeks

Green Belt - Policy P2

In the publication 'About Guildford' sent out by Guildford Borough, there is the statement 'Over 89% of our borough is within the green belt'. Why are GBC proposing to remove Send altogether from the Green Belt? Why aren't GBC fighting to keep Send in the Green Belt?

Why has Send been disproportionately hit by development? Is it because the majority of the Councillors/Officials involved live in a different area, rather than in the Send Area? Is there corruption involved with links with building companies?

The village of Send must be preserved in its village identity to prevent there being an urban sprawl between Guildford and Woking.

I object to any erosion of Send's Green Belt status under Policy P2.

Housing Need - Policy A43

In the publication 'About Guildford' it is stated that 'less than 700 homes per year will be built in total'.

Why are most of these homes being built in the Send Area? There are brown field sites which could be developed elsewhere, rather than in our beautiful Green Belt area around Send.

Why has Garlick's Arch suddenly been included at the last minute in the Development Plan? This doesn't match with the statement 'Only 1.6% of greenfield land will be taken and allocated for development' (again in the publication 'About Guildford'). No time has been given for adequate consultation here and it has not been included in previous consultations.

Is all the greenfield land coming from the Send and Ripley area?

The NPPF prevents the merging of settlements without any exceptions. Why has this been proposed?

I object to the proposed development of Land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common. Policy A43

However, I have no objection to the development of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane.

Ancient Woodlands

There are ancient woodlands at Garlick's Arch and this area should be conserved. There are trees dating back to the 16th century which could be felled or damaged.
I object to the encroachment on ancient woodland. Policy A43

Industrial and Warehouse Development

Why has industrial and warehouse space of 7000 sq. m. been proposed? There is room at Slyfield which should be fully developed to prevent proliferation of industrial areas in the Surrey Countryside. Keep them all on one site. Traffic would be intolerable for the residents in the Send area. The nature of the village of Send would be irrevocably changed by so much traffic.

I object to the proposed 7000 sq. m. industrial development at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common. Policy A43

4-way Interchange with A3

I note a new 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

Travellers' Pitches and homes on Landfill area

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.

Guildford Green Belt Councillors representing Send

In addition, I wish to protest at the lack of courtesy to our two democratically elected councillors representing our area at planning meetings. Their voices should be heard more attentively. They represent rate-paying members of Guildford Borough Council.

I object to the discourteous treatment of our two Councillors, Susan Parker and Mike Hurdle.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1293</th>
<th>Respondent: 15067585 / Ann Elms</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

Latest Development Proposals

I OBJECT. Full consultation under Regulation 18 should occur in respect of the new proposed development given the wide divergence from the earlier 2014 and April 2016 identified needs and sites.
GBC evidence of the scale of the proposed development.

The 2015 ELNA Assessment indicates an 80% reduction in employment space requirements from the previous assessment which would mean that industrial space at Burnt Common is no longer needed.

I would question the criteria assessing the need for so many new houses (693 per annum for 20 years) and that in fact actual realistic requirements could be built on Brown field sites without reverting to blighting Green Belt.

I therefore OBJECT.

Proposal to Remove Send and Ripley Villages from the Green Belt

I OBJECT. This will destroy the ambience, amenity and individuality of both and in the case of Ripley a significant piece of history.

Land at Garlick's Arch

This proposal for 400 houses and 7000 sq m of B1c, B2 and B8 Industrial/Storage on this site is new and was not addressed in the Regulation 18 draft. This is Green Belt land permanently protected which is especially significant in the regard because of the presence of ancient woodland. Why another 400 homes? ...there is no need.

I therefore OBJECT.

Sheet 1 of 2

New 4 Way Interchange for the A3 at Burnt Common

This would destroy Send Village: also Clandon. The A247 which runs through the Village would be utilised as a major artery into Woking and would be subject to almost constant gridlock not to mention health issues in respect of exhaust emissions.

I therefore OBJECT.

Land West of Send Hill and Winds Ridge: Proposed Housing and Traveller Pitches

This is protected Green belt land and has not been referenced previously in the Regulation 18 Draft. I therefore OBJECT.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/12  Respondent: 15082049 / Antony Marke  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy P2. Send should not be removed from the Green Belt. The green belt separates that villages from Woking and Guildford, is essential to local wild life including some buzzards that now live in the fields behind Boughton Hall Avenue and we need the flood plains still to prevent flooding further down the river.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/46  Respondent: 15082049 / Antony Marke  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Green Belt, Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/15  Respondent: 15082721 / John Stack  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy P2 Send should not be removed from Green Belt as it provides a buffer between Woking and Guildford

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
**Comment ID:** pslp173/104  **Respondent:** 15086017 / Shuli Sinai  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**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 inset Send Business Park from the green belt because there is highly restricted vehicle access along Tannery Lane, which is very narrow. This is an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful river wey navigation and once again this is another attack on the green belt, which is inappropriate and should be protected at all costs.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/298  **Respondent:** 15097345 / Rosemary Key  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.
2. I 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.
3. I object to the exaggerated “housing need” figure of 13,860 which is far too high and results in the completely unnecessary development of the Green Belt. The way students, economic need and affordability are calculated inflates the housing need.
4. I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.
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.
7. 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.
8. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.
9. I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.
10. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

11. I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. 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.

15. I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

16. I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/28  **Respondent:** 15102049 / Malcolm Holland  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please note I object to the following:

1. GBC have not followed correct process full consultation is required under Regulation 18.
2. Evidence GBC have failed to provide sound accurate evidence in terms of Employment Land Needs
3. Policy p2 Send should not be removed from Green Belt
4. Policy A43 30ha Land at Garlick’ Arch Burnt Common There is no need for more houses on top of 13860 already proposed
5. Policy A44 1.9 ha Land west of winds ridge and Send Hill. This site is new and was not included in regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. This will cause additional dangerous road traffic due to the very narrow width single track local roads. This area around Potters Lane is already a highly dangerous road accident area and the extra housing etc will only add to this resulting serious road death accidents. Will you be able to live with this as persons making decisions resulting in death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/35  **Respondent:** 15102049 / Malcolm Holland  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Green Belt Policy 2 par 4.3.15

1, highly restricted road access
2, more to detract for the green belt ideas
3, it effectively an old non conforming user in area an area of outstanding country side

Finally all the ideas create more traffic for a road structure that will not be able to cope and will therefore in time cost more money for the council to solve. In addition you will be causing more people to be hospitalised because of the extra traffic pollution

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/30  **Respondent:** 15102209 / Martin Manktelow  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
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 object strongly 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: PSLPA16/37  Respondent: 15104769 / Simon Crane  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of Send Marsh Green for over 30 years I wish to register my objection to the plan to add 485 new houses and traveller pitches in the Send Ward.

I object to the increase in housing in the area. This will cause a huge increase to local traffic, making travel more congested and stressful. Also schools are already at bursting point locally, you will not to be able to allocate places to all the new children that will be moving in without increasing spending.

Similarly, local GP surgeries will not cope with the population increase – it’s hard enough getting a convenient appointment already…..

I also object to Send being removed from the Green Belt. This means that more developments could (and I am sure would) follow, adding to the problems mentioned above.

For your records, my address 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]

Please ensure my comments are seen by the Inspector and send me a personal response.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/45  Respondent: 15106977 / Y C Smithers  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I am writing to advise that I object to the Final Draft Local Plan for Send Ward:

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane (Policy A42, page 220)

Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (Policy A43, page 222)

Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common (Policy A43a, page 224)

Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill (Policy A44, page 226)

My husband and I have lived in Potters Lane, Send in excess of 25 years. My husband having originally grown up in Send, we chose to return to the village to enjoy our retirement. We have many family and friends living close by, including both my daughters and grandchildren, all of whom regularly visit us.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/57  Respondent: 15106977 / Y C Smithers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to advise that I object to the Final Draft Local Plan for Send Ward:

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane (Policy A42, page 220)

Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (Policy A43, page 222)

Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common (Policy A43a, page 224)

Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill (Policy A44, page 226)

My parents have lived in Potters Lane, Send in excess of 25 years. My Dad having originally grown up in Send, my parents chose to return to the village to enjoy their retirement. My parents have many family and friends living close by, including myself, my sister and her children, and aunts and uncles. All of whom regularly visit my parents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/46  Respondent: 15107041 / Andy Williams  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 object to the changes to the Local Plan, especially the council's proposals to develop the land at Garlick's Arch at Burnt Common on the Send/Ripley borders for housing and industrial warehousing.

To summarise:
Comment ID: PSLPA16/2911  Respondent: 15107777 / Paul Ayers  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object, object, object…it’s a disgrace!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/56  Respondent: 15109121 / Larry Bottomley  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Subject: New local development plan comments

Having participated in the consultation of the “Draft Local Plan Strategy and Sites Document” during both 2013 and 2014, I object that the 2016 Proposed Submission Local Plan envisages now envisages previously unconsidered sites whilst dropping others that had some merit.

Notably the “74. Land around Burnt Common warehouse, London Road” with some A3 access is now no longer part of the Local plan, seemingly replaced with the significantly more extensive, new and previously unheralded proposals of “A43 Land at Garlick’s Arch Burnt Common” and “A44 Land West Ridge and Send Hill”. What had previously been envisaged as 315 homes has increased to 485 homes without reference to impact on infrastructure and local resources, and the new proposed A3 junction at Burnt Common likely to exacerbate the traffic problems within Clandon and Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
As a resident in Send for over 20 years I have seen it grow.

However this last minute planning really worries me.

Many of the roads in Send are very narrow, especially the one up to Send Hill where many houses and a travellers’s site are planned.

I wonder how all the increase in traffic will function.

The school coach and the refuse trucks have difficulty when passing cars any increase i numbers would make things worse.

Also when there is an accident on the A3 all too often now, the traffic is diverted onto Potters Lane then Send Hill or Vicarage Lane. It creates pandemonium.

The rush hour extends for most of the day. The new proposal for the A3 on and off junction at the Burnt Common roundabout would increase the huge lorries coming through Clandon, where they often have to climb the curb to get past cars and also those roads going through Send itself.

Garlic's arch development would put pressure on the local schools and surgery where even at present it is difficult to be seen.

How is the infrastructure going to be developed to cope?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

My continuing over-arching concern is the lack thought on the infrastructure development that will be required to support the implementation of the Local Plan. Increase in provision in Schools, hospitals, medical surgeries, local roads and public transport will all be required and the wholly inadequate provisions throughout the Local Plan will not be sufficient to make these developments sustainable. Individual developments will have an impact on physical and social infrastructure, whilst multiple developments will have an exponentially larger impact.

I have continuously responded to each iteration of the Local Plan with no discernible result other than what appear to be tangential changes. Requiring comments on only the changes in the Local Plan show that all previous comments, concerns and suggestions were futile and makes a mockery of local input in to the development of our environment.
I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because it is in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation and is an inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The site is on narrow country road leading in to Send, a town current gridlocked at rush-hour.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/59  Respondent: 15109601 / Louise Majithia  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the new local plan as Send should not be removed from the green belt. Planning on any of the suggested sites will have a major impact on Send and its natural beauty green belt land.

I object to destroying beautiful GREEN BELT countryside with these proposed developments. The proposals of the travellers pitches is inappropriate due to insufficient access to the site along a single track road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2152  Respondent: 15115201 / Katherine Mutton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 following: The new Conservative Council made a pledge that they would not INVADE THE GREEN BELT and you are planning numerous sites around Guildford and Woking which are currently in the Green Belt for development.

I attended the GBC meeting in May and was horrified at the lack of interest Councillors had to the views and wishes of local residents. Councillors have been elected to protect our interests and those of the community.

I OBJECT Consultation 2014 You have made significant changes to this document in respect of Burnt Common and Garlick’s Arch. These changes require another full consultation and currently the whole process is Invalid.

I OBJECT Garlick’s Arch There is no evidence that these vast areas of land are needed for Industrial Space and the huge housing numbers you are planning. The GBC’s Transport Assessment was not available to counselors and public at the meeting on 24th November. This is overload on houses and factories. This development would be far better placed at Slyfield. The impact on the A247 will be devastating.

I OBJECT to your plan to Remove Send from the Green Belt

This will just result in the village becoming an urban development of Woking. I object to the use of the land behind the School playing fields and the land at Cartridge being removed from its protection. Send is a village and the residence do not want to live in a new town nestling up to Woking.
I OBJECT TO the development of land opposite Wind Ridge, on Send Hill for homes and Travellers Pitches being designated for 40 homes. This is a Landfill Site and was not included in the original consultation. The access to the narrow road (Send Hill) opposite the cemetery and the location of the village school nearby makes access difficult and dangerous.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/113  Respondent: 15129057 / Yvonne Hamilton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 proposed development plans within the Parish of Send. I request that my comments and objections be seen by the Inspector.

Firstly I strongly object to the underhand way Guildford Borough Council have changed their original plans for development without a full consultation period. The Council have not followed the correct procedure introducing an increase from 185 houses during April 2016 to 485 in May 2016. This substantial increase would put yet more pressure on our local community, the roads, the doctors surgery, the schools.

I object to the proposed plan to build a new junction on the A3 which will have a negative effect on our local roads, it would further increase traffic in the area, and should there be any accidents on the A3, the result would be gridlock through the villages of Send, Ripley and Clandon. We already experience heavy traffic on the local roads, which has a significant impact on the local environment, safety for road users and pedestrians and further deteriorates the condition of our local roads.

I object to the proposed development at Garlick's Arch, this is Green Belt and is still protected. Send should not be removed from the green belt, we are in danger of losing the character of our village. We should be conserving our woodland and green areas not taring them down to build an additional 400 houses and an industrial development which are not needed. The Employment Lands Needs Assessment 2015 showed a decline in the need for employment floor space. As I drive around Guildford and the surrounding towns and villages I see plenty of empty office space and industrial sites unoccupied, why doesn't Guildford Borough Council direct some energy into working out a way to productively use the empty spaces and sites we already have?

I object to the introduction of the plan for 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches to be built on the land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. Yet again this is Green Belt, and would be spoilt by the proposal.

In conclusion I would urge the council to reconsider their plans, we do not have the infrastructure to accommodate all this development and increase in local population, the pressure on our surgery, schools, environment and roads would impact on all our village residents. We are a village and do not wish to become a town.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/118  Respondent: 15129345 / Vin Sundera  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to all erosion of the Green Belt.

I object to your plans to destroy the Green Belt. Have we not learnt lessons? Many areas in the UK are susceptible to floods and we have to protect the very little land we have by planting more trees and not destroy them to build houses and roads.

I object to site A43 Garlic Arch.

I object to site A43a the on and off ramp at Clandon - this will increase traffic problems in the villages, not help them! More and more young people get through their driving tests and even where we live, some families have more than one car and they block entrances by parking their cars everywhere. Then over weekends and during holiday periods, we all have visitors and when everyone drives around, leave engines running, this place is no different to a car park nearer town centre. We are unable to open the windows, because of the exhaust fumes.

When, about twenty cars in our cul de sac can cause this much stress, what would it be like if you build more houses and roads everywhere in the areas you have planned to build destroying the precious and much needed Green Belt!!! Very sad. In the long run, this area will be crowded, people will be unhappy, and too much traffic, noise and pollution caused by this, will be a danger to the young children and to the elderly people like me.

I depend on the Send Help group to take me to my doctor or to the hospital. They are helping the elderly folks in this area. I'm very grateful for the organisers of this group, because they are providing a great service to the community. I thought I ought to mention this, because, we have no bus service to get to our medical centre in Send and I depend on them, just like many old people in this area where we live.

I hope you reconsider your plans to build houses. You will regret it when the area floods. Where can the water go? The Green Belt must have protected this area all these years.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1970</th>
<th>Respondent: 15131425 / Roger Mutton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 wrote to the planning policy consultation on 11th June with objections which I will now re-enforce with more details now made available to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the local plan on the grounds that Send is in the Greenbelt and because too many houses are proposed to Send and Send Marsh area it would impact on local services and create additional traffic congestion and consequent drop in air quality and quality of life. There is also evidence of flood risk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A44 - I object to the proposal to build on the landfill site on Send Hill. I now find that Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 identifies that the proposed site is a local authorised landfill site as licensed under Part II of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. It is not a quarry as specified in the GBC Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposal on the grounds that Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1_1 dated 1yih February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC, has identified the site as landfill and has &quot;areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities&quot;. The widely reported death of the unfortunate child caused by seepage from contaminated ground following flooding is a dire warning not to disturb the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the proposal on the grounds that Send Hill is a single track country road quite unsuitable for further development with a cemetery and little space for vehicles to turn and pass each other.

Site A43 - I object to the Garlick Arch and A3 intersection proposals because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A2.47 which are all already at 100% capacity.

I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/124  Respondent: 15131713 / Deborah Hayter  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the amended proposed plans to the SEND area, I particularly OBJECT to SENDS CLOCK BARN NURSERY TANNERY LANE.

This area is valued by the local community and other communities as a place where we can explore our countryside heritage. Send is sandwiched between Guildford and Woking which are busy built up areas promoting trade and employment. I OBJECT to the land being developed around Send as it is a national treasure where my family and I participate in walks and cycle rides and should be protected for the community and its visitors to enjoy remaining in the green belt. I OBJECT Particularly around the clock barn site where it is known for its wildlife particularly the endangered slow worms.

I OBJECT to how there seems to be inappropriate handling in the application process where significant changes have occurred. I OBJECT to the changes in volume of houses without it going to full consultation. Starting at 430, reduced to 185 and increased to 485.

I OBJECT to the change of how land is being used changing from 40 houses to 2 traveller sites not included in the regulation 18 draft and hence NOT consulted on and has insufficient accessibility to site.

I Object to this proposed plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/918  Respondent: 15131937 / Felicity Howell  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. Green Belt was meant to be permanent and there are no overriding circumstances to justify this change. Local Councillors and central Government gave a very clear election promise to protect our Green Belt. Send's Green Belt gives a buffer between Guildford and Woking becoming one large conurbation.

1. I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch (opposite Send Marsh Road). This site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. If industrial space is required, it should be located where similar activity currently exists, i.e. Slyfield - NOT ON A GREEN BELT SITE.

1. I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Send would become gridlocked (although it's nearly that now!) because traffic from the proposed Wisley site of 2000 new houses, 2000 new houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm would come through Send! Pollution levels would rocket and be totally unacceptable.

1. I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. A very inappropriate site with narrow, single access country road. This site also contains unsafe landfill waste (which is documented and registered at GBC).

1. I OBJECT to 40 more houses being built at Clockbarn Nursery. Access to this site is totally inadequate and could not take any more traffic. Tannery Lane is a very narrow and winding road to be able to accommodate more traffic. Planning permission has been given for 64 new apartments at the Tannery and for building a new Marina - both making more traffic.

WITH ALL OF THE ABOVE, THERE ARE THE PROBLEMS OF LACK OF INFRASTRUCTURE - MORE HOUSES, MORE INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS, MORE LORRIES, MORE TRAFFIC CONGESTION, MORE PRESSURE ON DOCTORS SURGERIES, MORE PRESSURE ON SCHOOL PLACES, AND MORE POLLUTION.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
### Comment ID: PSLPA16/129  Respondent: 15134145 / Chantal Crane  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

RE: Local Plan for Send

I refer to your proposal to build approximately 485 new houses in two new sites in the Send area.

I wish to strongly object on the grounds that the scale of the proposal is wholly inappropriate, with infrastructure being unable to handle the impact these would have.

I feel your tactics in repeating the process are outrageous and totally unacceptable.

I also strongly object to taking Send out of the Green Belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPA16/2033  Respondent: 15134145 / Chantal Crane  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I refer to your proposal to build approximately 485 new houses in two new sites in the Send area.

I wish to strongly object on the grounds that the scale of the proposal is wholly inappropriate, with infrastructure being unable to handle the impact these would have.

I feel your tactics in repeating the process are outrageous and totally unacceptable.

I also strongly object to taking Send out of the Green Belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPA16/2034  Respondent: 15135937 / Charles Crane  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I refer to your proposal to build approximately 485 new houses in the Send area.

I wish to strongly object to this proposal.

I feel that the local services, such as education, council and health services will be put under undue pressure and will suffer, meaning local residents will also suffer.
The previous proposal was rejected before because the local environment could not cope with the pressure that would be put on it. Nothing has changed... We should not be made to go through the process again - the decision should remain 'NO'.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/131  **Respondent:** 15136097 / Peter Fava  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The local plan proposals for Send are misleading. The planners propose to take the whole of the existing settlement area of the village, plus an additional 123 acres, out of green belt thereby removing the original presumption against development over this land. This redrawing of the current Send Green Belt boundary (The Green Belt inset) will allow additional development in the village far beyond the 485 houses mentioned in your recent information pack. Conservatively this could more than double to 1,000 houses which will mostly be four bedroom unaffordable homes. We need more affordable houses within Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/312  **Respondent:** 15136513 / Ian Mitchell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the allocation of land to the strategic sites of Wisley Airfield, Garlicks Arch on Ripley / Send border and Gosden Hill Farm as development of these sites would have a disproportionate impact on the surrounding villages
2. I object to the A3 road from the M25 to Guildford becoming so congested that it will become a serious health hazard as a result of exhaust fumes from stationary or very slow moving vehicles

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/142  **Respondent:** 15137729 / Robert James  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am unable to understand the rationale for the plans at Ripley/Send and Clandon.

I particularly object to:
- Erosions of the green belt
- In-setting
- High development in a single borough
- Limited consultation
- Last minute inclusions of expanded sites
- Lack of evidence for housing need
- The lack of provision of schools in the plan
- The lack of other services (e.g., GPs) in the plan
- The lack of any thought on roads and traffic access

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3909  Respondent: 15138433 / Sylvia Pyne  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. The recent decision to grant permission to rebuild the Vision Engineering factory on Green Belt land was acceptable, because the new factory is on land adjoining the old factory and which was already owned by the factory owners. These were exceptional circumstances and should not be seen as creating a precedent. One small exception should not, in my view, invalidate the whole concept of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/324  Respondent: 15143937 / Helen Strudwick  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am sadly having to write again to you as I don’t think that you have read my last letter. I was under the impression that I lived in a democracy and that the local councillors were elected by the people who live in a borough to serve them. They were in part elected on the basis of promises made to the electorate which as we all know, at least as far as planning is concerned, they have ridden roughshod over or completely ignored.

Tens of thousands of objections have been placed before you last year regarding the local plan and you not listened at all. Even allowing for the fact that further housing is necessary over the coming years it would appear that the area north of Guildford especially Send has been disproportionately targeted. At this point in time I understand that you will only allow objections to the changes you have made in the latest draft. With reference to the policies A42, A43 and A58.

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt. This will allow future sprawling development over which we will have no control. We are all custodians of our countryside and we need to protect it for future generations. To allow this to happen will create the opportunity for future expansion or development at this location without consultation.
The housing demand number in the Local Plan has dropped by 39 houses per annum from 2018 to 2034, and despite this, Send’s contribution has been increased without any justification. Major sites in Send and Ripley have been changed 3 times; first we had Burnt Common, then Garlick’s Arch and now we have both. Guildford Borough Council appear to have a predetermined agenda to build on the Green Belt and without any constraints to take into account the lack of infrastructure such as roads, schools and medical facilities as required by law.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/711   Respondent: 15146529 / D C Ellis   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
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 proposed planning development by eroding Send's Green Belt status on the above site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/712   Respondent: 15146529 / D C Ellis   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

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: PSLPA16/1177   Respondent: 15146945 / E J M Symonds   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
We keep hearing that your Borough Council is listening to the residents of Send and Ripley. But in spite of the enormous response to the last Local Plan, now even more houses and developments are being planned encroaching on the Green Belt which the Conservative pledged to save. Now we have new proposals to build a 4 way junction at Garlick’s Arch. I object most strongly to the last minute proposal with no prior warning. Our villages would become totally overwhelmed and snarled up with yet more traffic.

I also object most strongly to the other last minute plan to build 40 new home 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 elderly people.

Our village has not the roads or the facilities or schools or doctors surgeries to withstand the new Local Plan which was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously.

The site in 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 full 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:** pslp173/691  **Respondent:** 15148705 / Catriona Wilkinson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 2017 Draft Local Plan on the grounds that:

- With regard to development proposals for the Send area, despite thousands of objections to the 2016 Draft Local Plan, these objections have been largely ignored by Guildford Borough Council. Instead of mitigating the effect of their original proposals, the Council have now proposed additional development in Policy Areas A42, A43 and A58.
- The proposed development within the Send area comprises 40% of the entire proposed development in the Draft Local Plan. How can this be acceptable when our area represents only 11% of the Borough? This amounts to a massive overdevelopment of one area, all on Green Belt land and with a disproportionately negative impact in an area where the infrastructure is already struggling to cope.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/215  **Respondent:** 15150913 / Peter Hamilton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I refer to the revised Local plan approved by the full council at the extraordinary meeting of 24th May.

Please take due and formal note that I OBJECT to all of the following:
1. The number of homes that the Plan intends to deliver.
2. The enclosure of protected Green Belt within the proposed new village boundaries (for which there will be a presumption for development in the future).
3. The Garlick’s Arch (Policy A43) proposal to build 400 houses and 7,000 square metres of light / general industrial / storage distribution space on the Green Belt.
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. This would be disastrous for Send as it would create gridlock 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).
5. The wholesale destruction of the Green Belt in this area (including the planned development of 2,000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow – Policy A25) in clear contravention of the central government’s stated commitment to Green Belt protection.
6. 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. The narrow width single track country lane providing access to the site is totally inadequate for and inappropriate to usage by Traveller settlements.
7. The removal of Send from the Green Belt.
8. The failure of Guildford Borough Council (GBC) to follow due and correct process. Since 2014, GBC has changed the plans for every major site in Send proposed for development and now seeks to add a massive new road junction. The 2014 proposal for 430 houses reduced to 185 in April 2016 and now shoots up to 485. These significant changes require full consultation under Regulation 18, not the Regulation 10 short cut which GBC seek to get away with. This action appears to invalidate the whole process.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/233  Respondent: 15155425 / Graham Brown  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

With reference to the above plan I strongly object for the following reasons:

• I object to all erosion of the green belt
• I object any "insetting” and removal of any villages from the green belt
• I object to the disproportionate amount of development in one area of the borough
• I object to the limited consultation period
• I object to the last minute inclusion of new sites with less than 2 weeks notice
• I object to the lack of evidence of any alleged housing number needs
• I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools
• I object to the lack of any immediate provision for doctors surgery

Cc'd Sir Paul Beresford as our MP requesting that he consider and invoke the conservative election mandate to "SAVE THE GREEN BELT"

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
With reference to the above plan I strongly object for the following reasons:

- I object to all erosion of the green belt
- I object any "insetting" and removal of any villages from the green belt
- I object to the disproportionate amount of development in one area of the borough
- I object to the limited consultation period
- I object to the last minute inclusion of new sites with less than 2 weeks notice
- I object to the lack of evidence of any alleged housing number needs
- I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools
- I object to the lack of any immediate provision for doctors surgery

Cc'd Sir Paul Beresford as our MP requesting that he consider and invoke the conservative election mandate to "SAVE THE GREEN BELT"

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Plans A25, A42, A43, A43a, A44

I object to all the above plans as they are an unconstitutional attack on the local Green Belt & based on unsubstantiated housing needs

I also object on the grounds that they are a disproportionate development in our area of the borough.

They do not take into consideration the lack of schools & medical facilities but above all they will have a devastating effect on the A247. Plans already agreed – ie the Send Marina, & the additional houses on the Vision Engineering plot will be more than enough to bring this road to rush hour standstill & the Tannery Lane crossroads, already difficult for large commercial vehicles will become an even more hazardous accident spot. Plan A42, the Clockbarn Nursery development will be especially detrimental at that spot.

The short section of the A247 between the Burnt Common roundabout & the new north & south A3 slip roads will have to absorb all this new local traffic but it will also attract those who currently go through Ripley.

A traffic survey of current levels would surely confirm that there are certain times of the day when we can take several minutes to gain access to the road.

I most strongly object to the inevitable increase in air pollution & noise, it is sad to think that we would have to endure even higher levels of both when in our gardens, any further increase will be a threat to health & too much to bear.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
General

I am only commenting on those aspects of the plan that affect Send.

I understand the requirement to build more housing but I am not convinced of the need to provide more industrial and business space in our area and I object in particular to the additional industrial and business space at places such as Garlick’s Arch. What’s wrong with the existing industrial areas?

I object to the fact that the plans don’t seem to really tackle the infrastructure problems caused, such as local road capacity, local public transport, school places, doctors, dentists, hospital, local shopping and other amenities. The plans make reference to a number of projects but there seems to be no attempt to tie the various relevant parts of the plan together.

I object to the fact that significant changes have been made to the plan at a late stage without the required consultation period.

You state “Developers of allocated sites are encouraged to progress housing proposals as soon as possible”. I object to that since it is not a good thing if solutions to the associated infrastructure problems are not progressed at the same time.

I also object to the fact that Send has been inset from the Green Belt. That only encourages encroachment on the Green Belt, as witnessed by a number of the schemes. In addition Send forms part of the Green buffer area between Woking and Guildford, and this must be preserved.

I object to having nearly half the growth in housing for Guildford Borough in Send and the immediate surrounding area. Surely if such a large quantity is required then it should be spread around the Borough more evenly.

Site 43A – Slip roads at junction of A247 and A3 at Burnt Common

This seems to be a good thing – it will undoubtedly ease the traffic in Ripley and I don’t understand why it was not built when the Ripley by-pass was built. I know the reason given, but my view has always been that these additional slip roads were necessary. I personally doubt that, on its own, it will significantly change the amount of traffic in the surrounding area, but this needs to be carefully monitored.

Site 42A – Clockbarn Nursery

I object to this because it is on a narrow road, Tannery Lane, and the junction of Tannery Lane with the A247 in the middle of Send Village is already an awkward and dangerous junction. There needs to be a serious review of the traffic situation.

I also object to this development since no consideration seems to have been given to the fact that 45 extra houses will impact the Doctor and Schools in the village.

I also object on the grounds that this is an extension of the village into Green Belt land along a road that is mainly rural.

Site 44A – Land west of Send Hill

I object to the underhand and cynical way that this proposal was slipped into this version of the Local Plan at the ‘last minute’ without any prior consultation period.
I object to this proposal because it is on a narrow road, Send Hill, that already takes quite a lot of traffic. In particular Send Hill down to Potters Lane is already a narrow and dangerous stretch of road with a dangerous junction where it meets Potter Lane.

I also object to this development since no consideration seems to have been given to the fact 40 extra houses and 2 Traveller Pitches will impact the Doctor and Schools in the village. There will also be an impact on visitors to the nearby cemetery.

I also object on the grounds that this is an extension of the village onto Green Belt land, between two well used footpaths, and is on an area often used for recreational activities and dog exercising.

I worry about how the Traveller Pitches will be incorporated onto such a small site – it needs to be done well to not spoil the environment for others. I would also have thought that two sites is actually too small a number – don’t travellers tend to travel in groups? Wouldn’t it therefore be better to incorporate a bigger group on to a larger site. I feel that there is a danger that these two pitches could become overcrowded and spoil things for everyone. I object to the fact that proper consideration of this appears not to have happened.

I also remember this site being used as landfill only about 30 years ago and it still has ventilation pipes in it. Is the site really suitable for a housing development? Has that been investigated properly?

This site is shown as smaller than the total potentially available area which leads me to suppose that once some houses have been built it could easily be extended with even more houses, thus further eroding the Green Belt area. This is another cynical attempt to hide a potential extra encroachment on Green Belt land at a later date.

I trust that you will consider the above points and modify the plan accordingly

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
to be employed, which will probably result in a further round of house building and so on. What is GBC doing to consider the wellbeing of their constituents? Was not happiness and wellbeing also on our Prime Minister’s agenda?

High volumes of traffic and congestion have negative effects. These include road collisions, the severance of communities, the costs of delays and the unreliability of journey times to people and businesses. Environmental impacts include traffic noise, air pollution and amenity issues. At a global scale, vehicle emissions contribute to climate change. Some parts of the major roads in Surrey operate significantly beyond their capacity, resulting in traffic congestion, and forcing drivers down rural / country lanes to avoid main roads, leading to further congestion and road accidents.

**Disproportionate size of sites in relation to rural locations**

I object to the allocation of land to the strategic sites of Garlicks Arch (Ripley/Send border), Gosden Hill (Clandon) and Wisley Airfield. The proposed development of these sites will have a disproportionate impact on the surrounding local villages. They will have a permanent and negative impact on each of these communities.

**Unbalanced allocation of development in one area of the Borough**

Between the M25 and Burpham, a distance of only about 5 miles it is proposed that over 6,500 houses are built. This represents over 40% of the housing proposed in the Local Plan. I object to this area being hit so hard by the allocation of development, which is disproportionate to the rest of the Borough.

**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.

**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 / Conservation area.

**I Object to the site A43 Garlick’s Arch**

Garlick’s Arch is a 100 acre site of Green Belt and ancient woodland which should be protected.

**Congestion on the A3 and M25 trunk roads**

I object to the development of the strategic sites due to the A3 and M25 already being at capacity during peak hours. Highways England has no plans to look at improving the A3 before 2020. It is therefore not sustainable to identify sites for further development which will worsen the congestion on these motorways and trunk roads.

**Congestion on the local village roads and lanes**

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day. For example the Newark Lane and Rose Lane junction in the center of Ripley, which at peak hours, is regularly gridlocked due to the volume of traffic, made worse when Ripley High Street (B2215) is used as a detour/slip road when the A3 is jammed. I object to further development which will cause even greater congestion in and around our villages.

**Unsuitability of our local roads for heavy vehicles and more traffic**

Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. For example, part of Newark Lane which was resurfaced for the 2014 Olympics cycle route and has been used subsequently for other cycling events, has had to have regular “fixes” to crumbling road surfaces and recurring potholes due to traffic volumes far in excess of the road surface
quality used. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

**Poor air quality concerns**

Further congestion, particularly in built up residential areas will only lead to greater levels of air pollution. I object to further development, which will result a fall in the air quality.

**Sites being planned in unsustainable locations**

Many of the strategic sites e.g. Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch, are in unsustainable locations. They do not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. I object on the grounds that these sites are not sustainable.

**Parking issues in local villages caused by larger population**

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems, to which I object.

**Local healthcare facilities will be overwhelmed**

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. I object to the further stress it will put upon existing overstretched health services.

**Local schooling facilities will be overwhelmed**

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new schooling, existing schools will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. I object to the further stress it will put upon existing overstretched schools.

**No protection of the environment and heritage assets**

I object to the lack of protection of the environment and heritage assets.

**I object to the lack of any evidence for the alleged housing need numbers**

Nowhere in the Plan document can I find an explanation for why new houses need to be built other than the obvious that there are too many people. GBC should not punish local residents for the errors of central government in controlling immigration. Its residents will applaud GBC for standing up to central government.

**I object to the limited consultation period**

The Council, having sneaked this proposal in at the last minute without any consultation whatsoever with the community, has only allotted six weeks to register objections to a document over 1,800 pages, this is half the usual time.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
I object to the 2017 Revised Local Plan by Guildford Borough Council (GBC) for the following reasons:

1. Housing at Site A43 Garlicks Arch would be on Greenbelt Land.
2. The potential increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlicks Arch is extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.
3. The inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the Greenbelt and there is no identified need within the Local Plan documentation.
4. The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan and so is out of scale with the proposed development.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. The increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around and within Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/287  Respondent: 15172545 / Lucy Maxwell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have the following objections to removing Ripley, Send and Clandon from the Green Belt:

1. **Green Belt**
   I STRONGLY OBJECT to the proposal to remove Ripley, Send and Clandon from the Green Belt. These are historic villages and there is no sound reason to do this. If this decision moves forward, the Green Belt will be gone forever and the character of the area will be destroyed.

2. **Disproportionate size of proposed development to size of villages**
   I STRONGLY OBJECT to the size of the proposed developments (e.g. Wisley Airfield, Garlicks Arch on the Ripley/Send border, Gosden Hill in Clandon). These developments are totally disproportionate to the rural villages and will have a catastrophic impact on the local communities.

3. **Unbalanced allocation of development in one area of the Borough**
   According to the statistics, in the 5 miles between the M25 and Burpham, there is a proposal to build over 6,500 houses. This equates to over 40% of the housing proposed in the Local Plan, which is disproportionate to the rest of the Borough. This is totally unacceptable and I STRONGLY OBJECT to this.

4. **Implications on traffic**
   Building as many houses as proposed will have a catastrophic effect on the A3 and local roads, many of which are already ridiculously busy and ill-suited to the volume of traffic. How can these roads cope with any more? The site at Wisley Airfield proposed over 2,000 houses which could mean (at the very least) an extra 4,000 cars on the road. Given Highways England has no plans to improve the A3 in the immediate future, how on earth will the surrounding villages be able to cope? For this reason, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan.

5. **Congestion on the local village roads**
   Following on from #4, the villages are already at capacity from the sheer amount of traffic we currently experience. The parking situation on the high street and surrounding roads is not sustainable. More traffic on our roads from these proposed developments leading to a larger population would be disastrous. I STRONGLY OBJECT to further development which will do nothing to help with the current congestion or parking issues we currently face.
6. **Unsuitability of our local roads for heavy vehicles and more traffic**  
The surrounding villages around these strategic sites have a lot of country lanes which are very narrow and often allow for only 1 car to pass at a time. The local roads are not in an optimal condition either which would only get worse with more traffic. For these reasons, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan.

7. **Impact on air and noise pollution**  
Increased traffic on the road will simply mean more pollution, both air and noise. For this reason, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan.

8. **Lack of proper infrastructure**  
As with all large housing developments, no thought is ever given to the current infrastructure. Schools and doctors' surgeries, to give just 2 important examples, are already at breaking point so how will building the amount of houses proposed in the Local Plan alleviate this? Much more thought has to be given to the local existing residents and impact on their quality of life. For these reasons, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan.

9. **Impact on utilities**  
The villages that surround these strategic sites are already close to capacity in terms of the electrical network and sewers so building a development such as Garlick’s Arch will have a catastrophic effect on these essential utilities. For this reason, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan.

10. **Lack of public transport**  
The sites at Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch are in totally unsustainable locations as they are not close to railway stations. The bus timetable between Woking and Guildford is being reduced even further this year so that in turn means residents are going to be more reliant on their cars. For this reason, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan.

11. **Impact on local policing services**  
With funding being cut to police services, how will building large developments, such as Garlick’s Arch and Wisley Airfield help? For this reason, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan.

12. **Impact on the environment**  
Destroying the Green Belt and beautiful greenery/woodlands in these historic villages around the strategic sites will have a catastrophic effect on wildlife and nature. This is completely UNACCEPTABLE and there appears to be no consideration for issues these developments will cause the conservation areas or Special Protection Areas. For this reason, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan.

13. **No protection of heritage assets**  
I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan as I don’t believe there has been any consideration for the protection of our heritage assets.

14. **Insufficient pedestrian footpaths/cycle lanes on local roads**  
With increased congestion which will be caused by building large sites, such as Wisley Airfield or Garlick’s Arch, this will have major ramifications for existing residents. Our footpaths are insufficient now so increasing the amount of vehicles on the roads will increase the danger to pedestrians. There are many cyclists who like to use the local roads, for which we don’t have cycle lanes. Is it worth risking human life to build such unsuitable developments? For this reason, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan.

15. **Consideration for local communities**  
By allowing these ridiculous developments in totally unsuitable locations, such as Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch, we are in danger of destroying local communities that have existed for years. The villages around these strategic sites are not suitable for turning into towns – for reasons stated above, the infrastructure and local amenities will not cope with a larger population. The needs of the local communities MUST come first. Once the Green Belt land is gone, it is gone forever. The South East is being paved over by greedy property developers who have no knowledge of the local areas. For this reason, and all reasons stated above, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I object very strongly to Guildford Borough Council's Local Plan dated June 2016.

Below are detailed my objections to policies within the Plan.

1. I object to removing Send, Ripley and Clandon from the Green Belt. (P2)
   There are no unusual circumstances for these villages being removed.

2. I object to the plan to build 400 houses and 7000 square metres of light industrial units at Garlick's Arch, Sendmarsh, Ripley. (A43)
   Garlick's Arch is protected from development as Green Belt.
   Also, it is an Ancient Woodland with trees going back to the 16th Century and is full of wildlife.

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.

4. I object to building in areas where there is a risk of flooding. (P4)
   The land at Garlick's Arch has been classified by the Environment Agency as being at risk of flooding.
   The field at Oldlands farm is often under water.

5. I object to the disproportionate amount of development in one area of the Borough. (S1)

6. I object to the last minute inclusion of new sites with less than two weeks notice.

7. I object to the poor quality of air concerns. (P13)
   Noise and air pollution is already bad.
   With the additional houses being built and resultant extra traffic likely to cause extremely poor air quality to residents in properties adjoining Portsmouth Road.

8. I object to the Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C)
   The Plan takes no account of the infrastructure needed for the Garlick's Arch site.
   e.g. utilities, sewerage and local services.

9. I object to the lack of provision for increasing the size of the local Medical Centre.
   The Villages Medical Centre is already full.

10. I object to the lack of provision of additional School places.
    The local schools are being enlarged to take account of the projected figures for the current population of Send.

11. I object to our Villages being turned into Towns.
    We bought our properties because they were in a village and we liked the Village atmosphere.

12. I object to the lack of any evidence of the alleged housing need numbers. (S2)

13. I object to the erosion of the Green Belt.

14. I object to the limited Consultation Period.

15. I object to the fact that Guildford Borough Council has not followed the Correct Process in their dealings with the Public in putting forward the Guildford Local Plan 2016.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
With reference to the policies P2, A42, A43, A43a and A44 I object for the following reasons.

Policy P2 - Send is a small village community on the edge of Woking and it provides a buffer between the town and the open countryside. To remove Send from the Greenbelt is a short-sighted act of lunacy. Greenbelt is designed to provide protection from urban sprawl and to erode it in this way is irresponsible and indeed there were repeated specific election promises to protect it.

We are all custodians of our countryside and it needs protecting from reckless planners for future generations.

I object to the large number of houses proposed in the plan on all of the sites. The increased population will undoubtedly place extra traffic onto roads which already struggle to cope with the current population. The A247 through Send is a small road in a bad state of repair due to traffic loading. During certain periods of the day the traffic queues back for more than a mile and as soon as any maintenance or service works are undertaken the road becomes realistically impassable during peak periods. The village of Old Woking provides a bottle neck for traffic heading toward Woking and Maybury and increasing population in Send and beyond will only exacerbate the situation. Moreover, I am a young adult who drives and has been a victim of a road traffic collision (RTC) on the roads in Send, in their current state, due to the reckless driving of others. Therefore, not only will an increase in congestion occur, it may also result in an increase in RTCs.

Policy A42 – I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Apart from this area being subject to potential surface water flooding this will just bring more traffic onto the A247 Send Road or feed it through narrow and single track rural roads towards Newark Lane.

Policy A43 - I object to the proposed employment space at Garlick’s Arch for the same reasons as above. The increase in HGV traffic, should this go ahead, will cause more congestion and damage to the roads in and around Send. I also object to the proposed 400 houses. This is a new site that has not previously been consulted upon; it was not included in the Regulation 18 draft. There is no need for these additional houses on top of the thousands already proposed for the borough.

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.

Policy A44 - I object to the proposed development for housing and travellers pitches in Send Hill for the following reasons.

This is again a newly identified site and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft; it has not previously been consulted on and is therefore inappropriate to include it in this consultation.

Send Hill is a quiet residential road surrounded by countryside. There is insufficient access to the proposed site, it is inappropriate for the proposed purposes and not in keeping with the area. Indeed other private local planning applications have been turned down for this reason. The subsoil of the site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented. The road is narrow, single track in places, with no footpaths and as the road is straight it is already used as a rat run for some vehicles to cut through to the A3. In addition to this, the dumping of rubbish on these narrow back roads, which seems to be deemed appropriate by some, is disrespectful, dispicable and out right dangerous. On a walk the other day, my family and I came across such an incident on a blind corner (please see the photo evidence below), on which new residents and travellers and indeed the older population of this area, may drive quickly around presuming it is safe and yet again be the cause of more RTCs and potentially life threatening incidents.

(see photo in attached PDF)

The road is used by the George Abbott school bus and many school children walk along Send Hill to meet the bus at the junction with the A247. Additionally younger children walk with families to attend the primary school currently in Bush Lane at the end of Send Hill. Even when the school moves to its new site the children will still be walking along Send Hill to attend it. Increased housing and the resulting traffic will place these children at added risk. Indeed rather than building more homes Send Hill should be subjected to traffic calming measures to protect the children who walk to school and other residents.
Send Hill is home to a number of bats who require protection from development and there are native bluebells in the woodland which also need to be protected.

To conclude my objection to the plan I would like to mention the local services such as health centres and schools which are already under a huge burden.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: Picture attachment Harry Strudwick.docx (210 KB)

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/294  Respondent: 15176193 / Ann Dawson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like my comments to be seen by the Inspector please

I object to the local plan as it pertains to the village of Send as it threatens to seriously and adversely affect the village where I have lived for over 25 years.

I understand the need for more housing, but I believe there is still scope to build on 'brownfield' sites, and particularly within Guildford where they are most needed. Some extra housing in Send would be acceptable, but the sheer number of houses (485) proposed in this small village is not feasible without seriously undermining the character of the village and overwhelming the current infrastructure. In particular the road through Send is already congested during rush hours, and this would become a major bottle-neck. The proposed enhancement of the junction with the A3 also threatens to increase traffic levels through the village. We would also need more facilities both for schooling and medical support which do not appear to have been adequately considered in the current plans. I also object to Send being removed from the green belt. This is an open invitation for further in-building which would further aggrevate the situation, and appears to be totally unnecessary to fulfil the identified objectives. Further, the housing proposed both in Send and all along the A3 threatens to undermine the rural nature of the area in which we live. The green belt is there for a purpose to give in this case a barrier of green between Woking and Guildford. I attended the meeting in June in Send and as horrified by the plans for more houses both here in Send and at Merrow - Policy A25and I object to these proposals.

This area is in danger of being spolit for future generations.

I look forward to your reponses to these objections.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/311  Respondent: 15177313 / Stephen Brunskill  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to register my OBJECTION to the new Local Plan and in particular its effect on the Green Belt which the conservatives vowed to protect in their election manifesto.

In particular:
1. I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford and is the whole purpose of the Green belt.

2. I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

3. I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.

4. I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

5. 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.

6. I 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: PSLPA16/321  Respondent: 15178369 / Geoffrey Wilkinson  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 create a four way junction on the A3 at Burnt Common (Policy 43A) by extending north and south access as this will increase traffic enormously on the A247 which is already at full capacity through Send at peak times and experiences huge traffic jams when even minor road works are required along its length. This new junction would result in Send being used as a cut through to the A3/M25. The proposal will also increase the volume of traffic on the A247 through West Clandon which is totally unsuitable for any significant volume of HGV traffic due to a very narrow stretch within the village where two large vehicles are unable to pass each other.

- I object to Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch as this substantial development was included in the Draft Local Plan at the last minute with less than two weeks’ notice and with insufficient consultation.

- I object to Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch, as the proposal to build at least 400 homes and industrial facilities will not only put impossible pressure on the existing road network, but other infrastructure such as schools and medical facilities will be insufficient to support this development. The Villages Medical Centre in Send is already at capacity and there is no secondary school proposed for Ripley and Send which even now causes problems for many children who are unable to get in to the already oversubscribed closest secondary school George Abbot in Burpham.

- 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 Ripley and Send.

- I object to the removal of Send and Ripley from the Green Belt because the villages and their countryside provide a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.
• I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt in Send, Ripley and elsewhere in the borough because all future required development can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.

• I object to the proposal to remove Ripley, Send, Wisley, Clandon and other villages from the Green Belt as this will open up these villages to even more excessive development and will destroy much of the existing open landscape and countryside, potentially creating a continuous urban development from the M25 down to the A31 Hogs Back.

• I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

• I object to the complete failure of Guildford Borough Council to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/346  Respondent: 15180833 / Mark Humphriss  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford and should be retained.
• I object to the building on the Green Belt at Send Hill because it is not justified and the Green Belt is meant to be permanent and not continually eroded.
• I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in easily in Guildford’s urban Brownfield areas which are 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. This is a significant addition to the plan and has not been properly consulted on.
• 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 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 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.

• 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 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”. 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 Envirossearch 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 Envirossearch 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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/329  **Respondent:** 15184993 / Muriel Millar  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Surrey wants to preserve as much of the Green Belt as possible. The nearer to London, the greater the pressures and the more important it is to resist them.

The Plan provides for undue development in Send and neighbouring villages We are all NIMBYS of course, but there has already been considerable development in Send, recently and at present.

On the grounds of Green Belt, traffic and infrastructure....

I object to policy A42 Clock barn Nursery, Tannery Lane

I object to policy A43 land at Garlick Arch Burntcommon

I object to policy A44 land West of Winds Ridge

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/61  **Respondent:** 15184993 / Muriel Millar  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increased green belt erosions which are contra-indicated by the Council's official stance.

Contrary to the first four points of the Council's own "significant updates" review (page 03 of About Guildford) and in spite of all the objections to the '16 Plan itself, Send's position has been worsened by the latest changes. Send's green belt status has been completely ignored. We challenge the statement that only 1.5% of greenfield land in the green belt is proposed for use in the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/338  **Respondent:** 15186305 / Joe Strudwick  **Agent:**
I am writing with reference to the final draft local plan for the Send and Ripley area and I would like to raise my objections with these quite frankly outrageous propositions.

With reference to the policies P2, A42, A43, A43a and A44 I object for the following reasons.

Policy P2 - Send is a small village community on the edge of Woking and it provides a buffer between the town and the open countryside. To remove Send from the Greenbelt is a short-sighted act of lunacy. Greenbelt is designed to provide protection from urban sprawl and to erode it in this way is irresponsible and indeed there were repeated specific election promises to protect it. We are all custodians of our countryside and it needs protecting from reckless planners for future generations.

I object to the large number of houses proposed in the plan on all of the sites. The increased population will undoubtedly place extra traffic onto roads which already struggle to cope with the current population. The A247 through Send is a small road in a bad state of repair due to traffic loading. During certain periods of the day the traffic queues back for more than a mile and as soon as any maintenance or service works are undertaken the road becomes realistically impassable during peak periods. The village of Old Woking provides a bottle neck for traffic heading toward Woking and Maybury and increasing population in Send and beyond will only exacerbate the situation.

Policy A42 – I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Apart from this area being subject to potential surface water flooding this will just bring more traffic onto the A247 Send Road or feed it through narrow and single track rural roads towards Newark Lane.

Policy A43 - I object to the proposed employment space at Garlick’s Arch for the same reasons as above. The increase in HGV traffic, should this go ahead, will cause more congestion and damage to the roads in and around Send. I also object to the proposed 400 houses. This is a new site that has not previously been consulted upon; it was not included in the Regulation 18 draft. There is no need for these additional houses on top of the thousands already proposed for the borough.

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.

Policy A44 - I object to the proposed development for housing and travellers pitches in Send Hill for the following reasons.

This is again a newly identified site and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft; it has not previously been consulted on and is therefore inappropriate to include it in this consultation.

Send Hill is a quiet residential road surrounded by countryside. There is insufficient access to the proposed site, it is inappropriate for the proposed purposes and not in keeping with the area. Indeed other private local planning applications have been turned down for this reason. The subsoil of the site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented. The road is narrow, single track in places, with no footpaths and as the road is straight it is already used as a rat run for some vehicles to cut through to and from the A3 potters lane junction.

The road is used by the George Abbott school bus and many school children walk along Send Hill to meet the bus at the junction with the A247. Additionally younger children walk with families to attend the primary school currently in Bush Lane at the end of Send Hill. Even when the school moves to its new site the children will still be walking along Send Hill to attend it. Increased housing and the resulting traffic will place these children at added risk. Indeed rather than building more homes Send Hill should be subjected to traffic calming measures to protect the children who walk to school and other residents.

Send Hill is also home to a number of bats who require protection from development and there are native bluebells in the woodland which also need to be protected.
In addition, this is an unsuitable position for travellers pitches, there are a number of elderly residents who are quite frankly terrified of what this area could become. Although it is stated that the areas will be maintained and managed, realistically that will not happen. This will only lead to increased pollution of our countryside, a potential increase in local crime, and it is not a suitable area to place

To conclude my objection to the plan I would like to mention the local services such as health centres and schools which are already under a huge burden.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/323  Respondent: 15186305 / Joe Strudwick  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am sadly having to write again to you as I don’t think that you have read my last letter. I was under the impression that I lived in a democracy and that the local councillors were elected by the people who live in a borough to serve them. They were in part elected on the basis of promises made to the electorate which as we all know, at least as far as planning is concerned, they have ridden roughshod over or completely ignored.

Tens of thousands of objections have been placed before you last year regarding the local plan and you not listened at all. Even allowing for the fact that further housing is necessary over the coming years it would appear that the area north of Guildford especially Send has been disproportionately targeted. At this point in time I understand that you will only allow objections to the changes you have made in the latest draft. With reference to the policies A42, A43 and A58.

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt. This will allow future sprawling development over which we will have no control. We are all custodians of our countryside and we need to protect it for future generations. To allow this to happen will create the opportunity for future expansion or development at this location without consultation.

The housing demand number in the Local Plan has dropped by 39 houses per annum from 2018 to 2034, and despite this, Send’s contribution has been increased without any justification. Major sites in Send and Ripley have been changed 3 times; first we had Burnt Common, then Garlick’s Arch and now we have both. Guildford Borough Council appear to have a predetermined agenda to build on the Green Belt and without any constraints to take into account the lack of infrastructure such as roads, schools and medical facilities as required by law.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/370  Respondent: 15196161 / Michael Corlett  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please note my following objections to the local plan

1. I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer
between Woking and Guildford and is a very beautiful area. The Government advice is clear that housing needs alone are not adequate grounds for building on the Green Belt.

2. Send. I object to the significant changes from 185 houses in April 2016 to the present 485 which will require a full consultation under Regulation 18, not the short cut of Regulation 19. These were not included in the previous consultation in 2014. These sites have been substantially changed and have not been properly consulted.

I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify existing brownfield sites within the urban area which could be developed before the open countryside and Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/27  Respondent:  15196161 / Michael Corlett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy 2 Green Belt at paragraph 4.3.15

I object to the proposal to take Send Business Park out of the Green Belt. It is an old site on the banks of the River Way with very limited access via Tannery Lane and further development of this site would present innumerable problems. The land floods and the increased traffic created on this narrow lane which is single track for much of it with few passing places, would prove impossible. It is the Governments policy that Green Belt ands should be preserved as such.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/391  Respondent:  15197345 / Louise Harris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the final draft plans relating to Send and Ripley for the following reasons:

1) I object to the increase in the number of homes being planned which was 185 in April 2016 and has now increased to 485 and this has been done without any consultation.

2) I object to the removal of Send and Ripley from the Green Belt. Send provides a strategic buffer between Guildford and Woking with lots of areas which are used for local recreation.

3) I object to the 400 houses and the 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing at Garlick's Arch. This site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been subject to consultation.

4) 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.
5) 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 area is very popular 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:
1. I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.

2. I 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.

3. I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.

4. 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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I moved back to the area seven years ago after living in Hertfordshire, having originally moved from Lancashire and the beautiful countryside of the Pennines. As a keen lover of the countryside and wildlife I was keen to move to a green belt area. I am writing to make my objections to proposed Garlick’s Arch and removal of the green belt.

I OBJECT to the removal of 15 villages, including Ripley and Send, from the green belt. This will lead to wholesale, and often inappropriate developments.

I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have not followed the correct process for Send and Ripley developments. Any significant changes to the 2014 proposals, such as the proposal development of Garlicks Arch, should have required another full consultation, which did not happen. This invalidates the whole process.

I list below my objections to parts of the local plan and request that they are brought to the attention of the Inspector.

1. Policy P2 SEND SHOULD NOT BE REMOVED FROM THE GREEN BELT

I object to the plans to remove land in the villages of Send, Ripley and Clandon from the Green Belt as this would allow the areas to be developed and the villages would lose their individual identity and the whole area become an urban sprawl joining Guildford and Woking. With the middle school combining with the first school this autumn, it would seem likely that the middle school site would be developed which does not appear in the Plan. This is a concern due to the extra traffic and the problem that would cause to Send Hill and Send Road.

1. EVIDENCE

I object as data presented by GBC is suspect and estimates of required housing exaggerated and strongly object to the Green Belt being used for housing that may not be needed.

5 GBC HAVE NOT FOLLOWED CORRECT PROCESS

I object to the significant changes in the sites suggested and including new sites at the last minute. The proposals for housing requirements have gone up and down in recent years and it is not acceptable to try and use Regulation 19 rather than the full consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
3) Policy P2. Send should not be removed from the Green Belt.

Send provides a buffer between Woking and Guildford. The particularly vulnerable areas of land being taken out of the Green Belt include; the land behind the school which includes playing fields and woodland, the land to the right of Cartbridge by the River Wey Navigation up to the new boundary fence with Vision Engineering and land to the left of Cartbridge going up to the old depot on the Wey Navigation.

Further points;

Huge development objectives like these limit ability to mitigate climate change and weather events like flooding.

Environmental health will suffer through increased air pollution, as well as increase both noise and light pollution.

Cyclists and pedestrians will be impacted by the increased traffic congestion.

Healthcare, social welfare and policing will be further stretched.

Surrey County Council is already proposing to reduce the number of bus services serving Ripley, if these plans were to go ahead how would they possibly provide essential bus services for the added population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/451</th>
<th>Respondent: 15208513 / Lauren Green</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

3) Policy P2. Send should not be removed from the Green Belt.

Send provides a buffer between Woking and Guildford. The particularly vulnerable areas of land being taken out of the Green Belt include; the land behind the school which includes playing fields and woodland, the land to the right of Cartridge by the River Wey Navigation up to the new boundary fence with Vision Engineering and land to the left of Cartridge going up to the old depot on the Wey Navigation.

Further points;

- Huge development objectives like these limit ability to mitigate climate change and weather events like flooding.
- Environmental health will suffer through increased air pollution, as well as increase both noise and light pollution.
- Cyclists and pedestrians will be impacted by the increased traffic congestion.
- Healthcare, social welfare and policing will be further stretched.

Surrey County Council is already proposing to reduce the number of bus services serving Ripley, if these plans were to go ahead how would they possibly provide essential bus services for the added population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/454</th>
<th>Respondent: 15208545 / Charlotte Green</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

3) Policy P2. Send should not be removed from the Green Belt.

Send provides a buffer between Woking and Guildford. The particularly vulnerable areas of land being taken out of the Green Belt include; the land behind the school which includes playing fields and woodland, the land to the right of Cartridge by the River Wey Navigation up to the new boundary fence with Vision Engineering and land to the left of Cartridge going up to the old depot on the Wey Navigation.

Further points;

- Huge development objectives like these limit ability to mitigate climate change and weather events like flooding.
- Environmental health will suffer through increased air pollution, as well as increase both noise and light pollution.
- Cyclists and pedestrians will be impacted by the increased traffic congestion.
Healthcare, social welfare and policing will be further stretched.

Surrey County Council is already proposing to reduce the number of bus services serving Ripley, if these plans were to go ahead how would they possibly provide essential bus services for the added population.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPA16/484  Respondent: 15227393 / Madeleine Davis  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I have lived in Send Marsh for 50 years and over the years have seen our green spaces being concreted over and planning permitted for people to sell off gardens for development. Enough is enough. We love our villages and to permit the construction of so many houses would destroy completely our rural life. This is an expensive area and to state that there would be affordable housing is completely rubbish. There is no such thing as “affordable” housing in this area.

I OBJECT to the removal of 15 villages, including Ripley and Send, from the green belt. This will lead to wholesale, and often inappropriate developments.

I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have not followed the correct process for Send and Ripley developments. Any significant changes to the 2014 proposals, such as the proposal development of Garlicks Arch, should have required another full consultation, which did not happen. This invalidates the whole process.

I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have failed to provide sound evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment which shows that industrial space at Burnt Common IS NO LONGER NEEDED.

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 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.

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.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPA16/883  Respondent: 15227809 / David Hall  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Local Plan Consultation 2016

Please take note of my formal objections listed below, to parts of your Plan and my wish for this letter of objection to be seen by the Government’s Planning Inspector.

New Village Boundaries

I strongly object to your proposal to remove, Send, Send Marsh/Burnt Common & Ripley from the Green Belt and expanding their boundaries which encroach on a large proportion of Green Belt Land, which is to be used for Housing & Industrial development, (Policy P2).

This proposal is in direct contravention to the Government’s stated Policy as part of their pre-election manifesto and their issued guide lines to Councils with respect to the preservation of Green Belt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object, most strongly that Wisley, Clandon, Send and Riley, and many other villages, be removed from the Green Belt. This plan effectively merges all villages along the A3 from the M25 to the Hogs Back with no provision for any infrastructure improvements to either the A3 or local roads.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/518  **Respondent:** 15233185 / Victoria Hogben  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Objections to Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016)

I very strongly object to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). I object on the following grounds

**I object to the Local Plan as the development proposed is not sustainable (Policy SI)**

The 13,860 new houses proposed is totally unsuitable- it will damage local communities by over development, particularly Ripley, Send and Clandon. The local communities do not need this number of houses. Wisley Airfield (A35) and Garlick’s Arch (A43) have no railway stations and inadequate bus services, so almost every adult will have to have a car. The Plan does not include anything to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch.

The development should be in urban areas not in green areas, where there is sustainable transport.

**I object to not protecting the Green Belt (Policy P2)**

I object to removing Ripley, Send and Clandon from the Green Belt, together with sites of Wisley Airfield (A35) and Garlick’s Arch (A43) and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for these villages and sites being removed, as required by the National Planning Policy.

The Plan should develop the existing brownfield site at Burnt Common rather than developing Garlick’s Arch (A43).

**I object to development in areas which are at risk of flooding (Policy P4)**

The Plan does not take adequate account of flood risk as required by National Planning Policy.

The site at Garlick’s Arch (A43) is classified by the Environment Agency as being in a higher risk than the Council’s own assessment. This area has flooded many times in recent years and therefore the Council’s assessment is not good enough to be included in the plan.

**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.

**I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)**

There is way too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.
The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

I object to the damage to the historic environment as a result of the scale of the proposed development (Policy D3)

The Garlick’s Arch (A43) proposal would double the built area in the locality, and would irrevocably damage the character of the Ancient Woodland on the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees.

I object to the Borough Wide Strategy (Policy S2)

GBC’s proposal for 13,860 new houses without any constraints to reduce the overall housing figure, differs from all the other Borough Councils in Surrey.

The Plan is unbalanced across the borough; there’s too much development in the north east of the borough (Wisley [A35], Ripley/Send [A43] and Clandon [A25]). 36% of all the Plan’s new housing is proposed in this area, which has only 11% of the existing housing.

5,036 houses are proposed between the M25 and Burpham (about 5 miles) which will obviously lead to a merging urbanisation of identities the villages.

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 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
- 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
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to

I object to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA figure of 693 houses per annum in the borough being too high (Appendix D)

The Plan’s proposed growth is based on the SHMA report, which says that 693 homes a year are required by the borough, which is more than double the figure of 322 used in previous plans.

But because the Council will not publish the SHMA report, this figure cannot be verified. This lack of transparency is not right for consultation on the Plan.

I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C)

The Infrastructure Schedule sets out the key infrastructure requirements the Plan depends on. There is no schedule for Garlick’s Arch (A43), so the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site. It is therefore not fit for purpose.

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.
I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick's Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

Furthermore the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been for there decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPA16/517</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15233217 / Mary Allwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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>

Regarding the proposed building and alterations in Send.

I object to Send being taken out of the Green Belt. This is a lovely village in the green belt area - which is why I moved here.

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>PSLPA16/520</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15233217 / Mary Allwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 increase in housing from 185 to 485 - these changes require another full consultation of regulation 18 and not the short cut of regulation 19 which you are trying to get away with.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/532  Respondent: 15234081 / John Sweeting  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

With regard to the sites numbered:

- A25 – Gosden Hill
- A43 and A43a - Land at Burnt Common – known as Garlick’s Arch
- A35 – Former Wisley Airfield

in the revised draft local plan.

I would like to object to the inclusion of these sites in the draft local plan for the following reasons:

1. The number of houses needed in the Borough was changed between the first and second issues of the draft plan indicating that there is considerable uncertainty in this figure and the basis and method of calculation. In view of the recent EU referendum vote and its impact on future immigration, the number of houses required is likely to reduce further. With smaller house numbers the need for any loss of the Greenbelt should be reassessed as 'special circumstances' necessary for reclassification have not been established.

2. Sites 43 & 43a were introduced at the last minute and there has been insufficient time for consultation before its inclusion in the draft plan.

3. Wisley/Ripley/Send/Burnt Common/Send Marsh is a semi-rural area and development on this large scale will lead to to urbanisation and permanently change the nature of the area. In particular this could provide the starting link in connecting Guildford to the M25.

4. These developments place a disproportionate burden on the north east of the Borough.

5. Traffic will increase significantly and the access and exit roads to and from the A3 are too narrow to cope with the resultant increase in traffic - particularly at peak hours. Other infrastructure.

6. Is there adequate power, drainage and sewage provision for industrial development and is there sufficient school, medical and similar provisions for domestic expansion?

7. Light and sound pollution.
   The area enjoys fairly dark skies for its proximity to London. Any additional development will add to the light pollution unless provisions are made to ensure strict control of any additional lighting. Please consult Guildford Astronomical Society. It already suffers from noise pollution from the A3. Traffic noise pollution seems inevitable if development proceeds. If included in the plan, provision should be made for strict control of noise and light pollution emanating from the site – particularly at nighttime.

8. The sites contain a substantial number of trees many of which are quite mature and must make a significant contribution to the Borough's carbon reduction target. It seems perverse that planning permissions have been refused because of the impact on the individual trees whilst the wholesale destruction of woods seems inevitable if these sites are included. It seems difficult to reconcile these two extreme positions. If included in the plan preservation orders should be placed on appropriate trees as a minimum requirement.

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 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:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/543  Respondent: 15234657 / Jenny Bole  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Draft Local Development Plan - Send, Send Marsh & Burnt Common

I am very concerned indeed about your proposal to increase the number of new homes in our villages from 185 to 485 by the sudden late (and, in my opinion, underhand and cynical move by Guildford Borough Council) inclusion of the large Green Belt Garlick's Arch area of fields and ancient woodland in this latest, and very flawed, Plan.

The last Plan put out two years ago allocated a total of 431 homes to our villages, which would have increased the population by nearly 25% - itself far too high for the local infrastructure - roads, schools, medical centre, etc - to cope with.

The revised Plan submitted to the Guildford Borough Council executive committee in April this year, lowering the figure to 185, was far more realistic, but even this would put great pressures on our infrastructure. At the Send Parish Council public meeting at the Lancaster Hall on Tuesday 14th June, Councillors Spooner and Furniss, from GBC, promised that none of this massive development would take place before the infrastructure was in place to cope with it. But we all know how long it takes Governments and County Councils Highway Departments to plan for and actually build new roads, schools etc.

Political promises are much easier to make than keep! I OBJECT to the inclusion of the Garlick's Arch site in this Plan.

I wish this letter to be forwarded to the Government's Planning Inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/551  Respondent: 15238881 / Stephen John Tully  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to disproportionate amount of development in one area of the Borough namely Send, Ripley and Burnt Common areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/553</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 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 building on the Green Belt at Send; Garlick's Arch and Send Hill because it is not justified by any exceptional circumstances, the 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/554</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 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and the surrounding countryside provide the necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.

I will be writing again when I have had more time to consider the plan; the consultation time is inadequate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/656</th>
<th>Respondent: 15241921 / Donald Jolliffe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the proposed development at Send Hill, because I understand that the area for the proposed development would be where there was a landfill and there are pollutants as well as dangerous gases that if released, would cause concern of the health of the people in Send Hill and areas around. I moved to Send Hill so that in my wife's later age she can have a better health. She suffers from Asthma & other breathing problems. I am not happy at all about this proposed site as I believe this proposed plan did not consider peoples views and so is illegal.

There are NO changes I can think of that would work in this area, for the reasons I have mentioned above. I am just a retired man who wants a better quality of life for my wife and myself. If this land is 'worked on' I hope Guildford County Council realizes that there may be serious consequences for the chamber to face.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2691  Respondent: 15251105 / Michael McGrath  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I, my family and many friends, will be directly affected by the many negative impacts that will arise if your local plan as it affects the communities of Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common, is adopted.

I have a number of objections to your local plan and these are covered in the attached signed scanned copy of my letter to your Planning Policy Office, that I have highlighted “TO BE READ BY THE PLANNING INSPECTOR”.

I would appreciate, by reply to this email, your acknowledgement of the receipt of this email and the attached letter.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/612  Respondent: 15253281 / Chris Phillips  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
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 Guildford Borough Council Local Plan, particularly the aspects of the plan that propose removing Green Belt status from Send and Ripley, and building residential and industrial sites (elements A42, A43 and A44), for a number of reasons.

I object, as large parts of Send and Ripley are built on low-lying land that is prone to flooding; building houses, roads or other developments as part of this plan could affect the delicate balance of drainage, and adversely affect all parts of Send and Ripley.

I object, as the current road network in Send and Ripley is quite small, compact, and highly-dependent on the A247 for access to both Woking and Guildford. Any increased development in the area will put more pressure on this road. This road has a number of constrictions, both buildings and waterways, so will be bottlenecks and cause gridlock in the area. Development of the Send Hill site (NUMBER) in particular will place huge pressure on the narrow roads of Send Hill (which is built-up on both sides, with no scope to widen it) and Potters Lane, particularly where they each join the A247 northbound to Woking. Sections of the A247 to the south of Send Hill, on Send Barn Lane, are already prone to partial flooding during heavy rain.

I object, as there are no plans to improve public transport in the area. There are no local railway stations, and the current bus services to Guildford and Woking are very infrequent and expensive; residents in the proposed new houses would be forced to use cars to travel and to commute, putting increased pressure on the roads in the area.

I object, as the plans for industrial estates would adversely affect the area; there would be increased traffic, particularly from HGVs (for which the road network is completely unsuitable), adversely affecting current residents. Industrial sites are just not in keeping with the quiet, rural character of Send and Ripley.
I object, as all of the proposed sites are currently green fields and woodland. I have seen deer, rabbits and other animals on these fields, particularly the site opposite Send Cemetery which has proposed developments, and can not understand why these areas are even being considered for building upon.

I object, as the proposed changes will change the character of Send and Ripley forever. They are tranquil, rural villages, not busy towns; if the residents wanted to live in busy, congested towns, they would not have moved to Send or Ripley. Changing the nature of these villages would be unfair to the current residents. Once Green Belt protection has been removed from these areas, there will be nothing to stop even more development, and they will just become part of the urban sprawl of Guildford and Woking. Is the requirement for further housing in the area more important than protecting the Green Belt?

I object, as there are no clear plans to use the current brownfield sites. Guildford Council should have a register of available brownfield sites; using these would be preferable to eating into precious Greenbelt land.

I object, as the increased traffic and industrial activity will lead to increased pollution (both noise and atmospheric), again this is unfair to the residents who had selected, and expected, a quiet, rural environment.

I object, as there are no plans for increased provision of medical facilities, or schools / colleges, for the extra families who would be living in the proposed new homes. Having moved recently from central Woking to Send, I can personally attest to the effect that the pressure of increased population can have; increased pressure upon local primary schools, waiting a month for a GP’s appointment. Has the effect of the increased population upon current residents been considered?

I object, as some of the proposed areas (particularly Send Hill) have not been included in previous proposals, and so it has not been possible for residents to be consulted with regards to developments in these areas.

I object, as the proposed developments in Send and Ripley account for almost half of all the housing in the current development plan; it seems unfair for Send and Ripley to take such a large proportion of the new homes for the whole of Guildford Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/614  Respondent: 15253537 / Marie-Ann Hillier  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing with regard to final draft local plan, and the objections I have to it.

1) I object to you trying to remove send from the green belt, why remove land that is used by wildlife and locals and acts as a water catchment when it rains, and replace it with concrete? This would be bad socially and environmentally, why ruin such important areas just for money?

2) Similarly I object to you planning to build on garlick's arch, burnt common, again I have environmental concerns, for the existing wildlife, and water catchment and also levels of air pollution, from the massive increase in traffic and builds in the area. Also why add more industrial units, when they are just not required? Lastly, you have not even consulted upon this site and this new massive junction, does the council feel it doesn't have to follow the correct consultation processes?

3) I object to your plans for the land west of winds ridge, again you are trying to skip the consultation process and ruin the green belt. Why kill wildlife, ruin the rain catchment and try to wedge too many houses in an area, with a tiny access road, which will get congested and polluted. There is also the issue of if the build went ahead, the site has been previously
used for landfill, which could possibly lead to future problems for the people who purchase the housing. Lastly why build two travellers pitches, we have no travellers in send, so why would you need to build pitches which are surplus to requirement, plus they would have the same problems as the housing - unsuitable narrow access and existing landfill pollution.

4) I also object to the fact the council has no sound evidence to prove send etc needs all that industrial building, or that amount of homes, where would you find the businesses or people to use all these buildings? Brownfield sites would be a much better option, there would be existing infrastructure, you wouldn't be killing wildlife or ruining the water catchment and the land is already concreted, so it would be better to regenerate 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: PSLPA16/622</th>
<th>Respondent: 15253953 / Olivia Bedworth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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>

GBC Local Area Plan for Ripley, Send and Clandon

Please see below the objections I have to the current plan mentioned above. I believe that the current plan is simply not fit for purpose. Below I set out why I believe this to be the case:

1. I object to the lack of consideration of infrastructure improvement. It does not make any sense to have a plan that effectively merges all villages along the A3 from Wisley to Blackwell Farm. In order to make it sound, very significant infrastructure improvements would need to be made, including, but not restricted to, completely rebuilding the A3/M25 intersection to make it freer flowing and an additional lane to be added to the M25 in either direction. The A3 through Guildford would need to become 3 lanes too, and the junction with the A31 Hog’s Back significant altered / improved.

2. I object to the limited consultation period. The impact of the proposal on the locality is so high that further consultation is necessary.

3. I object to the process. The correct process has not been followed: Regulation 18 should have been followed bearing in mind the significant changes that have been made to the plans, more widely, and specifically at Burntcommon, (Garlick’s Arch policy A43), and at land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill (A44). My understanding is that this invalidates the whole process.

4. I object to the situation being labelled as “exceptional”. There is nothing exceptional about the current situation, and if anything, the Brexit vote should put all development on hold until its impact can be fully assessed. The demand for housing may fall if there is a resulting reversal in immigration trends, and foreign student choosing to come to the UK, for example.

5. I object to the disproportionate amount of development in one part of the borough.

6. I object to the villages of Send, Ripley and Clandon being removed from the Green Belt. Send provides a buffer between Guildford and Woking. None of these villages should be “inset”. The better use of Brownfield sites must be fully explored and exploited.

7. I object to the provision of sound evidence. The reduction in ELNA of 80% since the 2013 survey means that the need for industrial space at Burntcommon is no longer present.

8. I further object (following on) to the plans being based on insufficient evidence of future housing needs. Again, with reference to the huge potential of the Brexit decision.

9. I object to only 2 weeks’ notice being given for the inclusion of new sites in the plan.

10. Finally please explain why the inclusion of 2,000 homes at Wisley is still in the plan despite earlier rejection by the GBC on the grounds that they are unsuitable. This gives me no confidence that a logical and valid process is being followed.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/628  Respondent: 15254465 / Karen Hook  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Here are my reasons:-

1. I OBJECT TO the villages of Ripley, Wisley, Clandon and Send etc being removed from the greenbelt. I OBJECT TO the erosion of the greenbelt in this plan.
2. I OBJECT TO the Garlick's Arch site A43
3. I OBJECT TO site A43a due to increased traffic problems that will potentially be created
4. I OBJECT TO site A45 in order to protect a conservation area.
5. I OBJECT TO site A57 as I believe this to be unlawful.
6. I OBJECT TO the removal of any villages from the greenbelt.
7. I OBJECT TO the excessive quantity of development proposed for this area of the borough.
8. I OBJECT TO last minute addition of new sites at short notice.
9. I OBJECT TO the lack of evidence for housing needs in the proposed areas.
10. I OBJECT TO the lack new schools within the plans to match the level of extra housing.
11. I OBJECT TO the lack of extra Doctors Surgeries within the plans to provide healthcare required for the extra population proposed for the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/646  Respondent: 15256449 / S Withers  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the final draft plans relating to Send and Ripley for the following reasons:

1) I object to the increase in the number of homes being planned which has increased from 185 in April 2016 to 485 and this has been done without any consultation under Regulation 18.
2) I object to the removal of Send and Ripley from the Green Belt. Send provides a strategic buffer between Guildford and Woking with lots of areas which are used for location recreation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2957  Respondent: 15257697 / Deborah allen  Agent:
I object to the proposed removal of Send from the green belt area and to all proposals to build on green belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough when there are adequate brownfield areas to accommodate what is really needed.

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common, this would cause more problems to an already very busy section whereby at peak times will become gridlocked. This would be disastrous for Send and the A247. The noise and pollution levels are already harsh for those living in the area. Send would be taking traffic from the proposed new houses at Wisley, Gosden Hill, Burpham and Blackwell Farm with a lot of this traffic coming through the village to and from the A3 and M25.

I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlicks Arch. This proposal only recently became known to the residents of Send without any prior consultation. The infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with the proposed housing levels. Our roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope. Industrial space is not needed and if it was could be accommodated on the Slyfield industrial estate as was originally proposed and would not impact anything else that wasn’t already affected.

I object to the building of another 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery as Tannery Lane. These roads cannot take anymore traffic and the junction with Send Road is already dangerous as it is quite a blind spot and will be made much worse. Already planning permission has been given for 64 apartments and a marina which is going to generate additional traffic.

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. The cemetery has been extended on Send Hill and this will make for more traffic in any event. This area needs to remain as a peaceful area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

- I object to Send village being removed from the surrounding green belt potentially removing the buffer between Guildford and Woking towns.
- I object to 40 houses and two travellers pitches squished into a small area of beautiful grass and woodland alongside the narrowest part of the lane further away from the village amenities.
- I object to 45 dwellings on clockbarn nursery in another narrow country lane
- I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common adding considerable traffic passing through Send and Ripley village roads.
- I object to considerable development at Garlick’s arch adding considerable pressure on all services schools and further congestion in a rural area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Re: proposed developments in Send and a new interchange onto the A3

I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford and I particularly to the building on the Green Belt at Send at Garlick's Arch, Clockbam Nurseries and Send Hill because it is not justified by any special circumstances. In act that area of Green Belt is meant to be pennant and not continually eroded.

I object to the exaggerated "housing need" figure of 13,860 which is far too high and results in the completely unnecessary development of the Green Belt. The way students, economic need and affordability are calculated inflates the housing need. I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford's urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.

I object 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.

In fact I object to all the proposed sites in Send because, not least 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. We were promised there would be no major changes made to the 2016 draft plan by the Leader of the Council.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/659  Respondent: 15260865 / K M Pearmain  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
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 density of housing proposed for Send as there is not the infrastructure to support such development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/666  Respondent: 15262305 / L J Crane  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have concerns over the strain the additional proposals will place on local resources. The roads in the surrounding area will not be able to cope with the addition of some 800 vehicles of local traffic. It is also my belief that the current local surgery will be overstretched with the addition of houses proposed causing a backlash for current residents.

I OBJECT to the removal of 15 villages, including Ripley and Send, from the green belt. This will lead to wholesale, and often inappropriate developments.

I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have not followed the correct process for Send and Ripley developments. Any significant changes to the 2014 proposals, such as the proposal development of Garlicks Arch, should have required another full consultation, which did not happen. This invalidates the whole process.

I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have failed to provide sound evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment which shows that industrial space at Burnt Common IS NO LONGER NEEDED.

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 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.

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 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 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 Envirosearch 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:
I object strongly to GBC's proposal to desimate the countryside surrounding Send Village by removing it from the Green Belt. I cannot believe that as a clear election promise to preserve and protect the Green Belt you now propose to renege on that promise. It would appear you have no special circumstance to justify abandoning the National Planning Policy Framework which was intended as permanent and you now propose to ride roughshod through Ancient Woodland.

I object strongly to the suggestion that GBC are in fact taking the building responsibilities intended for Woking BC I find that a particularly sinister practice.

I object strongly to the fact that you, GBC have changed every major site in Send proposed for development since 2014 and now you have just added a huge new road junction. As you have made significant changes to your original and amended proposals, your current changes now require another full consultation not the short cut of regulation 19 which GBC are now trying slide this proposal through on.

I object to the fact that GBC have refused to disclose the calculations regarding Guildfords housing requirement, the proposal to build 400 houses on Garlicks Arch (a site that floods, and ancient woodland) and 7000sq meters of industrial space is clearly ridiculous and it has been suggested the beginning of GBC to merge Guildford to Woking. Once you remove the Green belt from our Villages you know the developers will desimate our homes, needlessly. you have perfectly adequate accommodation for the proposed industrial space available at Slyfield Industrial Estate inconveniencing no homeowners.

I object to the fact that your proposed building on Clockbarn Nursery and Send Hill are currently served by narrow and twisty lanes. Tannery Lane (Clockbarn Nursery) cannot take anymore traffic the junction is already dangerous. Likewise, Send Hill is inappropriate not only because of the single access country road providing insufficient access but also because the subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is registered at GBC.

I object to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common as an already busy road, often gridlocked during rush hours, would have to take the traffic from the proposed new GBC building at Wisley, Burpham and Blackwell Farm we simply cannot support it and the noise and pollution levels would be unmanageable and possibly dangerous.

Our infrastructure is already stretched, you have alternative available sites and I find your trudging through the Green Belt and your sinister handling of this planning proposal, unacceptable. I object to the fact that Guildford and Surrey County Council own brownfield sites which would accommodate your plans.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Navigation up to the boundary fence with Vision Engineering and Land to the left of the cart bridge going up to the old depot on the Wey Navigation. So the council can concrete over the whole area of Ripley Send and Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3855   Respondent: 15274241 / Chris Finden-Browne   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the overall impact upon Send on the grounds that the local infrastructure impact will be massively detrimental, and would strain its capabilities and capacity to beyond breaking point. The main road through Send (A247) is already overloaded for considerable durations during morning and evening rush hours: there is extremely limited capacity for additional volume. The area is already highly prone to flooding - significant loss of open land (to tarmac, concrete and buildings) and of trees will exacerbate the flooding risk and occurrences. There are specific infrastructure impact implications which are covered in the individual points below.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1830   Respondent: 15274305 / Samuel Sheppard   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I live in Send Marsh and the proposed local plan will directly affect the quality of life in this area. In my particular area, Manor Road, we have already been subjected to so-called developers who purchased a large field behind us from the company CEMEX and as part of an apparent land-bank scheme sold 20+ plots to people who may or may not have realised that the land was Green Belt. The result of that of course was that the land is no longer managed (as it had been previously by a local farmer) and it is just a mass of very long grass, dandelions, buttercups and rag wort. Despite the attempts of the developer and the new owners of plots to frustrate the residents of Manor Road and others who live adjacent to the field, we managed to secure a prescriptive right around the perimeter of the field for the use of the local community, dog walkers etc. The developer was promising a grand residential estate – on Green Belt, with no sewage, road facilities or other infrastructure – and of course because of the current law there is no planning permission to build on the field. This field is included in the local plan. I OBJECT to the inclusion of this field in the local plan as an area of potential development because it will fly in the face of the current law protecting the Green Belt (which the current government pledged to protect); it would create untold traffic chaos for Send Marsh Road and the roads around Send Marsh Green; building the infrastructure and facilities needed to provide for further homes would cause extensive disruption and damage to local amenities such that life here would become intolerable.

In relation to the local plan overall:

1. I OBJECT to the removal of Send Village from the green belt. As I understand it the the Green Belt was intended to be permanent (National Planning Policy Framework) unless there are special circumstances in a particular area to deviate from that principle. There are no special circumstances justifying ripping up the Green Belt around Send. Send has an ancient history; it is in the Domesday Book and should be entitled to protection from the destruction of its village character. Why do people choose to live in Send, Send Marsh, Ripley,
Clandon and other similar villages in Surrey? It is because of the quality of life afforded by the beauty and tranquillity of the Green Belt, which if built upon and built upon will be lost forever. We have a duty to protect it for future generations. Local government and central government have a duty to protect the Green Belt and honour their election promises. Removing Send from the Green Belt, and indeed Ripley and Clandon, would inevitably lead to the creation of a large conurbation linking these villages directly, in physical terms, to Guildford and Woking and thus destroying the villages in the process.

1. **I OBJECT** to the proposed building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because there is inadequate access and traffic volume would increase to an unmanageable level. Tannery Lane is a narrow and twisty country road and could not accommodate a large increase in traffic. The junction with the main road is hazardous and would become more so with increased traffic. The recent planning go-ahead for apartments at the Tannery and the marina by the Wey Navigation will already create added traffic volume. Allowing more development will multiply that to a level with which the area could not cope.

1. **I OBJECT** to building 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch opposite Send Marsh Road. Slyfield is already an industrial site and could easily accommodate the further space proposed. I am not persuaded that sufficient consideration has been given to brownfield sites for any further development. Garlick’s Arch is covered in ancient woodland, which would suffer as a result of development. Send Marsh Road is already a busy road, particularly in school term time as it is effectively a rat run which becomes gridlocked in the mornings. This proposal in the Local Plan will exacerbate the traffic problem to an unacceptable level. Algorithms and mathematical equations used to predict housing needs in the future are all very well, but predictions may or may not come true. Nobody except the consultants who did the calculations know the methodology used to arrive at their prediction. What exact considerations did they take into account? For example, what about Brexit? Everyone predicted the UK would remain in the EU but the opposite happened. Now that we have embarked on this disastrous road to Brexit what of the European companies based in Guildford, for example. Are they going to remain? Are European students still going to flock to Surrey University? Major Tim Peake, the British astronaut, recently expressed serious concern about the future of science in the UK after Brexit. Surrey University is a leading university in science and technology, particularly space science. If science declines, if foreign investment declines and companies leave the UK and foreign students no longer come to Surrey to study surely the housing and employment needs will be greatly reduced.

1. **I OBJECT** to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers’ pitches at Send Hill. The narrow country road is inadequate for access. I understand the site contains unsafe landfill waste. Further it is a valued local amenity area which further development will spoil.

1. **I OBJECT** to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. This proposal by definition would mean that Send would become the traffic conduit to and from the A3, the M25, Guildford and Woking. Send Road, already bearing heavy traffic at peak times would become gridlocked. And if proposals for 2000 homes at Wisley Airfield, 2000 homes at Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm were to get the go-ahead the problems of traffic, noise pollution and air pollution would be increased to wholly unacceptable levels.

To conclude: My objections are not based on NIMBYism but on genuine concern for the rural heritage of this area. There are things, even in this so-called modern world, worth preserving and the Green Belt is right at the top of the list. Destroying the Green Belt by allowing this Local Plan to go forward with its current proposals for development would, in my view, be a wholly retrograde step, which once carried out, would be irreversible. Surely development for future housing and employment needs can be achieved without the wholesale destruction of the Green Belt surrounding the Surrey villages of Guildford Borough.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Green Belt, Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15

Send Business Park now taken out of the Green Belt altogether

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is a historic, time evolved development in an area of natural countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation. A beautiful area demonstrating the past growth of Send.
- The access road from either Send or Ripley/Send Marsh is completely unsuitable for a higher volume of traffic. (Single track)
- The existing development blends with the nature of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The site is located within partly within the existing village boundary and partly within the proposed site boundary of Send, near to all the village amenities in a sustainable location. The site is outside of the Flood Plain and would provide access to adjoining properties and facilitate a larger allocation of land suitable for residential development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  Send90-92 Potters Lane Send.pdf (36 KB)

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/759  Respondent:  15284577 / Helen Whiley  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to make known my objections to the local development plan that is currently under consideration. I feel very strongly that the plan will impact negatively our village in terms of safety, quality of life, and environmental reasons. Specifically, I object as follows:

1. I object that the Green Belt will be compromised by this plan. The area between Woking and Guildford needs preserving so that there is an area of countryside separating them to prevent the sprawl of development for us, and future generations.
2. I object that the tranquil area of the Green Belt at Send should be preserved so that residents of Woking and Guildford, and indeed our village, can enjoy the benefits of the beautiful countryside and all the benefits that being around nature brings to them. We moved to this area a year ago in the understanding that we were to be living in certain environment. We paid a premium to live here and now that way of life, and investment are at risk.
3. I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. This increase in traffic along the A247 would be disastrous. This road is a minor road really and is already congested much of the time. Trying to cross this road with children, dogs, or indeed for my neighbour who is frail, is a nightmare even with the traffic we have now.
4. I also object to the development plan as this would increase traffic along our road, Potters Lane, and this is a major safety issue. People leave the A3 and many speed along our road, which is supposed to have a 30 mile an hour limit where we live. At the A3 end of Potters lane, it is very narrow and it is very dangerous with cars and big lorries coming at speed after leaving a major highway and finding themselves on a minor, twisting country lane. Traffic entering Send Hill at Potters Lane is problematic too. It is a very narrow lane and cannot tolerate more traffic. At the New Inn end of Potters Lane, residents have to park on the road leaving only one lane for traffic to pass one another. Huge lorries find themselves here and have to go up on to the pavement putting pedestrians, including the elderly, the frail and disabled, dogs, and property at risk. The Potters Lane exit from the A3 should be closed. It is dangerous.
5. I object to the development at Send and Garlick’s Arch for a large number of houses and industrial development. There was hardly any notice of the inclusion of this. This area also is a site of ancient woodland and as such is a very precious site that should be cared for and preserved for future generations.
6. I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill. As mentioned above, this location is on a very narrow road and will be a disaster for the area in terms of traffic and spoiling the beautiful countryside. We use this countryside daily to walk our dogs and is one of the reasons we moved to this area. This area is in the Green Belt and is a precious commodity to local people and those from nearby urbanised areas that come to the area for a break from the stresses of urban life.

Please consider my concerns and objections above.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
This email is to state my OBJECTIONS to the proposed changes to the Draft Local Plan which would affect my village of Send drastically.

I feel that despite a local swell of objections from people directly affected by the proposed changes, GBC have not listened to the people and insist on planning for our village to be ruined. I feel that our village has been targeted disproportionately for development by Guildford Borough Council. My future votes will reflect my feelings on this matter.

The village of Send is already congested with traffic. We live on Potters Lane and it is only a matter of time before speeding traffic coming off the A3 will cause an accident on our lane. Any further development to the area will worsen our situation here. Huge lorries have to drive up on to the pavement and risk hurting someone all the time. This junction should be closed!

I object to the Green Belt, Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15 - Send Business to be removed from the Green Belt because:

1. The increase in traffic along Tannery Lane would increase on this narrow lane and this road is already overused even with the existing development.

2. The existing buildings fit into the landscape and are now part of the countryside there (we walk there extensively with the dogs) but to increase the amount of space and the nature of its construction would be incongruous to the area and spoil the beautiful river landscape. We do not want further building here to ruin a slice of nature that is beneficial to everyone who lives nearby.

The above reflect some of my objections to the proposed changes to the plan. Please consider these and the views of other residents and please do not target our village unduly. We have a right to have our village preserved and it is only fair that development is spread over the area, not just to us.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/778  Respondent: 15292193 / John and Fiona Gilbert  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Forsaking Green Belt & The Local Plan**

Before getting to the nub of this e-mail, let me first explain why my wife and I are perhaps in a more tangible position than most others who are in equal measure literally up-in-arms of the above twin proposals.

In short, we have just recently returned to live in Ripley after only two years away and what we have immediately noticed is the substantial increase in traffic. This factor is not only due to a number of brown-fill sites that have been cleverly utilised as much needed dwellings but also due to the seemingly insatiable effects of living nearby to our capital. The term supply and demand fits the bill perfectly.
Thankfully, at the moment Ripley, Send and their neighbouring communities are just about able to cope. Of course at peak periods traffic becomes tiresome but that is a problem for the South-East in general and is not unique. Having made this point however, should no further invitation be made to developers, within the next five to ten years or so we shall nevertheless experience deadlock. A five-year plan to negate this forthcoming problem should be on your agenda now and not the unwise invitation to build upon the green belt that the twin proposals offer.

To close this issue, most reasonable, free-thinking councillors who are not manacled by political dogma will agree. And, please do not simply place these comments in the filing cabinet marked ‘not in my back yard,’ for to do so would be a gross distortion of the truth and unworthy!

We will now bullet-point our objections.

1. We object to Send Village being removed from the green belt. It would amount to both folly and chaos.
2. We object to any further development at Clockbarn Nursery. The roads are simply unsuitable and traffic danger would follow.
3. We object to the unreasonable proposals to over develop Garlick’s Arch. In part, the area acts as a flood plain. What folly it would be to hinder this essential environmental aid.
4. We object to any development to Send Hill. Forty new dwellings and two travellers’ pitches would again cause traffic chaos and spoil this idyllic and peaceful area. Do remember that some of the area is land-fill and that many years ago our forefathers chose in-part to home a church and a cemetery. Let those that are buried there rest in peace.
5. We object to the proposal to use the opening of the A3 interchange as a hostage. We are aware that this is a bargaining tool for the over development of the old Wisley airfield and the idea is in our layman’s view rather underhand.

Finally, please do not harbour and rancour or malice as we are well aware of the pressure you are all having from our political masters, especially in this so-called period of austerity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---
Comment ID: PSLPA16/806  Respondent: 15297217 / Elizabeth White  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
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 the result such a development would have on local schools and GP surgeries.
• I object to the increased traffic that would result from the Garlicks Arch development and the on/off ramp at Burnt Common.
• I object to any removal of villages in the Green Belt.
• I object to inappropriate and massive over development of sites such as Wisley Airfield and Gosden Hill Farm.
• I object to site A45 The Talbot - over development in a conservation area
• I object to the lack of evidence for the alleged housing need numbers.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---
Comment ID: PSLPA16/822  Respondent: 15298913 / Natalie Stevenson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

---
We are writing to you to express our objection to the following plans for Send Village and the surrounding area:

We object to Send village being removed from the Green Belt:

As Send residents, we object to our village being removed from the Green Belt. The Green Belt was intended to be permanent and we have received local election assurances that promised this would be the case. Clearly this promise will not be upheld if the LP goes ahead. Our Green Belt is any area of natural beauty and keeps the towns of Woking and Guildford separate, divided by locally valued countryside.

We object to the building of 45 new houses at Clockbarn Nursery:

The access to this site is via Tannery Lane, a narrow single track country lane that is not designed for volumes of traffic. Planning permission has already been given for a number of apartments and a marina. This road will struggle to cope with the increase of traffic associated with these developments. Further traffic down this road will greatly increase the risk of accidents. The junction with Send Road is also already dangerous for drivers and cyclists joining the main road.

We object to the building of 400 houses and a 7,000sq metre industrial space at Garlick's Arch:

This Green Belt site is prone to flooding. Send has several flood plains which help keep our houses dry during exceptionally wet winters. By filling such a large site with an enormous base of concrete, this will surely put local residents at a higher risk of flooding - including the new proposed homes. It's essential that brownfield sites are utilised to their full potential before a Green Belt site is even considered. Expansion at Slyfield is one possibility for increasing industrial space in the borough.

We object to the building of 40 new homes and 2 traveller's pitches at Send Hill:

This location is accessed via narrow roads that make access for a volume of traffic hazardous. The roads are totally unsuitable for large vehicles such as caravans. This site also contains unsafe landfill waste (which Guildford Council is aware of) and is also an area of beautiful countryside. We believe this site should not be disturbed.

We object to a new interchange with Burntcommon and the A3:

This new interchange would have to handle the traffic for the huge number of proposed houses at Wisey Airfiled, Blackwell Farm, Burpham and Gosden Hill. Much of this traffic to and from the A3 would pass through Send. The road that runs directly past our house (Send Road) would become congested during rush hour and pollution and noise levels would increase significantly. This road is already very busy and current noise and pollution levels are already excessive.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
We Object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane is totally unsuitable due to lane being narrow and the junction to Send Road is already dangerous.

We Object to building 400 hundred houses on Garlick's Arch.

We Object to 40 houses and two travellers pitches in Send Hill.

We Object to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because of the extra traffic this will bring to the roads in Send which are already overloaded.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/865  Respondent: 15301953 / A Smithers  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1) I OBJECT to Send village being taken out of the Green Belt, the Green Belt was intended to be permanent and should remain so.

2) I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, Tanner Lane is far too narrow and the junction with Send Road very hazardous. Planning permission has been granted for 64 apartments at the Tannery site and for the marina both of which will add to more heavy traffic through the village.

3) I OBJECT to building 400 houses and industrial space at the Garlick Arches. The area is totally unsuitable for houses as the land floods and is also covered by ancient woodland.

4) I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill again the road is too narrow with single access.

5) I OBJECT to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common, again Send would have to take extra traffic through the village, which would become gridlocked. noise pollution levels are already at excessive levels and would worsen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/866  Respondent: 15302049 / Rebecca Green  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I was upset by and strongly object to send being removed from Green Belt status. This will permanently alter the character of the village and will only open the way for yet more building development in the future. We live in Send and love the fact it is surrounded by fields which gives it its rural status. With building on the Green Belt land our village feel
and status will be irreversibly lost. Green Belt is exactly what it says it is and is there to protect the nature of places, provide open green spaces and enhance the lives of those that live there. Once lost, it is gone forever!

I am concerned and strongly object to the way Guildford Borough Council have tried to 'sneak' these plans through without proper consultation.

Significant changes legally require full consultation under Regulation 18. Since the last consultation major development proposals have been added to the plans and the council are obviously trying to quietly push them through. The 2014 proposal for 430 houses went down to 185 in April 2016. These have now gone up to 485! Every major site proposed for development in Send has been changed and a massive new road junction added on. I am disappointed in the council's underhanded approach to the people of Send.

Send already struggles with the large amount of traffic driving through the village which of ten results in long queues and tail backs. The infrastructure will not be able to cope with all these new build proposals. You cannot just take a small village and dump hundreds of houses and large industrial developments onto it and expect it to work. There are not enough school places, it is already extremely difficult to get a doctor's appointment at the medical centre, the roads will be permanently grid locked and the status of village and village life will be gone forever. We do not wish to be an extension of Guildford but wish to remain a separate village with our own identity.

I strongly object to policy A43.30ha Land at Garlick's Arch. There is no need for more houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed by the borough. It is Green Belt protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. It is covered in ancient woodland with trees dating back to the 16th century and once lost, is lost forever. The latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. Therefore the proposed industrial development of 7000sq m is not needed. The obvious place for any new industrial development is at Slyfield, Guildford - an industrial site already set up and running. There would then be no need to have to build a new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this industrial development. Surely saving money!

I strongly object to 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 narrow 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 take away 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?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/868</th>
<th>Respondent: 15303457 / Hannah Green</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 was upset by and strongly object to Send being removed from Green Belt status. This will permanently alter the character of the village and will only open the way for yet more building development in the future. We live in Send and love the fact it is surrounded by fields which gives it its rural status. With building on the Green Belt land our village feel and status will be irreversibly lost. Green Belt is exactly what it says it is and is there to protect the nature of places, provide open green spaces and enhance the lives of those that live there. Once lost, it is gone forever!

I am concerned and strongly object to the way Guildford Borough Council have tried to 'sneak' these plans through without proper consultation. Significant changes legally require full consultation under Regulation 18. Since the last consultation major development proposals have been added to the plans and the council are obviously trying to quietly push them through.

The 2014 proposal for 430 houses went down to 185 in April 2016. These have now gone up to 485! Every major site proposed for development in Send has been changed and a massive new road junction added on. I am disappointed in the councils' underhanded approach to the people of Send.

Send already struggles with the large amount of traffic driving through the village which often results in long queues and tail backs. The infrastructure will not be able to cope with all these new build proposals. You cannot just take a small village and dump hundreds of houses and large industrial developments onto it and expect it to work. There are not enough school places, it is already extremely difficult to get a doctor's appointment at the medical centre, the roads will be permanently grid locked and the status of village and village life will be gone forever. We do not wish to be an extension of Guildford but wish to remain a separate village with our own identity.

I strongly object to policy A43.30ha Land at Garlick's Arch. There is no need for more houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed by the borough. It is Green Belt protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. It is covered in ancient woodland with trees dating back to the 16th century and once lost, is lost forever. The latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. Therefore the proposed industrial development of 7000sq m is not needed. The obvious place for any new industrial development is at Slyfield, Guildford - an industrial site already set up and running. There would then be no need to have to build a new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this industrial development. Surely saving money!

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. Add yet more houses and traveller pitches (with caravans) will make this junction impossible to cope and dangerous. Send Hill is a narrow 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 take away 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?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/354  Respondent: 15303457 / Hannah Green  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:
- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding natural beauty which will be lost forever with
I was saddened by and strongly object to Send being removed from Green Belt status. This will permanently alter the character of the village and will open the way for yet more building development in the future. One of the main reasons we have chosen to live in Send is the fact it is surrounded by fields which gives it its rural status. With building on the Green Belt land our village feel arid status will be irreversibly lost. Green Belt is exactly what it says it is and is there to protect the nature of places, provide open green spaces and enhance the lives of those that live there. Once lost, it is lost forever!

I am very concerned and strongly object to the way Guildford Borough Council have tried to get these plans through without, in my opinion, proper consultation. Significant changes legally require full consultation under Regulation 18. Since the last consultation major development proposals have been added to the plans and the council are obviously trying to quietly push them through. The 2014 proposal for 430 houses went down to 185 in April 2016. These have now gone up to 485! Every major site proposed for development in Send has been changed and a massive new road junction added on. I am disappointed in the councils' approach which has been very underhanded and dishonest to the people of Send.

As you may appreciate, Send already struggles with the large amount of traffic driving through the village which often results in long queues and tail backs. The longest part of my commute to work in Guildford is actually getting out the village of Send in the morning. The infrastructure will not be able to cope with all these new build proposals. There are not enough school places, it is already extremely difficult to get a doctor's appointment at the medical centre, the roads will be grid locked and the status of village and village life will be gone forever. We do not wish to be an extension of Guildford but wish to remain a separate village with our own identity.

I was shocked by and 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. This 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: Adding yet more houses and traveller pitches (with caravans) will make this junction impossible to cope and dangerous. Send Hill is a narrow width single track country road and certainly not built for so much extra daily traffic.

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?

Attached documents:
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 affecting Send on the following grounds:

1. **I 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.

2. **I OBJECT** to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.

3. **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.

4. **I OBJECT** to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

5. **I OBJECT** to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

6. **I OBJECT** to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

7. **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.

8. **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.

9. **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 also want to object to your hypocritical comments in your published newspaper regarding support for the green belt whilst simultaneously proposing to remove so many local villages from its protection.

Please ensure my objections are shown to the Planning Inspector and also provide confirmation that this objection has been received.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions - this road is already quite dangerous as it is single track in a number of places
• Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/425  Respondent: 15312769 / Norah Johnson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object 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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/915  Respondent: 15314561 / Sophie Burrows  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to add my support to the objections of local residents to the proposed development of various areas of Send Village.

Please find my objections below:

• I OBJECT to all erosion of the green belt
• I OBJECT to site A43 Garlick’s Arch that is proposing 400 new houses
  ○ The site is often prone to flooding
  ○ There is already huge amounts of pressure on the Send doctors surgery in attaining appointments, this will only make it worse
  ○ There is also lack of places available at local schools
  ○ Traffic is already always bad through Send dip, this is only going to get worse. I work in Guildford town centre, only a few miles away from Send however this often takes over 20 minutes to only reach the A3 at Burntcommon due to heavy traffic
• I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers’ pitches at Send Hill
  ○ This is an extremely inappropriate location
• I OBJECT to 45 new houses being built at Clockbarn Nursery
  ○ This also is an inappropriate location due to the large amounts of traffic, and inadequate access. With the 60 or so apartments already granted permission, this will enhance traffic greatly. The area cannot take any more increases in traffic
• I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common
This is already prone to huge amounts of traffic and congestion, this would only increase. Noise and pollution is already an issue around this area

- I OBJECT to site A45 The Talbot
- This is overdevelopment in a conservation area
- I OBJECT to the limited consultation period
- I OBJECT to the lack of immediate provision for new schools

I hope you take my objections into consideration and that they are passed on to the appropriate councillors.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/916  Respondent: 15314593 / Chris Cornelius  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. The green belt was intended to be permanent, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, and there are no special circumstances to justify abandoning it.

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of inadequate access and traffic volume in the lane. Tannery Lane is too narrow and twisty to take any more traffic and the junction onto Send Road is already dangerous.

I object to building 400 houses and 7000 sq meters of industrial space at Garlicks Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. Industrial space is not needed in the village and additional traffic in the village will be unsafe.

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burntcommon, Send village cannot cope with the extra traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at the Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. Send Road will become gridlocked, noise and pollution levels are already too high and will increase and the road will be unsafe for our children to walk near.

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. It is an inappropriate location because of the narrow width of single access country road with insufficient access. Any development would spoil beautiful countryside and kill off our wonderful wildlife.

Please leave our beautiful village and Green Belt alone, 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: PSLPA16/930  Respondent: 15315169 / E Palla  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to send village being removed from the Green Belt. I object to all building in Tannery Lane it is far too narrow.
I object 40 houses and travellers pitch at Send Hill, I object to all building in our green and pleasant village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/243  Respondent: 15320673 / Rosie Beauvais  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I agree that more affordable housing is required all around the Surrey area, however Send has been disproportionately targeted and will result in the destruction of a village and the surrounding Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/956  Respondent: 15323905 / Kerri Herbst  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

TO: LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION, GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

I OBJECT to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. The Green Belt was intended to be permanent and there are no special circumstances abandoning it. Local councillors and central government gave a clear election promise to protect the green belt and this reneges on this.

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of inadequate access and traffic volume. The junction with Send road is already dangerous for vehicles trying to join the main road. Planning permission has previously been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina both of which will generate additional heavy traffic.

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sqm of Industrial space at Garlicks Arch opposite Send marsh Road. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial space is not needed but if it were it should be at Slyfield. Slyfield also has many vacant industrial units.

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.]

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.

I request that my list of objections and comments are shown to the Planning Inspector and would like to receive confirmation that this communication has been received.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Re: Objections to GBC Submission Local Plan (June 2016)

We STRONGLY OBJECT to the removal of Send, Ripley and Clandon plus sites at Wisley Airfield and Garlick's Arch. There are NO EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES for Garlick's Arch to be removed (Policy 2) when there is an existing brown field site at Burnt Common.

The disproportionate number of new houses (13,860) is totally unsustainable, local villages will be irreparably damaged and do not require these houses. All local schools and medical services are almost at capacity. There are inadequate bus services and the nearest main line stations are Guildford or Woking so the majority of journeys will be made by car.

Local village roads all ready suffer with too much traffic and are narrow, in poor condition and without footpaths, with 5,000 more houses this unsustainable and potentially dangerous.

Insufficient account has been given to the flood risk (Policy P4) at the site of Garlick's Arch which was classified by the Environment Agency as higher than the council assessment. There have been several floods in recent years and destruction of ancient woodland and wildlife habitats at this site is unacceptable.

WE STRONGLY OBJECT to this huge number of houses which is totally unbalanced and could see the small villages merged to become an urban sprawl and a catastrophic destruction of the character of the area.

In conclusion:- WE STRONGLY OBJECT TO

- Lack of infrastructure i.e. local services, utilities, sewerage, doctor and schools (both almost at capacity)
- Traffic congestion with greater levels of air pollution
- Flooding risk
- Medical/police emergency services capabilities
- Destruction of green fields, wildlife habitats, ancient woodland and character of areas
- Catastrophic destruction and merging of small villages

Please carefully and fully take into consideration these objections and accordingly amend the local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to any building in Send and local areas on Green Belt Land. Causing more traffic congestion and the destruction of wildlife to the countryside and the village of Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. **Building on Current Green Belt land:** I OBJECT to the proposed development sites current Green Belt sites at Clockbarn Nurseries, Garlick’s Arch, and Send Hill since there are no special or exceptional circumstances which justify removal of their Green Belt status.

3. **Due process:** I OBJECT to the proposed development sites at Clockbarn Nurseries, Garlick’s Arch, and Send Hill since they were not included in the previous Draft Local Plan consultation exercise in 2014. Send sites were all substantially changed without the proper two-stage process of consultation being followed, unlike the rest of the Guildford Borough.

4. **Traffic levels and associated environmental issues:** I OBJECT to the proposed Burnt Common interchange that will increase both traffic movement levels through the Parish and the level of traffic related pollutants over wide areas in the Parish.

5. **Housing Numbers:** I OBJECT to development of sites at Clockbarn Nurseries, Garlick’s Arch, and Send Hill since the number of houses proposed (485 + 2 traveller pitches) will increase the number of houses in Send by 25% which is incompatible with maintaining Send’s current rural nature.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/990  
**Respondent:** 15326977 / Jane Gaines  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

We would like to object in the strongest possible terms to the various proposed developments in and around the areas of Send and Ripley.

Whilst we are all aware that new homes are needed, the scale and the questionable way in which these developments have been introduced into the planning timetable leads us to believe that the prime concern of the Council is not the welfare of existing residents.

Too much unbalanced development shouts off the list of proposals. If all of these developments were give the green light, the strain on road congestion, schooling and doctors' surgeries would be overwhelming.

The Green Belt is there for a very important purpose. It is not there for Local Authorities to abuse by taking chunks out of it to meet spurious building targets.

All of the proposals the Council have listed are contentious but for our part the A43 Garlicks Arch development is a classic example of the Council's doubtful conduct by dangling an additional slip-road off the A3 in the hope that will appease the residents.

It will not.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1051  
**Respondent:** 15341441 / Gillian Thorpe  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**
The 4 policies (A42/A43/A43a and A44) are totally unacceptable for the village and there are far more suitable places for development, especially within Guildford and therefore I suggest GBC considers alternative sites. Send cannot cope with the level of development proposed and any development will have a detrimental effect on the local community and environment.

Please can I request that my comments are shown to the Planning Inspector who will decide on the proposed developments in Send and the surrounding area.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1053</th>
<th>Respondent: 15341665 / Phil Moody</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 feel it my duty to object to your current plans to this area. I object to the proposal in the local plans on the grounds that Send Hill is a single track country road and therefore would be far too narrow to accommodate the additional traffic your proposed plans would bring, it would also make parking for visitors very restricted and dangerous for children or in my case grandchildren. I also object to the blatant disregard for the respect of green belt policy that needs to be addressed or we will lose the beauty of OUR countryside not only in Send but in other areas that are close to us. I would like to request confirmation of these objections.</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: pslp173/149</th>
<th>Respondent: 15341985 / William Walker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposal to Inset Send Business Park from Green Belt because:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is extremely restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions. Further development at this location would detract from the openness of the Green Belt and is totally inappropriate and uncalled for.</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: pslp173/562</th>
<th>Respondent: 15348481 / Donna Styles</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

---

**Section page number**
Page 306 of 409

**Document page number**
1365
I object 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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1098  Respondent: 15350497 / Eleanor Smith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to to object to Send village being removed from the Green Belt. I also wish to object to the development of 40 houses and 2 traveller pitches on Send Hill. The location is inappropriate because of the narrow width of the road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/355  Respondent: 15356513 / Anthony Gatford  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4) I object to the proposal to Inset Send Business Park from Green Belt because:
There is extremely restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions. Further development at this location would detract from the openness of the Green Belt and is totally inappropriate and uncalled for.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/357  Respondent: 15356833 / Carolyn Gatford  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4) I object to the proposal to Inset Send Business Park from Green Belt because:
There is extremely restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions. Further development at this location would detract from the openness of the Green Belt and is totally inappropriate and uncalled for.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPA16/1143  Respondent: 15366721 / Sylvia Newton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Consideration

None At All - for residents in the areas chosen for houses, industrial buildings and building of new 4 way on/off rampsto A3 at Burnt-Common

No Common Sense.

I strongly object. To the 2016 Draft Local Plan

Conservatism

None. It was Promised Nothing on Green Belt.

I strongly Object

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1150  Respondent: 15368225 / V.A. Lazenby  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This morning it has taken me seven minutes to get out of Sanger Drive onto the main road, so you can imagine what it will be like for me if you allow all these extra houses to be built.

So I object to Policy A43 30km of land at Garlicks Arch, particularly as this was not mentioned at the last meeting in Send I attended, an dthe thought of 400 more houses, probably with two cars each, fills me with horror.

I also object to Policy A44 1.9km Land on Send Hill - again more houses and again a new proposal and the narrow roads to approach the site are certainly not suitable access for a travellers pitch!!

I wish these objectives to be seem by the inspector and also wish to object to send being removed from the Green Belt as it is a buffer zone between Guilford and Woking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1155  Respondent: 15368321 / P. Miller  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would Just like you to know that I STRONGLY OBJECT:

To take away our Green Belt in Send

To the Green Belt being built on at Send, Garlick Arch, Send Hill and Clockburn Nurseries as I was told we would have the Green Belt Permanently that is why I bought our Bungalow in Send so we all can enjoy it.

To the amount of housing that is needed 13,860 with this amount needed you would have to use the Green belt I say NO

To ALL in Send and Surrounding areas why can you not use the Brownfield area around Guildford. Not in Send

Also to the interchanging onto the A3 at Burnt Common as we have a lot of traffic now. So with this we would be at a standstill and make Send like a car park in the Rush Hour. Also Send would be used as a cut through to the A3 and M25 also the A247. Why cant you use Slyfield for the industrial space

To the site of Garlicks Arch which is known for flooding in the area

To the 45 houses at chockbarn. How are we able to take the traffic through tannery lane as it is to narrow. this road would not take the extra traffic

I object to this site on Send Hill as it has a lot of Green Belt and it is an area of Beautiful Countryside also it was used for land fill years ago and I know there was unsafe waste put in this site. Also to have 2 travellers pitches included there is insufficient acces to this and will also encourage more travellers to park themselves on this site. NOT HAPPY

The GBC has not identified the sufficient Brownfield sites around Guildford, Send, Wisley, Horsley. This will destroy the open amenities of teh Greenbelt also the A3 will end up Gridlocked and the surrounding areas, they are Bad Now so what would happen with all the extra traffic. I wish to breath in FRESH AIR NOT FUMES FROM THE EXTRA TRAFFIC

To the inadequate requirements for the infrastructure of our Village. How will the schools and doctors cope with all this extra traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attatched documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPA16/1159</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15368321 / P. Miller</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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? ( )

I am Objecting to ALL of the plans in and around Send village. Due to eg:

Taking away Green Belt which would destroy all of the lovely countryside Green Belt is meant to be Permenant.

The extra traffic which the Roads and Lanes will not take the extra traffic. Also the schools and the doctors we are having problems now so it will not be able to take these extra persons.

To the 2 travellers pitches which is inappropriate to put them where there is only single track roads so their would be insufficient access to this site also to encourage more to move in on that site.

The interchange at Burntcommon will not work as it will be Gridlocked for nearly all day and the A3 will become congested most of the day as well.
To 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses to be built on Green Belt.

To the infrastructure has not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with all these proposed housing to be built.

Why are GBC not using up all the Brownfield Sites?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1160  Respondent: 15368577 / A.L. Miller  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would Just like you to know that I STRONGLY OBJECT:

To take away our Green Belt in Send

To the Green Belt being built on at Send, Garlick Arch, Send Hill and Clockburn Nurseries as I was told we would have the Green Belt Permanently that is why I bought our Bungalo in Send so we all can enjoy it.

To the amount of housing that is needed 13,860 with this amount needed you would have to use the Green belt I say NO

To ALL in Send and Surrounding areas why can you not use the Brownfield area around Guildford. Not in Send

Also to the interchanging onto the A3 at Burnt Common as we have a lot of traffic now. So with this we would be at a standstill and make Send like a car park in the Rush Hour. Also Send would be used as a cut though to the A3 and M25 also the A247. Why cant you use Slyfield for the industrial space

To the site of Garlicks Arch which is known for flooding in the area

To the 45 houses at chockbarn. How are we able to take the traffic through tannery lane as it is to narrow. this road would not take the extra traffic

I object to this site on Send Hill as it has a lot of Green Belt and it is an area of Beautiful Countryside also it was used for land fill years ago and I know there was unsafe waste put in this site. Also to have 2 travellers pitches included there is insufficient acces to this and will also encourage more travellers to park themselves on this site. NOT HAPPY

The GBC has not identified the sufficient Brownfield sites around Guildford, Send, Wisley, Horsley. This will destroy the open amenities of teh Greenbelt also the A3 will end up Gridlocked and the surrounding areas, they are Bad Now so what would happen with all the extra traffic. I wish to breath in FRESH AIR NOT FUMES FROM THE EXTRA TRAFFIC

To the inadequate requirements for the infrastructure of our Village. How will the schools and doctors cope with all this extra traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3370  Respondent: 15371809 / Susan Pengilly  Agent:
I object to Ripley and Send villages being removed from Green Belt. The Government initiative of Green Belt was intended to be permanent, re National Planning Policy Framework, and there are no special circumstances to justify a change. In particular Send's Green Belt provides an essential buffer to stop Woking and Guildford becoming one conurbation.

Local Councillors and central Government gave a clear election promise to protect the Green Belt and this reneges on it. Developers will be quick to take advantage and there will be nothing to stop them.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I was born and raised in Send and had just put in an offer on a house in Send and was looking forward to returning to the Borough. I have withdrawn my offer as I would not like to live in an area or Borough that does not try to protect its greenbelt or open spaces. I therefore object for the following reasons.

I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.

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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I cannot understand why you wish to destroy local village life. I am 86 and have lived in Send all my life. It has undergone many changes, but this latest proposal is heartbreaking. Where are the schools or Doctors to help with an already over full village?

I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford. I also object strongly to the following.

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.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1260</th>
<th>Respondent: 15384065 / Kevin O'Rourke</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

As for,

POLICY P2 Send,
POLICY A43, 30ha, Land at Garlik's Arch,
POLICY A44. 1.9 ha Lands west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill

It is my opinion that the Ripley Send areas are NOT in need of further development. Furthermore these areas are of borderline flood risk areas (there is a clue in the road name "Send Marsh Road" and so I believe that these areas must stay within the green belt area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1266</th>
<th>Respondent: 15384257 / Marlene Harwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. The Green Belt was meant to be permanent. Central Government gave a clear election promise to protect the Green Belt from any future development. It would be formidable to change your policies now to allow developers to take advantage of our village.

2. I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery Send, There is already an existing planning permission to redevelop the Tannery with 64 apartments. This would completely overload Tannery Lane with new traffic. Any more additional development would be dangerous, especially in Tannery Lane and the junction onto Send road. Vehicles would use Tannery Lane/ Papercount Lane which are single access as a short cut through Ripley.

3. 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.

Please show my comments to the planning inspector. I hope my objections will be looked upon favourably.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1276</th>
<th>Respondent: 15385057 / D Munt</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1277</td>
<td>Respondent: 15385089 / A Munt</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 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 strongly to the 2016 draft local plan:-

All erosion of the Green Belt, site A43 Garlicks Arch, site A45 The Tolbot (conservation area)

The amount of development in one area, The Green Belt must stay GREEN for us and our families generations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1278</th>
<th>Respondent: 15385121 / C Munt</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 strongly to the 2016 draft local plan:-

All erosion of the Green Belt, site A43 Garlicks Arch, site A45 The Tolbot (conservation area)

The amount of development in one area, The Green Belt must stay GREEN for us and our families generations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1307</th>
<th>Respondent: 15388737 / Elizabeth Sharman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 disregard Guildford Borough Council and its attitude towards planning regulations and lack of consultation with relative bodies including Parish Councils in Send and Ripley to which they have shown to respect.

I object to the lack of thought and consideration to the local needs such as the over development of housing and industrial use which is far and above what is needed.

I object to the grounds that the roads are not capable of taking the traffic as they already get gridlocked morning and evening the school capacity is not there the Doctors surgery is already oversubscribed it is also already impossible to park in front if the shops etc

I object very strongly to the removal of Send from the Green Belt as this will ruin what is a beautiful area enjoyed and used very much by local people. Also much of the proposal is woodland which should be protected by you.

I object also to the over development of land at Burnt Common. 400 houses and 700 sq m of industry and warehousing this is unnecessary over development also it is alongside the very busy A3.

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 change will come but what Guildford Borough Council is proposing will ruin instead of enhance the whole area.

I hope you will look seriously at this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1347  Respondent: 15390369 / Lewis Thorpe  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The 4 policies (A42/A43/A43a and A44) are totally unacceptable for the village and there are far more suitable places for development, especially within Guildford and therefore I suggest GBC considers alternative sites. Send cannot cope with the level of development proposed and any development will have a detrimental effect on the local community and environment.

Please can I request that my comments are shown to the Planning Inspector who will decide on the proposed developments in Send and the surrounding area. Please can you also confirm receipt of my letter.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1349  Respondent: 15390465 / Delva Robinson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to complain about Guildford Borough Council's plan to build hundreds of houses in and around Send. I have loved and walked over the countryside in this area for many years and am concerned that its whole character will be...
destroyed. How can the current narrow roads, schools, medical services and facilities be expected to cope with such a
huge population influx, and why do you target unspoilt greenfield sites rather than urban brownfield sites?

I fear for the future of this pleasant area. Please do not go ahead with this scheme.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1352 **Respondent:** 15390497 / James Mylet **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I grew up in Send and my mother 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 several points in the above plan.

1. I object to the plan to build 400 houses and 7000 sq mtrs of Industrial Units at Garlick's Arch. This is Green Belt land and has an ancient woodland full of wildlife.
2. I object to the poor quality of air concerns. The noise and air pollution is already bad. The extra traffic from the additional buildings will lead to even poorer air quality for residents in Portsmouth Road.
3. I object to the Infrastructure Schedule. The Plan takes no account of the infrastructure needed for the Garlick's Arch site.
4. I object to removing Send, Send Marsh, Ripley and Clandon from the Green Bel There are no special reasons for doing this.
5. I object to building in areas at risk of flooding. The field at Oldlands Farm is often
6. I object to the building of a 4-Way junction with the A3/A247. This would lead to severe traffic jams in Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Clandon.
7. I object to the huge amount of development in one area
8. I object to our Villages being turned into Towns. My Mum bought her house in a village because she liked the village atmosphere. My children, her grandchildren, enjoy visiting her in the countryside. These changes will affect all of our family.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1361 **Respondent:** 15391169 / S.M. Smith **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to Send village being removed from the green belt.

The green belt was intended to be permanent, as required by the national planning policy framework and there are no special circumstances to justify abandoning it.

I object to building 45 houses at clockburn nursery because of inadequate access and traffic volume. The junction is too dangerous already and will be made much worse.
I object to building 400 houses and 7000 sq. metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road. With proper use of existing brownfield sites this Green Belt is not needed the land used to be the property of Merton College, what has changed this status?

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.

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, Gosda Hill, Burpham and Blackwell Farm. Much of this traffic to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would go through Send. Send Road is already at its capacity for through traffic and could not cope.

Please show my objection to the planning inspector, as there are plenty of other sites, especially brownfield sites, which could be used before the green belt needs to be used. Local councillors and central government gave a clear election promise to protect the green belt and this breaches it, especially at the short notice that the above proposals have suddenly been thrust upon us, without due consideration and deliberation as to the detrimental effects on the village

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object, as the current road network in Send and Ripley is quite small, compact, and highly-dependent on the A 247 for access to both Woking and Guildford. Any increased development in the area will put more pressure on this road. This road has a number of constrictions, both buildings and waterways, so will be bottlenecks and cause gridlock in the area. Development of the Send Hill site (NUMBER) in particular will place huge pressure on the narrow roads of Send Hill (which is built-up on both sides, with no scope to widen it) and Potters Lane, particularly where they each join the A247 northbound to Woking. Sections of the A247 to the south of Send Hill, on Send Barn Lane, are already prone to partial flooding during heavy rain.

I object, as there are no plans to improve public transport in the area. There are no local railway stations, and the current bus services to Guildford and Woking are very infrequent and expensive; residents in the proposed new houses would be forced to use cars to travel and to commute, putting increased pressure on the roads in the area.

I object, as the plans for industrial estates would adversely affect the area; there would be increased traffic, particularly from HGVs (for which the road network is completely unsuitable), adversely affecting current residents. Industrial sites are just not in keeping with the quiet, rural character of Send and Ripley.

I object, as all of the proposed sites are currently green fields and woodland. I have seen deer, rabbits and other animals on these fields, particularly the site opposite Send Cemetery which has proposed developments, and can not understand why these areas are even being considered for building upon.

I object, as the proposed changes will change the character of Send and Ripley forever. They are tranquil, rural villages, not busy towns; if the residents wanted to live in busy, congested towns, they would not have moved to Send or Ripley. Changing the nature of these villages would be unfair to the current residents. Once Green Belt protection has been removed from these areas, there will be nothing to stop even more development, and they will just become part of the urban sprawl of Guildford and Woking. Is the requirement for further housing in the area more important than protecting the Green Belt?

I object, as there are no clear plans to use the current brownfield sites. Guildford Council should have a register of available brownfield sites; using these would be preferable to eating into precious Greenbelt land.

I object, as the increased traffic and industrial activity will lead to increased pollution (both noise and atmospheric), again this is unfair to the residents who had selected, and expected, a quiet, rural environment.

I object, as there are no plans for increased provision of medical facilities, or schools / colleges, for the extra families who would be living in the proposed new homes. Having moved recently from central Woking to Send, I can personally attest to the effect that the pressure of increased population can have; increased pressure upon local primary schools, waiting a month for a GP's appointment. Has the effect of the increased population upon current residents been considered?

I object, as some of the proposed areas (particularly Send Hilt) have not been included in previous proposals, and so it has not been possible for residents to be consulted with regards to developments in these areas.

I object, as the proposed developments in Send and Ripley account for almost half of all the housing in the current development plan; it seems unfair for Send and Ripley to take such a large proportion of the new homes for the whole of Guildford Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1367  Respondent: 15391905 / Geoff Gear  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 removed from the Green Belt. If this is allowed to happen, it will set a precedent and the majority of Surrey could lose its status.

Election promises were to protect the Green Belt!!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1497  Respondent: 15422465 / Lynn O'Rourke   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY P2 Send

POLICY A43, 30ha Land of Garlick's Arch

POLICY A44, 1.9 ha Lands West of winds ridge and Send Hill

It is my opinion that the Ripley I Send areas are NOT in need of further development. Furthermore these areas are of borderline flood risk areas (there is a clue in the road name "Send Marsh Road" and so I believe that these areas must stay within the green belt area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1504  Respondent: 15422689 / Felicity Thorpe   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The 4 policies (A42/A43/A43a and A44) are totally unacceptable for the village and there are far more suitable places for development, especially within Guildford and therefore I suggest GBC considers alternative sites. Send cannot cope with the level of development proposed and any development will have a detrimental effect on the local community and environment.

Please can I request that my comments are shown to the Planning Inspector who will decide on the proposed developments in Send and the surrounding area. Please can you also confirm receipt of my letter.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1546  Respondent: 15428289 / Vicki Donnelly   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to any increase in traffic on send barns lane where I live. This being the Woking – Dorking – Brighton route is heavily congested during the rush hours and I usually have to wait for 5 mins just to cross the road at the roundabout to catch the bus.

Furthermore it should be taken into account that there are two schools (Send First and Second) Further down the line people driving children have to part on the lane turning area into a bottle neck. To have more roads converging at burnt common would be accidents just waiting to happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/525  Respondent: 15429985 / Jennifer Slade  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The new plan clearly demonstrates a lack of concern for Green Belt land and the residents of Send, who made thousands of objections to the 2016 Plan, all of which have been completely ignored in the latest Local Plan. An even greater number of houses have been proposed for the areas between and around Ripley and Send.

GBC appears oblivious to the loss of the Green Belt and the increase in pollution that will be caused by their proposed developments. GBC is ignoring the traffic and environmental problems which this Plan will cause - clearly totally uncaring for the health and safety of residents. GBC is deliberately ignoring the inadequate infrastructure of the area and are failing to place constraints, to take into account the lack of schools, medical facilities and roads, as is required by Law.

The assumption is that GBC and its Officers are placing commercial organisations and considerations over care for Residents and the areas of special scientific and historic interest contained in and around Send and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1552  Respondent: 15430049 / Michael Armstrong  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My family and I have lived in Send Marsh for thirty-three years and enjoyed the benefits of a small community within the Green Belt. The services, transport and schooling area sustainable for the present population and allow the sense of identity for all those who live in Send, Send Marsh and Ripley.

The boroughs plans for new homes under represent draft plan is an enormous concern to us and many families in the green belt will cause the destruction of our rural village life and identity.
We greatly object to the Garlick's Arch proposal, near to our home. The increase in housing, population and transport will have a strain on the present lifestyles and smooth running of services and especially transport to the A3 and M25.

Furthermore, there are more concerns to object to, which include: the buildings at clockbarn nursery; Send hill and the creation of a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt common.

The local councillors need to protect our greenbelt area and prevent the creation of a large conurbation which will be a failing for those living there.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I am writing to express my deep concern and anger over the recent new building proposals for Send.

I was saddened by and strongly object to Send being removed from Green Belt status. This will permanently alter the character of the village and will only open the way for yet more building development in the future. One of the main reasons we have chosen to live in Send is the fact it is surrounded by fields which gives it its rural status. With building on the Green Belt land our village feel and status will be irreversibly lost. Green Belt is exactly what it says it is and is there to protect the nature of places, provide open green spaces and enhance the lives of those that live there. Once lost, it is lost forever!

I am very concerned and strongly object to the way Guildford Borough Council have tried to 'sneak' these plans through without proper consultation. Significant changes legally require full consultation under Regulation 18. Since the last consultation major development proposals have been added to the plans and the council are obviously trying to quietly push them through. The 2014 proposar for 430 houses went down to 185 in April 2016. These have now gone up to 485! Every major site proposed for development in Send has been changed and a massive new road junction added on. I am disappointed in the councils' approach which has been very underhanded and dishonest to the people of Send.

Send already struggles with the large amount of traffic driving through the village which often results in long queues and tail backs. The infrastructure will not be able to cope with all these new build proposals. You cannot just take a small village and dump hundreds of houses and large industrial developments onto it and expect it to work. There are not enough school places, it is already extremely difficult to get a doctor's appointment at the medical centre, the roads will be permanently grid locked and the status of village and village life will be gone forever. We do not wish to be an extension of Guildford but wish to remain a separate village with our own identity.

I strongly object to policy A43.30ha Land at Garlick’s Arch. There is no need for more houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed by the borough. t is Green Belt protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. t is covered in ancient woodland with trees dating back to the 16th century and once lost, is lost forever. The latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. Therefore the proposed industrial development of 7000sq m is not needed. The obvious place for any new industrial development is at Slyfield, Guildford - an industrial site already set up and running. There would then be no need to have to build a new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this industrial development. Surely saving money!

I was shocked by and 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 narrow 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?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/358  Respondent: 15433153 / Helen Green  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 inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt (Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15) because:
• It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding natural beauty which will be lost forever with consequent impacts on the quality of life of future generations
• There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery lane - in both directions
• Once again, it eliminates the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1575  Respondent: 15433441 / Jacob Green  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to express my concern over the recent new building proposals for Send.

I strongly object to Send being removed from Green Belt status. This will permanently alter the character of the village and will only open the way for yet more building development in the future. With building on the Green Belt land, our village feel and status will be irreversibly lost. Green Belt is exactly what it says it is and is there to protect the nature of places, provide open green spaces and enhance the lives of those that live there.

I am very concerned and strongly object to the way Guildford Borough Council have tried to 'sneak' these plans through without proper consultation. Significant changes legally require full consultation under Regulation 18. Since the last consultation major development proposals have been added to the plans and the council are obviously trying to quietly push them through. The 2014 proposal for 430 houses went down to 185 in April 2016. These have now gone up to 485! Every major site proposed for development in Send has been changed and a massive new road junction added on. I am disappointed in the councils’ approach which has been very underhanded and dishonest to the people of Send.

Send already struggles with the large amount of traffic driving through the village which often results in long queues and tail backs. The infrastructure will not be able to cope with all these new build proposals. You cannot just take a small village and dump hundreds of houses and large industrial developments onto it and expect it to work. There are not
enough school places, it is already extremely difficult to get a doctor's appointment at the medical centre, the roads will be permanently grid locked and the status of village and village life will be gone forever. We do not wish to be an extension of Guildford but wish to remain a separate village with our own identity.

I strongly object to policy A43.30ha Land at Garlick's Arch. There is no need for more houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed by the borough. It is Green Belt protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. It is covered in ancient woodland with trees dating back to the 16th century and once lost, is lost forever. The latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. Therefore the proposed industrial development of

7000sq m is not needed. The obvious place for any new industrial development is at Slyfield, Guildford - an industrial site already set up and running. There would then be no need to have to build a new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this industrial development and thus saving money!

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 traveler’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 unspoil 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 traveler pitches (with caravans) will make this junction impossible to cope and dangerous. Send Hill is a narrow 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 reading my concerns.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt

As I understand the Green Belt was always intended to be kept as such to provide a division between Villages, towns etc.

- I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane has as exceptionally narrow and winding road, in places only room for one car and if you meet a lorry there is no room for maneuver. Also a very hazardous junction coming from Tannery lane to join the Send Road, the sight vision is dreadful with parked cars either side of the junction onto the main road.
- I object to the building of 400 houses and an Industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. This site in particular is covered with woodland and pasture and certainly never intended for building purposes. The site floods dreadfully, water coming off the A 3 into the stream which then floods the fields. We have photographic proof of this as it is Cobham Sporting Gun Club site and has been for the best part of 30 years and floods often. The Industrial proposal should be sited at Slyfield which would be ideal to extend and keep in one place.
- I object to the building of 40 houses and 2 pitches on Send Hill called the Paddocks. 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 travelers site.
- I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common very 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. 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 Dr’s, 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: PSLPA16/1592  Respondent: 15434305 / Antonia Phillips  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 Guildford Borough Council Local Plan application, with the proposal to remove Green Belt status from the villages of Send and Ripley in order to build residential and industrial sites (elements A42, A43 and A44), for the reasons stated below.

I object, as the road network in Send and Ripley, centred on the A247, is barely adequate for the current population of these villages; it is already frequently congested during rush hour. Any population growth or industrial expansion in the area will inevitably result in an increase of traffic, particularly heavy vehicles, which will not only bring congestion to
the network, but also increase pollution and noise levels, which will adversely affect the health of those who have chosen
to live in a peaceful, environmentally friendly environment.

I object, to the proposed removal of Send Village from the Green Belt. The Green Belt has always been intended to be
permanent, this is a requirement stated by the National Planning Policy Framework, and no special circumstances can
justify abandoning this requirement now. Send's Green Belt is an essential buffer, preventing urban sprawl and stopping
Woking and Guildford becoming one conurbation. There is a very clear commitment from Local councillors and central
government to protect the Green Belt and this reneges upon this guarantee.

Developers will be quick to take advantage and the Villages of Send and Ripley will lose their heritage and traditions.

I object, to the proposal to build 400 houses and 7000 sq. metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch (Policy A43),
opposite Send Marsh road. This site is covered by ancient woodland; industrial sites will destroy this forever. The extra
industrial space, if required, could be added to the current industrial area in Slyfield, as adding to this industrial area
would have much less impact. As Guildford’s housing requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated with a
refusal to disclose their calculations. With proper use of brownfield sites this Green Belt site is not needed.

I object, to the development of 40 houses and 2 travelers’ 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:
I am writing to register my objection to aspects of the local plan effecting the villages of Send and Ripley. My first objection is to the removal of the green belt status of the villages. I have lived at the above address for over 35 years and the area has gradually improved throughout that time. The idea of removing either of these villages from the Green Belt, currently before the planning committee, would be little short of vandalism. The dividing line between Send and Old Woking is already and extremely thin one. The dividing line between Send and West Clandon (the A3) is already virtually non-existent. If new building is allowed to fill the little green belt that remains then yet another urban sprawl will be the result and the people who, like my family, moved out of London to enjoy the green fields of 'leafy' Surrey will be cheated out of the life style they bought into and have paid the premium for.

My second objection is to any large housing development in the area such as the proposal for 400 new houses at the Garlick's Arch site on Burnt Common. Over the years I have witnessed the growing strain on the infrastructure of the two villages. Inthe last few years finding a parking space in either has become progressively more difficult. Clearly any significant increase in the local population will completely overload this capacity. This will also put unacceptable strain on the provision of local school places and doctor's surgeries. I do not have any objection to small developments that local services can cope with.

I am, of course, well aware of the national housing shortage and the problems specific to London (successive politicians have done little to be proud of on that score in the last forty years). However, building too many houses in this area will not solve that problem -they will be too expensive for the people who really need accommodation to afford. What is needed are more 'new towns', where the infrastructure can be designed appropriately. What is not needed is the destruction of the nation’s village heritage.

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1612  Respondent: 15437217 / P.J. Henderson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the plan to remove the Villages of Send, Ockham, the Clandons and the Horsleys from the Metropolitan Green Belt. Our parent's era devised the idea of this green belt in 1935 to stop the ongoing sprawl of London and other cities to give permanently open space, devoid of inappropriate development, and open air for everyone to enjoy. You only have to visit our villages every weekend to find the roads full of cyclists enjoying the countryside and fresh air. To change this policy will mean unethical developers will build on every scrap of land and we will become yet another London suburb -this must not happen.

Particular to Send, where we live, I object to the underhand planning application for Garlick’s Arch which came to light very late in the planning application process. Send itself already struggles to provide sufficient school places, doctors appointments, and bus services and the traffic is already at an unacceptable level at peak times. To add 400 more houses...
and an industrial area on this small wedge of green belt land is crazy and just greedy on the part of the landowners, who clearly have no conscience for the village and its needs.

I also object to the plans to build a new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to take all the extra traffic going through our village from the proposed developments - not only at Garlick Arch but the proposals for Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill, Burpham and Blackwell Farm. Send Road and Send Barns Lane is already extremely congested and would become grid-locked.

Finally, I object to the renewed application for 2 travelers' pitches at Send Hill. This road is extremely narrow and the surrounding countryside a favourite walking spot for many Send residents, let alone visitors to the cemetery who would lose the peace and tranquillity of that place should the travellers be allowed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1648  
Respondent: 15438049 / David A Sprigings  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of Site Policies A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send, Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send, A45 Land at the rear of the Talbot, High Street, Ripley and A57 The Paddocks, Rose Lane, Ripley as there is already a very significant problem with parking in shopping areas locally and this would only be exacerbated by the addition of a further 507 local families. Ripley is particularly bad for parking with it often being impossible to find a free space. Send is not much better.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2570  
Respondent: 15438049 / David A Sprigings  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

From Guildford Borough Settlement Profiles:

Send - Retail and employment:

Send village has a small parade of shops with flats above and there is a reasonable selection of convenience and comparison shops, including a post office, mini supermarket, and sandwich bar.

Send - Transport:

A bus also goes to Kingston upon Thames 13 times a day during the week, with limited weekend service.

Send - How well the village works:

As a connected village, Send scores very poorly as public transport is limited...
Send Marsh/Burntcommon : Retail and employment:

The only convenience shop within the settlement is located in a petrol station and located opposite the entrance to Boughton Hall Avenue.

Send Marsh/Burntcommon -Transport

There is a reasonable bus service ...

Send Marsh/Burntcommon - How well the village works:

As a connected village, Send Marsh scores very poorly as public transport is very limited ....

Although there are some local shops and businesses ....

From Major Village Expansion : Guildford Borough Green Belt & Countryside Study

Send

Send has a bus service rating of 3 within GBC's settlement hierarchy and therefore has good public transport connections.

Send Marsh/Burntcommon

Send Marsh and Burntcommon is served by a good bus service scoring 3, as defined within GBC's Settlement Hierachy.

In an earlier document The Villages Medical Centre, which is located on Send Barnes Lane,Send, was shown instead as being in Send Marsh.

Inconsistencies :

Send : The Settlement profile statement that "Send scores very poorly as public transport is limited" is totally inconsistent with the Greenbelt & Countryside Study Major Village Expansion comment that Send "has good public transport connections".

Send Marsh/Burntcommon : The Settlement profile statement that "Send Marsh scores very poorly as public transport is very limited" is totally inconsistent with the Greenbelt & Countryside Study Major Village Expansion comment that Send Marsh and Burntcommon "is served by a good bus service".

- Also, the Settlement Profile for Send Marsh/Burntcommon contradicts itself by saying under Transport "there is a reasonable bus service" and under How well the village works "Send Marsh scores very poorly as public transport is very limited".
- So according to the Local Plan support documentation Send Marsh/Burntcommon : Has a reasonable bus service
- Scores very poorly as public transport is very limited Is served by a good bus service

One thing is for sure, you would find it very difficult to find anyone in Send or Send Marsh/Burntcommon who thinks that the bus service is good.

Errors:

Although it is correct to say that bus service 515 runs from Guildford to Kingston it is NOT CORRECT to say that this bus service serves Send village. A 515 bus travelling from Kingston to Guildford leaves the A3 after the M25, travels along Ripley High Street and Portsmouth Road, then turns left at the Shell Petrol Station roundabout onto the A247 towards Clandon and onto the A3. It DOES NOT go into the village of Send.

Although Send has a convenience store in the form of McColls, with the best will in the world this cannot be described as a mini-supermarket .
**The Villages Medical Centre is in Send NOT Send Marsh** – I confirmed this with Dr Burns when I identified this error in September 2014.

Send Marsh/Burntcommon Settlement Profile: How well the village works includes "there are some local shops" Where are they? The only convenience store is at the Shell Garage as mentioned elsewhere. There are no other "shops".

Although these errors may at first seem minor, they were very significant as the information was used in scoring the different villages for Local Plan purposes, resulting in erroneous scores for both Send and Send Marsh.

How can anyone trust the content of the Local Plan when there are such errors and blatant inconsistencies in the supporting information on which it is based? There are others, including saying that Global Companies have their headquarters in Guildford. One of those quoted is "Phillips". Having worked for the Dutch Philips Electronics Group for over 30 years I, unlike the Council, at least know how to spell Philips correctly and also that the Philips HQ in Guildford is that of the UK Philips organisation, the UK being only one of more than one hundred countries in which Philips operates, whilst the Global HQ of Philips Electronics is in the Netherlands and has been since 1891. Is the Council again trying to mislead the public?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1646</th>
<th>Respondent: 15439777 / R.A.D. Donn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) is Sound?</td>
<td>( ) is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Send village being removed from the Green Belt, this would be a broken pledge by councilors and politicians.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the building of 40 houses and 2 traveler's pitches at Send Hill, completely out of place in this rural area near the Cemetery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the building of houses at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, again out of place, there is too much traffic on Tannery Lane now and difficult access to the main Send road, more building would only increase this problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the building of 400 houses and 7,000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch, what a travesty to destroy this ancient woodland, another reason why we need to keep the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a new interchange with the A 3 at Burnt Common, already there is too much traffic, it is now quite rare to travel on the A 3 north or south in this area without a hold up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If any of the above is allowed to happen it will help to turn this area into an urban sprawl, with the added problems of school places, medical services, water, supply, waste and sewage disposal etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you please confirm that you have received this letter of objection to the Local Plan and that my comments are shown to the Planning Inspector.</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: PSLPA16/1650</th>
<th>Respondent: 15440385 / Jane Donn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 Send village being removed from the green belt – We cannot let it be turned into a town.

No more industrial buildings – houses and traffic.

- I object to 45 houses at clockbarn nursery
- 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch
- 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill
- New interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1652  Respondent: 15440449 / Ron Peponis  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the send village being removed from the Green Belt. I was born to believe it was permanent. It keeps us separate from Woking/Ripley and Guildford.
2. I object to 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, tannery road is bad enough. I’m disabled so more traffic is disastrous.
3. I object to 400 houses and industry buildings at Garlick’s Arch as I live of Send Green – This is a natural beauty spot and will become a traffic shape up and pollution.
4. I object to 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. It will cause traffic on a narrow road which was a beauty spot.
5. I object to the interchange at Burnt Common A3 at Send as where I live will become a rat run. It will leech proposed wisley and Burpham. We need a free space. I have asthma and so does my wife and this traffic would cause pollution and grid lock.

Please don’t develop our Green Belt – we will become a rotten LA/USA what we have is precious.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/28  Respondent: 15442785 / Tammy Hoar  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Green Belt Policy 2 at paragraph 4.13.15 becausre

1. Further contempt for the Green Belt by GBC.
2. Totally unsuitable access.
3. Destructiuon of an area used by so many people for relaxation.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/29  Respondent:  15446561 / Peter Hoar  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Green Belt Policy 2 at paragraph 4.13.15 because

1. Further contempt for the Green Belt by GBC.
2. Totally unsuitable access.
3. Destruction of an area used by so many people for relaxation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1731  Respondent:  15448801 / John Ridson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the development at Garlick's Arch because the stream which runs through that area ends up across the road from our house, in Send Marsh Road, and it has flooded in the The new development would increase the amount of run-off into the stream, by replacing soft, permeable, vegetated surfaces with new hard surfaces, and therefore increase the risk of flooding downstream on Send Marsh Road. The development site also has a particular conservation sensitivity as it includes much old woodland. I believe trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site itself is also subject to flooding.
- I also object to the development at Garlick's Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks' notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.
- I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick's Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.
- I object to the removal of Send, Ripley and Clandon from the Green Belt because the villages and their countryside provide a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.
- I object to building on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas, much closer to existing transport hubs.
- I object to the exaggerated "housing need" figure of 13,860 which is far too high and results in the completely unnecessary development of the Green Belt. The way students, economic need and affordability are calculated inflates the housing need.

• I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas, much closer to existing transport hubs.

• I object to building 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 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 also object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.
- I object to 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
- I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing level Roads, doctors' surgeries and schools will be unable to cope.
- I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 and our road, Send Marsh Road, which are all already at 100% capacity especially during the rush hours.
- I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the
- The NPPF states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development "should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking." Standing at the head of the draft plan, Policy S1 ought to set a clear Instead, no definition of "sustainable development" is given. The policy also fails to set out any principles for applying sustainable development in practice to local planning decisions, which often have serious long-term impacts.
- Please show my comments to the Planning Inspector, and please confirm receipt of my letter.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• I object to 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.

• I object to the exaggerated "housing need"figure of 13,860 which is far too high and results in the completely unnecessary development of the Green Belt. The way students, economic need and affordability are calculated inflates the housing need.

• I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas, much closer to existing transport hubs.

• I object to all the proposed sites in Send because they were not included in the previous consultation in 2014. Unlike the rest of the borough Send has not been properly consulted and all its sites have been changed substantially.

• I object to the 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 also object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

• I object to 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

• I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing level Roads, doctors' surgeries and schools will be unable to cope.

• I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 and our road, Send Marsh Road, which are all already at 100% capacity especially during the rush hours.

• I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the

• The NPPF states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development "should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking."Standing at the head of the draft plan, Policy S1 ought to set a clear instead, no definition of "sustainable development" is given. The policy also fails to set out any principles for applying sustainable development in practice to local planning decisions, which often have serious long-term impacts.

• Please show my comments to the Planning Inspector, and please confirm receipt of my letter.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Apart from destroying the a quiet village environment, there is currently greenbelt land at the end of Send Hill that was divided into hundreds of plots and sold off to individuals on the premise that one day it may lose its green belt status. If the green belt were to be removed the flood gates would be opened to wipe out our village life and destroy our community.

Send Hill New Housing A44 .1.9 ha: 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.

Lastly, the properties you are proposing would have an immediate impact on my home value.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1842  Respondent: 15457793 / Jonathan Lord  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have been a Send resident all my life. The village has seen development but nothing on the scale that has been proposed in this 2016 Local Plan. It really has alarmed my family and all our community, at the proposed developments around our home.

I strongly object to Send village being removed from the Green Belt. This acts as a buffer between Woking and Guildford, because it is not justified by any special circumstances and the fact that Green Belt is meant to be permanent and not continually eroded. We are so close to being absorbed into the urban landscape.

I voted for the Conservative party at the last election and one of the main reasons was because of the promise to protect the Green Belt. I do hope the Conservative party/GBC do not break this promise.

I object to the Garlick’s Arch site with the change of this land, as it is ancient woodland, of local beauty and floods. I object to the 400 houses and the 600+ cars. The local roads are already heavily congested at commuting times let alone with more added, and also the pressure on local facilities.

I object to the 7000sq metres of industrial units at the Garlick's Arch site. Is there not space yet at Slyfield or Brownfield sites that are more appropriate for industrial units rather than virgin Green Belt land? Also I believe from the last Employment Land needs Assessment of 2015 that this showed a reduction of 80% in required employment from the previous Local Draft Plan.

I strongly object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Send will be a cut through and have to take the extra traffic from Woking and Guildford and also the A3 and M25 for the proposed developments at Blackwell Farm, Gosden Hill, Wisley Airfield, and Burpham. Our main road, the A247 is already struggling, with regular crawling traffic/ gridlock. The pollution and noise levels are already very high.

I strongly object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill because some the lane is single access and some parts winding and extremely narrow, to add even more traffic to an already struggling road would be dangerous. I have been gridlocked many times with traffic unable to pass along Send Hill and then blocking Potters Lane. It cannot be walked safely as a pedestrian. Also I believe, the land is an unsafe landfill site. It’s a beautiful area of countryside that I walk and enjoy on a regular basis. Also this affects our local cemetery that is a place of beauty and peace; this will be compromised.
I strongly object to the Clockbarn Nursery site with 45 houses because of the very inadequate access and congestion.

Tannery Lane is like many of our Send back lanes, very narrow and twisting. It is already very hazardous for traffic from Tannery Lane to join the Send Road. Traffic has to dangerously edge out, and often gridlocks Send Road.

We already have the marina development going ahead and 60+ apartments, and I feel that this in its own right will cause enough traffic concerns. Also at this junction is our Send Recreation Ground, which has been highly maintained and extremely popular. I object to any more pressure being put on this road junction as it will be a detriment to our Park, with safety, noise and pollution.

I have also read and heard about the GBC's refusal to disclose their housing requirement calculations and that these have been greatly exaggerated. I object to having local plans being suggested without the GBC written evidence to back up the housing requirement. I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly thought through, as Send's are not good enough to deal with the proposed housing levels. There will be irrevocable pressure and damage on the surrounding flora/fauna and infrastructure; roads, doctors, schools will not be able to handle this.

I do appreciate that housing in the Guildford borough is needed but would ask that GBC put every effort looking into Brownfield sites in the urban area before the open countryside.

I would like my comments to be shown to the Planning Inspector and also a confirmation that you have received my communication.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3687  Respondent: 15457793 / Jonathan Lord  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have lived in Send my whole life and I enjoy the mix of housing and environment. I walk often in the surrounding area and it would be such a shame to lose the countryside appeal of Send. I object to the removal of Send from the green belt because the countryside gives a needed buffer between our local towns. I object to any proposal to build on the green belt land, as I believe you should use all the urban/brownfield sites in Guildford (nearer transport links) before using any green belt land.

I object to the Garlick's Arch site with the change of this land as it is ancient woodland, of local beauty and floods. I object to the 400 houses and the 600+ cars. The local roads, especially the A247, are already congested at commuting times, and also the pressure on the local infrastructure. I object to the 7000sqm of industrial units at the Garlick's Arch site. I believe you should use all the urban/brownfield sites that are more appropriate for industrial units rather than greenbelt land.

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common as Send will have extra traffic from the A3 and M25 for the proposed developments at Blackwell Farm, Gosden Hill, Wisley Airfield, and Burpham Woking and Guildford also. Send will become a cut through. Our main road, the A247 is already struggling, with regular crawling traffic/gridlock. The pollution and noise levels are already very high.

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill because some the lane is single access and some parts winding and extremely narrow, to add even more traffic to an already struggling road would be dangerous. It cannot be walked safely as a pedestrian. Also I believe, the land is an unsafe landfill site.

I strongly object to the Clockbarn Nursery site with 45 houses because of the very inadequate access and congestion. Tannery Lane is very narrow and twisting. It is already very hazardous for traffic from Tannery Lane to join the Send Road. Vehicles have to edge out. The planning has gone through for the marina development with 60+ apartments, and I feel that this will cause enough traffic concerns.
Although I realise that housing in the Guildford borough is needed I would ask that GBC put every effort into looking into Brownfield sites in the urban area before using the green belt/countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1863</th>
<th>Respondent: 15458209 / A. Gent</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 village being removed from the green belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I object to building 400 houses and 7000 sq meters of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I object to 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Losing our Green Belt I feel is unnecessary.</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: PSLPA16/1872</th>
<th>Respondent: 15458753 / Joan Gent</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 send village being removed from the green belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn nursery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I object to building 4000 houses and 7000 sq meters of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I object to the development of 40 and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly object to all the above proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1877</th>
<th>Respondent: 15459297 / Mark Murphy</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

Finally the most important objection:
I OBJECT to Send village being removed from the Green Belt.

This fantastic legacy from our Victorian Philanthropists was always intended to be permanent, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. There are no special circumstances to justify abandoning this fantastic legacy.

The Green Belt in Send provides an ESSENTIAL Buffer, stopping Woking and Guildford becoming one conurbation. The GBC Councillors and Government gave clear election promises to protect the GREEN BELT. This plan blatantly reneges on those promises, and goes against Government Guidelines as pointed out by Sir Paul Beresford our local MP.

This would be a Developers Charter to provide unlimited development all over our Village and some other villages.

Please do not allow this dreadful error which will be irreversible

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1892  Respondent: 15460129 / Simon Kirkpatrick  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am a resident of Send Hill and am appalled by the proposals by the Council to remove Send Village from the Green Belt, which was intended to be permanent under the National Policy Planning Framework.

In particular:

* I object to the development of further houses at Send Hill.

* It would be detrimental to what is currently a quality Green Belt amenity and area of beautiful countryside.

* 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 further object on the basis that the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste.

* 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 for two Traveller Pitches. The Pitches would be 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 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 resulting 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 too many houses are proposed to Send 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 Send Hill already suffers from significant congestion, particularly at peak times such as during the school run.

* I object to the local plan on the grounds that it could result in 92 extra cars in Send Hill, which already suffers from limited parking.

* 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, Greystones.

* 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.

* I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. It was intended to be permanent and there should be no special circumstances for removing such an important feature of our environment.

Please ensure that my comments are show to the Planning Inspector, and confirm receipt of my e mail.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1897</th>
<th>Respondent: 15460193 / Helen Kirkpat</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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>

I am a resident of Send Hill and am appalled by the proposals by the Council to remove Send Village from the Green Belt, which was intended to be permanent under the National Policy Planning Framework.

In particular:

* I object to the development of further houses at Send Hill.

* It would be detrimental to what is currently a quality Green Belt amenity and area of beautiful countryside.

* 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 further object on the basis that the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste.

* 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 for two Traveller Pitches. The Pitches would be 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 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 resulting 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 too many houses are proposed to Send 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 Send Hill already suffers from significant congestion, particularly at peak times such as during the school run.

* I object to the local plan on the grounds that it could result in 92 extra cars in Send Hill, which already suffers from limited parking.

* 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, Greystones.

* 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 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 contaminate 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 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.

* I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. It was intended to be permanent and there should be no special circumstances for removing such an important feature of our environment.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1902  Respondent: 15460321 / Ritchie Lord  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have been a Send resident all my life.

I object to Send being removed from the greenbelt. Send’s greenbelt offers protection from being absorbed into Woking and Guildford. I can’t see any special circumstances and also feel that greenbelt is meant to be permanent and not eroded. We are close to being absorbed into the urban landscape.

I object to the Garlick’s Arch site with the change of this land- it is ancient woodland, of local beauty and floods. I object to the 400 houses and the 600+ cars. The local roads are already heavily congested at commuting times let alone with more added, and also the pressure on local facilities. I object to the 7000sqm of industrial units at the Garlick's Arch site. I believe there are other brownfield sites that are more appropriate for industrial units rather than greenbelt land?

I strongly object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Send will be a cut through and have to take the extra traffic from Woking and Guildford and also the A3 and M25 for the proposed developments at Blackwell Farm, Gosden Hill, Wisley Airfield, and Bursgham. Our main road, the A247 is already struggling, with regular crawling traffic/gridlock. The pollution and noise levels are already very high.

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill because some the lane is single access and some parts winding and extremely narrow, to add even more traffic to an already struggling road would be dangerous. I have been gridlocked many times with traffic unable to pass along Send Hill and then blocking Potters Lane. It cannot be
I walked safely as a pedestrian. I used to travel on the school bus that was regularly stuck/trying to reverse to get passed other vehicles. Also I believe, the land is an unsafe landfill site.

I strongly object to the Clockbarn Nursery site with 45 houses because of the very inadequate access and busy traffic. Tannery Lane is very narrow and twisting. It is already very hazardous for traffic from Tannery Lane to join the Send Road. Traffic has to dangerously edge out, and often gridlocks Send Road. We already have the marina development going ahead and 60+ apartments, and I feel that this in it's own right will cause enough traffic concerns.

I appreciate that housing in the Guildford borough is needed but would ask that GBC put every effort looking into Brownfield sites in the urban area before the open countryside.

I would like my comments to be shown to the Planning Inspector and also a confirmation that you have received my communication.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1907  **Respondent:** 15460993 / Mike Coussens  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**DRAFT LOCAL PLAN SITES A42, A43, A44 – PLEASE PASS LETTER TO INSPECTOR**

I object as a Send resident to the number of new house builds being proposed in Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common.

I object to the 7000 sq m of warehousing being included in A43. Burnt Common already has warehouse facilities.

I object to the amount of extra traffic and pollution these proposals will bring. The volume of traffic is already set to rise, regardless of many objections following the Councils permission for the building of Send Marina.

I object to the proposal of Send being removed from the Green Belt. The Green Belt is intended to be permanent and the local council and central government gave a clear election promise to protect the Green Belt and this plan reneges on that.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1912  **Respondent:** 15461153 / Lynda Masters  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Objection to planning proposals for Ripley1 Send and West Clandon**

I would be grateful if you would show my objections to Guildford Borough Council's proposals relating to the proposals for development at Clockbarn Nursery, Land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common and land west of Winds Ridge.
I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt. The Green Belt was Intended to act as a permanent buffer from excessive noise, traffic and disturbance. Local Councillors and central government gave an election promise to protect the Green Belt and this promise must not be reneged upon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/1936</th>
<th>Respondent: 15461761 / K.J. Pullen</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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? ( )

Re: proposed developments in Send and a new interchange onto the A3

I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford and I particularly 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. In fact that area of Green Belt is meant to be permanent and not continually eroded.

I object to the exaggerated "housing need" figure of 13,860 which is far too high and results in the completely unnecessary development of the Green Belt. The way students, economic need and affordability are calculated inflates the housing need.

I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford's urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.

I object 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.

In fact I object to all the proposed sites in Send because, not least 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. We were promised there would be no major changes made to the 2016 draft plan by the Leader of the Council.

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch for 400 houses, which was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks' notice and without any prior consultation. This has been quite disgraceful. Also this proposed development is simply not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick's Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch because the site has particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which have existed since the 16th century would be endangered. The site is attractive open countryside and part of the permanent Green Belt, with is protected under the National Policy Framework. It also represents an unrestricted sprawl and goes against the purposes of the Green Belt which include the prevention of merging towns and settlements. Oh yes, and the site is also subject to flooding!
I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bandy to take any more traffic. It is a country LANE. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travelers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

I object to the large proposed development 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. The local school cannot take any more pupils. The local doctors' surgery cannot take any more patients.

I vehemently object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

I ask that you please take note of the deep concerns of a huge number of Send residents and indeed many others who are connected to the village, pass through it on a daily basis and use this area for recreational purposes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I notice that Send Business Park has been taken out of the Green Belt in total. It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation. There is a very restricted vehicular access the length of Tannery Lane in both directions, further development/expansion here detracts from the openness of the Green Belt. It is out of place. In my opinion the proposals to build on the Green Belt in Send are completely unacceptable.

The GBC have not listened to the views of locals' objections and points of view, but are set on making life very uncomfortable for all of us. The proposals are inadequate for the infrastructure (as required by law, for schools, medical facilities, etc) and the already crowded roads. Plus this is notwithstanding the planned decimation of ancient woodland and our beautiful countryside.

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? ( )

Green Belt: I was absolutely appalled to read that you would contemplate taking the villages of Send & Ripley out of the green belt. We voted for a Conservative Council to protect our rights. The very mention of losing the green belt status in our little village is a betrayal of what we thought you stood for and I strongly object to this proposal.

Apart from destroying the very reason I moved into Send 29 years ago to be in a quiet village environment, there is currently greenbelt land at the end of Send Hill that was divided into hundreds of plots and sold off to individuals on the premise that one day it may lose its green belt status. If the green belt were to be removed the flood gates would be opened to wipe out our village life and destroy our community.

Send Hill New Housing A44.1.9 ha: 40 x houses and 2 x traveler 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 the 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. This was also a dump and I believe has methane gas rising from the land. I strongly object.

Where to build: If you need to build new properties, place them next to the A3 or similar position (not on the green belt). I wish when I bought my first property I was able to afford such a beautiful quiet area. Instead my view was overlooking the M3 at Sunbury. 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.

Infrastructure: Having hundreds of new homes without the infrastructure in place is exactly the problem we had with free movement in the EU. Why do Councils and Governments keep squeezing a gallon into a pint pot, it doesn't work. Why are there no entries in your plan to expand the Doctors surgery where it's currently not easy to get an appointment, or our school. I suppose we will worry about that later, just like the NHS!! Invest in infrastructure before you expand populated areas, and do not increase them by 25 % of their existing population.

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:
I object to the lack of proper consultation - the proposed sites in Send were not included in the previous consultation in 2014 - the borough of Send have not been properly consulted and all its sites have been changed substantially.

I object to the last minute inclusion of sites and object to the massing of these new housing proposals in one area of the borough.

I object to the complete lack of consideration of the impact of these proposals on highways, education, transport or medical services.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1971  Respondent: 15463009 / P M Proctor  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to you because I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan.

In particular I object to any encroachment on GREEN BELT land which under your plans would be lost forever and deprive future generations from enjoying it.

You are obviously targeting the villages in North Surrey and I object to your policy of 'in-setting' these villages, particularly Ripley, Ockham, Send, the Clandons and Horsleys to name just some. I also object to what is clearly a disproportionate amount of development in one area.

I particularly object to the underhand way in which the Garlick's Arch site has been handled allowing a development of at least 400 houses to be considered with less than 2 weeks notice.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1984  Respondent: 15463969 / Estrella ap Rhys Pryce  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A25, A35, A42, A43, A43a, A44.

As a fairly new resident of Send Marsh (we moved here a year ago) I am horrified that Guildford Borough Council appears to want to ruin the very pleasant environment here by 'insetting' the villages of Ripley, Send and Wisley and thus removing them from the Green Belt, which is so precious.

The present Conservative Govt. was elected on a promise to protect the Green Belt and to build mainly on 'brownfield' sites. GBC appears to want to do exactly the opposite.

We have not seen any evidence as to why there would be a sudden increase of population in Send & Ripley, which is relatively stable, which would necessitate the building of 485 new homes.
Why did the Council suddenly include a new site for both housing and industrial development at Garlick's Arch? This was only proposed on Wednesday 11th May at 4.30pm and then passed at 9.00pm the same evening. This meant that there was no time for any consultation with local residents, which, while it may be legal, invalidates the whole process. The land at Garlick's Arch which was suddenly included is entirely new and is within the Green Belt. It is covered in ancient woodland which has been there for centuries. It would be entirely inappropriate to have 7,000 sq.m of industrial space, which would be welcomed at the existing Slyfield 'brownfield' site.

The proposed on & off A3 interchange at Burnt Common to serve this development would cause excessive traffic to be channelled through Send to Woking on the A247. This road is already over-subscribed during rush hour. The local roads simply could not cope, and they cannot be widened due to the existing built environment.

In conclusion, I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan for the following reasons:

1. I object to the 'insetting' of Send, Ripley and Wisley from the Green Belt.
2. I object to the disproportionate amount of development in this area of the Borough.
3. I object to the lack of any evidence for the alleged housing needs.
4. I object to the plan to build 7,000 sq.m of industrial space on Green Belt land, when it could, and should, be put on a brownfield site.
5. I object to the very limited consultation period allowed.
6. I object to the last minute inclusion of the Garlick's Arch site.
7. I object due to the fact that the local roads and infrastructure could not cope with the increase of traffic that these developments will cause.
8. I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools which the increase in population would need.
9. I object to the lack of immediate provision for Doctors surgeries, when the local Villages Medical Centre is already oversubscribed.
10. I object to the new A3 interchange at Burnt Common which would in no way alleviate traffic in Ripley or Send if the proposed development goes ahead. I would like the Inspector to see my objections.

In conclusion, the Plan does not serve the interests of the local residents in Send, Ripley, Wisley and Clandon. The Council is going directly against the stated Conservative Government policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because it's an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the Wey Navigation and vehicle access is restricted in both directions along Tannery Lane. Expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I refer to your proposal to build approximately 485 new houses in two new sites in the Send area.

I strongly object on the grounds that the proposed sites are not suitable and their impact on the existing environment is inappropriate. The pressures on the roads, education, health facilities and council services, including policing, are unsustainable.

There are more appropriate brown sites and other sites especially south of Guildford.

I also strongly object to taking Send out 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: PSLPA16/2043</th>
<th>Respondent: 15470017 / Jason Riley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing to object to many areas regarding the above. As a resident of Send/Ripley I wish to make the following points:

- I object to all erosion of the Green Belt.
- I object to any "in-setting" of ANY villages from the Green Belt.
- I object the amount of development in one area of the borough.
- I object to the lack of immediate provision for Doctors Surgeries.
- I object to the limited consultation period.
- I object to the last minute inclusion of new sites with less than 2 weeks.

I strongly object to the lack of any evidence for the alleged housing need numbers.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2068</th>
<th>Respondent: 15473473 / Gordon Prosser</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of any such proposals being carried through would result in the narrow roads in and around Send becoming total gridlock with much damage being done to the economy and the well being of local residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am writing to object to the final draft local plan that has just been released, and I want my comments to be seen by the Planning Inspector.

1. I object to the fact that GBC has changed every major site in Send and added a major new road junction without full consultation under regulation 18.
2. I object to Send being removed from the green belt, in particular to areas such as the playing fields and woodlands behind the school, and the land along the River Wey which is a particularly beautiful area.
3. I object to plan for houses and warehousing at Garlick's Arch. This site is new and was not included in any previous consultation. It is Green Belt protected by the NPPF to prevent the converging of communities. ...no exceptions!!! This site is covered in ancient woodland dating back to the 16th century.
4. I object to the proposal for a new 4 way link onto the A3 at Burnt Common. This would make Send a major thoroughfare for traffic from the M25, A3, and the proposed house at both Burpham and Wisl. Send already experiences traffic jams daily and a further burden of traffic such as this would be calamitous.
5. I object to Policy A44, land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This again was not included in the draft and was not consulted upon. Such a proposal would make Send Hill very hazardous for the school children going to and from St Bedes School, and as there was a land fill site there up until the late 80's early 90's it would be an inappropriate area for housing and travellers pitches because of the risk of toxic gas.
6. And in general I object to the proposals as a whole as Send does not have the infrastructure to cope with the additional population and traffic... neither the school or the local sewers, nor the medical services.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
6. And in general I object to the proposals as a whole as Send does not have the infrastructure to cope with the additional population and traffic...neither the school or the local sewers, nor the medical services.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2099  Respondent: 15477089 / M.M.L Prosser  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object strongly to all the proposals in the DRAFT LOCAL PLAN. My principal concern is the potential excess of traffic.

Getting out of our drive in Broadmead Road generally takes several minutes at least. Either way it is pretty well non stop, and you have to be quick to make an exit.

As we lie in bed in the front bedroom of the house we watch huge lorries passing or standing still, before they get to Old Woking, where presumably they have the same " stop go "routine until they reach their destination.

Sitting in the garden gives us little pleasure, with constant noise of traffic even at the week-end. Today the culprit for holding up the traffic was a man riding a horse -and why not? - this is a village.

I object to the Draft Local Plan proposals on the basis that Send simply could not bear the weight of the increased traffic levels.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/30  Respondent: 15477729 / Julia Hoar  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Green Belt Policy 2 at paragraph 4.13.15 becausre

1. Further contempt tor the Green Belt by GBC.
2. Totally unsuitable access.
3. Destructiuon of an area used by so many people for relaxation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2110  Respondent: 15477921 / P Barclay  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to object strongly to the proposed building, road, and travellers pitches that GBC have put in place.

1. I object to the increase of proposed houses from 185 to 485 in the area. Send cannot take it.
2. I object to the proposed building on Green Belt. If we do not save the Green Belt the whole of Surrey will be a mass of concrete structures and it should not be thought about. Also the roads will not take heavy traffic.
3. I object to Send being removed from the Green Belt, we don't have enough green areas in Surrey for wild life and parks - one day we will be joined up with Woking and Guildford- not a nice thought.
4. I object to the land at Garlick’s Arch Burnt Common being designated for 400 houses and industrial and warehousing. Why use this land when Slyfield is used as an industrial site? I also object to the proposed new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. This will cause drastic road obstructions through Send as it will be used as a highway from the M25, A3 through to Woking. Send is always gridlocked during peak times - this will only make it worse for residents.
5. I object most strongly to the proposed building of 40 homes and 2 travellers pitches in Send Hill. This is a quiet residential area with wood and open space - we now have a lovely Cemetery - the peace would be shattered. Send Hill is a single track road for most of it and the provision of houses together with at least two cars per household would prove catastrophic for the present residents. As for putting 2 travellers pitches in the middle of a quiet secluded spot behind beautiful houses, ridiculous.
6. Has anyone thought of the impact all this new development will have on the local school (full to capacity at the moment) and also medical centre. It's bad enough now to get appointments with our doctors - what will happen when 485 houses are built?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
to be the right reasons and done properly. Overall I have a lot of concerns about the lack of transparency of the plans, a concern that the infrastructure will not be up to the job, a concern that there will be unintended consequences particularly with regard to traffic volumes and congestion and traffic flows if some of the major developments go ahead. The A3 is certainly not up to the job of dealing with significant development.

I trust that these objections will be fully considered and that a) the proposed plans to remove Send from the Green Belt will be duly removed from the local Plan with immediate effect and the Settlement Boundary will predominantly remain as per the local Plan 2003 and b) any housing development will be appropriate and proportionate such that Send remains a village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2156  Respondent: 15479937 / William Pigram  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the proposals in the Draft Local Plan for the following reasons:

I live in East Horsley and find the roads

I object to the building on the Green Belt at Send at Garlick’s Arch, Clockbarn Nurseries and Send Hill because the Green Belt is meant to be permanent and there are no special circumstances to justify development.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough, as illustrated by the 80% reduction from the 2013 to the 2015 Employment Land Needs Assessment.

I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the needed development can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because 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. Clandon would also suffer increased traffic to and from the south.

I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3. This 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.

be very dangerous with even the current amount of traffic let alone if we get more traffic due to the increased population in Horsley and the surrounding areas. I notice there is a development proposal at the Thatchers Hotel on the Guildford Road East Horsley. This area of road is particularly dangerous as it has a blind corner and a sharp bend and many people having to turn right out of Ockham Road South onto it, all within the space of about 50 metres.

I object to all the proposals at the sites in West Hosley and East Horsley for the reasons of the local transport infrastructure simply not being able to cope with the huge demand the increased numbers of population will place upon them. In particular the stretch of the A3 from the M25 junction at Ockham past Wisley, past Burpham and all the way along to Guildford experiences many collisions. A new junction will increase numbers of traffic on this dangerous road.

In addition as a daily commuter into London from Horsley station I do not see how this small village station can cope with the increased demand from literally potentially thousands of extra commuters every morning and every evening
travelling to and from the proposed sites in The Horsleys and at Wisley Airfield Ockham. The new Guildford Local Plan states expressly that regarding Effingham Junction station it is “not considered sequentially preferable or sustainable to direct office development to these locations”. See extract below. If it is not considered an adequate station where will the commuters residing at and office workers working in Wisley Airfield Ockham get the train to and from? Surely not Horsley as this will be having to cope with extra commuters from the 535 proposed new homes in the Horsleys.

4.4.17 For the purposes of the sequential assessment the train stations at Clandon, Chilworth, Gomshall, Shalford and Effingham Junction, will not be considered to be transport interchanges because of their locations within the Green Belt, AONB or the isolated nature of the station away from the village or centre. We do not consider that it is sequentially preferable or sustainable to direct office development to these locations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

The amount of proposed development that Guildford Borough Council has prescribed for our villages is totally unsustainable. The level of development proposed is unreasonable and would change the whole character and ambience of the villages. I object to this most strongly. The proposed increases to Ripley, Send and Send Marsh and Burnt Common are both disproportionate and unsustainable with the existing level of infrastructure. Send village is to expect 22% increase in housing and Send Marsh/Burnt Common a 27% increase, whereas the Borough as a whole will be approximately 14% with this housing requirement. Our villages SIMPLY CANNOT COPE with such a huge increase in population.

The proposed insetting of land planned in and around Ripley, Send and Send Marsh and Burnt Common would both virtually double the size of the villages and increase the potential for future land speculation and proposals for inappropriate development. The current road structure is already stretched to capacity and the lack of shops and school place provision would be exacerbated further by the draft Local Plan proposals.

The communities are semi-rural villages and very poorly served by public transport. The buses to Send are approximately one an hour Monday to Saturday, finishing at about 6.45pm and none at all on Sundays. Burnt Common has an additional service the 515 which passes along Portsmouth Road on the way to and from Kingston. No public services go to the Villages Medical Centre in Send Barns Lane at all. This medical centre serves a wide area including Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common, Ripley, Old Woking and beyond. The service is extremely busy currently, so increasing the amount of residents so vastly will cause great problems in increasing numbers of service users. The absence of buses passing the medical centre, results in patients using cars to travel there or getting lifts from friends or voluntary services. I object to your greed putting our lives at risk

The communities of Ripley Send Marsh and Burnt Common have few proper shops at all apart from the Burnt Common petrol station store. There is no open space where children may kick a ball around and no community centre. In fact we feel that the scoring system your Council has used for sustainability is seriously flawed and will have affected our ranking in some areas.

The access roads around this proposed development site are appalling with traffic exiting from the A3 northbound carriageway still travelling at high speed in London Road. It is mooted that there might be a northbound access to the A3 at Burnt Common but this has been talked about for at least 25 years to my knowledge. The noise and pollution from the A3 abutting this site is dreadful. The roads nearby flood frequently, both from the run off from the fields and the A3. The road at the foot of the slipway from the northbound A3, at its junction with Vicarage Lane floods frequently throughout the year and is often flooded for several days at a time in the winter. The site lines for exiting the properties in question
which back onto the northbound carriage of the B2216 are appalling. You are entering a road where the traffic is travelling at 60mph, with very restricted views. The whole roadway system in this area would need redefining if development went ahead here. Much of the proposed land for development is floodplain, building on this again will increase the likelihood of flooding to both roads and housing which is completely unacceptable. I object to this in the most strongest terms.

In summary I consider that the housing requirement for the borough as a whole has been significantly overstated and that Ripley, Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common have both been unfairly and inappropriately targeted to bear a disproportionate number of additional dwellings. I object to this most strongly.

Our local MPs Sir Paul Beresford and Anne Milton have stated that they question the housing numbers in the Local Plan. They understand that even though the ONS has revised the population growth figures downwards this has not been reflected in the total number in the Draft Plan. Likewise the decision to leave the EU and have a more direct control on our borders must also call for a re-evaluation in the population growth figures. It is also Sir Paul Beresford’s contention that the Green Belt must be protected and that removal of any site from the Green Belt must be under exceptional circumstances. I share this opinion that the housing requirement in the Draft Local Plan has been overstated and that Guildford Borough Council has not had sufficient regard to their duty to protect the Green Belt land in the borough.

The road network is quite inadequate for the level of the existing population at peak times and it would be totally unable to cope with the proposals for increases in the population of Ripley, Send, Send Marsh/Burnt Common.

I object to these developments, I also consider that the scale of the proposed development will destroy the essentially rural nature of the parish and that the general lack of infrastructure within the villages makes them unsuitable for anything other than minor infill housing development. I request that these comments are shown to relevant planning director and I should be grateful if you would please acknowledge receipt of my email.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2320  **Respondent:** 15484225 / Lorraine Bint  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to state my objection to the 2016 Draft Local Plan for Send and Ripley.

I specifically object to the development of site A43 Garlicks Arch which was only included recently and is an overdevelopment of a green belt area. The increase in homes and traffic without any increase/improvements to infrastructure eg: school places, doctors surgery/already congested busy roads, is just unacceptable. The local school has just had planning approved to build a new school but with no increase in pupil numbers. This is somewhat short sighted if planning on increasing local housing.

The site at Wisley has included it's own school, shops, doctors surgery which seems much more reasonable and whilst is a beautiful spot it is perhaps under used/less accessible to most people therefore making it a more sensible choice for building. Send and Ripley are already busy villages. The traffic is increasing year on year and the roads are becoming more dangerous.

I object also to the inclusion of numerous traveller sites. The roads around the Send Hill sites are too small to cope with additional traffic. The traveling community do not generally wish to cause trouble with other people but there is often fighting within their own communities and therefore putting two sites so close together could be a case of tempting fate and encouraging issues.

I object also to the fact that there is no hard evidence of the need for such an increase in local housing numbers. Or indeed why they have to be crammed into such small areas. The removal of any villages from the green belt would be a terrible shame. Something that cannot be reversed. There should be a council priority to maintain our green belt as that is what makes the local area so desirable and makes the area a good choice for families, of many generations, who support the local economy, support the local councils, help build communities, to create a larger conurbation of homes will lead to a sense of anonymity, which in turn can lead to a sense of disengagement and the general breakdown of the local communities. There are other larger more suitable areas that could be developed rather than destroying the green belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2351  **Respondent:** 15485505 / Jean Turner  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 your plans to remove SEND VILLAGE from the green belt. I have never heard such a silly idea.

I OBJECT to plan A42 this is on prime agricultural land and the access on and off would be onto a very narrow lane and would affect the wildlife which inhabits this area, there are deer forces of a multitude of birds of which come into my garden i.e gold finches, chaffinches 4 different types of sets of black birds, pheasants and also RED KITES which would be driven away and no longer give me the opportunity to watch them, at 85 they are great pleasure also the extra traffic it would put on the main road which is always brought to a standstill and very blocked up. I OBJECT STRONGLY.

I OBJECT A44 plan again this is a Very Narrow lane and would spoil the area and bring uproar to a quiet road and spoil the quiet area.
I OBJECT to the A43 plan for lands at Garlicks Arch this again is undesirable on a quiet area with all sorts of wildlife and ancient woodlands etc again too the amount of extra traffic which it would generate at least a 1000 more vehicles and cause even more chaos on the roads. Have you ever tried to get get to Guildford and beyond on an afternoon around 4-430 from this area it is absolutely grid locked on both the old and the new A3 it is horrendous. The roads and infrastructure are not fit for purpose with schools, shops, doctors etc etc.

The councillors were voted on the borough and promised to save the Green Belt.

I OBJECT PLEASE READ OUT.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/2352  **Respondent:** 15485889 / Joanne Saunders  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

To Whom It May Concern:

From day one this has been a very underhand process, which I believe, proves that we are not living in a democracy!! It’s the same old story that if you know the right people and give the right handshake then anything is possible. You have listened to dishonest councillors and greedy developers but noone has actually listened to the families that will be affected.

I am listing below my objections and the reasons for those objections. I cannot believe that again I having write the same things as before.

I object to the following:

1 I object to: Building 45 houses at Clockbarn nursery

2 I object to: Send Village being removed from the Green Belt!

3 I object to: New interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common

4 I object to: building 400 houses and industrial space at Garlicks Arch

As already stated in my previous three letters to yourselves, Tannery Lane cannot accommodate the amount of traffic that the new developments will bring. We have already had an accident on Send Road this month where a child got knocked down and many near misses on the junction of Tannery Lane.

This is a LANE not a main road and is not meant to be one. Send village is a Village not a TOWN and is not meant to be one.

The current infrastructure cannot cope with any additional residents as the Doctors Surgery currently services 3 villages at present. It can be very difficult if not Impossible sometimes to get an appointment within a month.

The local schools, although being redeveloped and becoming a through Primary will still only be able to cater for the same amount of pupils, although, Secondary places will definitely be a problem.
The greenbelt prevents places like Send and Ripley and Send marsh from becoming an extension of Woking and Guildford Town. It also serves a conservation purpose which as you clearly know is an extremely important function with our recent flooding issues. Developers, once they have the go ahead will not stop and you wont be able to stop them as it will set a president.

Unfortunately due the way this whole plan was put together it has left local people with a very bad taste in their mouths. We do not trust anyone and we do not believe that even these objections will be taken seriously which will prove my point.

To summarise:

Our current infrastructure and busy roads in our village cannot cope with any further housing or increase in flow of traffic. I am concerned about the safety of not only our children but the elderly residents of our village who sometimes take chances crossing these roads to get to the busy park and shops…. I hope you will take my views into consideration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/242  Respondent: 15486017 / Neil Higgins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am a resident of the Borough living at [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998].

I object to the revised draft local plan. The model used to calculate revised housing needs is still flawed and does not accurately reflect the temporary impact and needs of students enrolled at University of Surrey. Housing needs have been overstated.

I object to the revised local Plan because there is still not adequate infrastructure being implemented for the increased needs generated by the additional homes specified in the Draft Plan i.e. schools, doctors, dentists, shops and most importantly the impact upon local roads which would naturally follow if the draft local plan were to be implemented has not been addressed.

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

I trust that all of these objections, together with those which I submitted when the previous iteration of this Local Plan was made open to comment, will be taken into account when finalising the Local Plan. That final version should simply address the needs of the community and not reflect the desires of developers and land owners.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to Send village being removed from the Green Belt. The green belt was intended to be permanent, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, and there are no special circumstances to justify abandoning it. Sends Green Belt provides an essential buffer stopping Woking and Guildford becoming one conurbation. Local councillors and central government gave a clear election promise to protect the Green Belt and this reneges on it. Developers will be quick to take advantage and there will be nothing to stop them.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2440</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497473 / Laura Clark</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objections to the Guildford Borough Council Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hereby wish to put forward my sincere objections to Guildford Borough Council’s Draft Local Plan regarding the proposed developments in the village of Send. I believe that this plan is not in compliance with the regulations with which it is required to comply. The proposals with which I object are outlined below followed by my considered reasons for this objection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A42</th>
<th>Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send</th>
<th>Send</th>
<th>Homes (C3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A43</td>
<td>Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh Burnt Common and Ripley</td>
<td>Send and Lovelace</td>
<td>Homes (C3) and employment floorspace (B1c, B2, B8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A43a</td>
<td>Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</td>
<td>Send and Clandon and Horsley</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A44</td>
<td>Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send</td>
<td>Send</td>
<td>Homes (C3) and traveller pitches (sui generis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aside from the obvious issues of destruction of wildlife habitats and decrease of biodiversity if these plans go ahead, the Green Belt land on which these proposed developments are intended to be built is necessary in the protection of identities of small rural villages such as Send. By building so many new houses and industrial premises on this land and adding to urban sprawl, the village of Send will begin to merge more and more with the towns of Woking and Guildford, losing its current charm and negatively impacting the lives of the residents in this area. As Send is a rural village, building new houses in the area will be likely to attract more families which will likely bring at least one-two cars per household, therefore drastically increasing the number of cars on the small local roads. This, coupled with the proposed new slip-roads on and off the A3 and new employment floorspace will create more traffic and congestion than the local roads around the village are able to support. The new slip-roads will also add another entrance onto the busy A3, potentially increasing the amount of accidents on this stretch of road, especially at peak times where the A3 is busy enough as it is. Congestion on the local roads is also an issue currently, as are the road surfaces around Send which are already in poor condition. Adding an extra 485-970 plus cars onto this area, not even including those who will be travelling to the new employment space, will considerably worsen both of these issues. These extra cars will also give off more air pollution, which will negatively affect any remaining wildlife that has not already been lost by the reduction of the Green Belt. It is impossible to solve the already prevalent issues regarding the roads by adding more cars into the equation, so therefore these proposed developments are ridiculous, only adding to existing issues without benefiting the community or the environment in the slightest.

It is not only the roads and wildlife that will be negatively affected by the proposed developments but the infrastructure currently in place in the area will not be able to cope with increased strain on their services. As I have already explained, rural villages such as Send attract young families, especially if they are close to large towns, such as Guildford and Woking in this case, which provide good facilities and transport links. The proposed new houses would therefore be a prime location for young families, requiring schools and healthcare and the small village of Send would not be able to withstand the increase in demand of these two primary infrastructures. There is only one primary school and one junior school in Send and these local schools are not large enough to be able to cope with many more students as there simply would not be enough places to be able to accommodate them all. Likewise, The Village’s Medical Centre already struggles with being able to provide enough appointments for the current population of Send; any increase would make it much harder for those who need medical appointments to be able to arrange them. Your proposed developments of 485 homes and the traveller site does not account for these issues and even on the unlikely proviso of there being one resident per new household, this would severely increase the strain on these services, again not benefiting the community in any way. It is for these reasons that I believe these plans to be ill-conceived and I strongly object to the developments.

I hope you will consider my reasons for objection and see that these developments cannot take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2483  Respondent: 15500833 / Amanda Edwards  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I live in Orchard Way in Send & I wish to log a strong objection to the amount of Green Belt being removed from Send/ Ripley in the new local plan.

I object to the way in which the Garlick’s Arch development was added to the local plan.

I object to the huge lack of evidence that these high numbers of houses are actually needed in this area.

I object to the planned A3 junction changes at Burnt Common due to the negative effect on the surrounding villages which will not be able to handle the additional traffic in an already busy area. It will lead to more through traffic increasing the chances of road traffic accidents, particularly around the local schools.
I object to all the additional houses when the local schools are already overwhelmed with new applicants. The school in Send where my children attend is currently being rebuilt, with no further capacity to take additional children and has no desire to do so.

I object to all the additional houses as the local doctors surgery is already at its full capacity and this will put additional pressure on the services impacting local services.

I object to the additional amount of cars that will be on the road in the immediate and surrounding areas, causing further risk to our children as they travel to and from school.

I also object to the proposed housing development & traveler pitches off of Send Hill. This is completely unnecessary & Send Hill will struggle with the increased traffic. The road is not wide enough to accommodate caravan traffic & I would be hugely concerned about a increase in crime.

Please keep our Green Belt green, that is why we chose to move to Send & bring our children up here.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Finally the most important objection:

I OBJECT to Send village being removed from the Green Belt. This fantastic legacy from our Victorian Philanthropists was always intended to be permanent, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. There are no special circumstances to justify abandoning this fantastic legacy. The Green Belt in Send provides an ESSENTIAL Buffer, stopping Woking and Guildford becoming one conurbation. The GBC Councillors and Government gave clear election promises to protect the GREEN BELT. This plan blatantly reneges on those promises, and goes against Government Guidelines as pointed out by Sir Paul Beresford our local MP.

This would be a Developers Charter to provide unlimited development all over our Village and some other villages.

Please do not allow this dreadful error which will be irreversible.

I object to the GBC removing the green belt status behind St Bedes School and near the Canal in Send this is vital green space for the village and must be put back as green belt to prevent developers incursion into our vital green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Objections to the Guildford Borough Council Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016)
I wish to express my strong concerns and objection to Guildford Borough Council to object to the Council’s ill-conceived Draft Local Plan in relation to the proposed developments (as shown in table below) in the village of Send. I believe that this plan is not in compliance with the regulations with which it is required to comply. My reasons and arguments against are explained below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A42</td>
<td>Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send</td>
<td>Send</td>
<td>Homes (C3)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A43</td>
<td>Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh Burnt Common and Ripley</td>
<td>Send and Lovelace</td>
<td>Homes (C3) and employment floorspace (B1c, B2, B8)</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A43a</td>
<td>Land for new north facing slip roads to/ from A3 at Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</td>
<td>Send and Clandon and Horsley 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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A44</td>
<td>Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send</td>
<td>Send</td>
<td>Homes (C3) and traveller pitches (sui generis)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Send is a small, quiet village surrounded by a number of areas of greenbelt land and development of these areas would cause numerous negative impacts to both the environment and character of the village. I therefore very strongly object to the councils proposed development plans.

Over recent years Send has already seen some more housing developments and as a result has increased the population of this village. The proposed plan to develop a further 485 homes is ludicrous as the current infrastructure in place in this village is not able to cope with an increased number of people. The roads are already in a poor state in places and an increased number of cars using them will only lead to further deterioration. More cars will add to the traffic problems, especially during rush hour times, where it already takes a long time to get out onto the (((Portsmouth Road))) from Send Marsh Road and leading to traffic queues to back up on the small roads through the village of Send Marsh. The housing development will likely bring at least 1-2 cars per household leading to a further 485-970 cars and that is not including the additional cars that will be accessing the area at peak times to get to the new employment spaces that are being proposed. New slip roads accessing already busy areas of the A3, especially at peak times would only increase the risk of accidents along those sections of roads as people try to join the A3 flow. I do not believe it is a sensible, well thought idea to go ahead with a development plan that could increase the chances of road traffic accidents.

Increased population size will add to the strain on The Villages Medical Centre, which is already very busy. Further development will make it near impossible to be able to get an appointment within a reasonable time on an already heavily strained Centre. As Send it situated between two large towns, Woking and Guildford, which provide good access to local facilities and transport links, it makes it a prime location for families to establish. The children that grow up here will need access to a local school and Send only has 1 infant school and 1 junior school which could become over-subscribed from an increased number of residents that would be caused from the additional houses that are being proposed to be built and increase the pressure on these schools.

The greenbelt land provides an open feel to the area and gives Send its characteristic of being a small village with a more rural feel. The development of employment floor space and resulting loss of this greenbelt land would see Send loose its identity and start to merge with the larger towns of Woking and Guildford. Greenbelt land is aimed to help minimise urban sprawl and is not a place for industrial development. Aside from this, greenbelt land provides important spaces for wildlife to survive amongst the ever developing landscape. Building on this land will see a loss of both plant and animal species therefore reducing biodiversity of organisms in the area. These species will either die out due to habitat destruction or have to find new homes, leading to competition within other habitats and putting strain on other ecosystems nearby.

New development plans should impact the lives of the residents in a positive manner and as you can see from my reasons stated above this would not be the case with these proposed ideas and why I strongly object to these development plans. I trust that you will take these points into consideration and drop the proposed plans.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Regarding the proposed developments in the Send Green Belt area. The National Planning Policy Framework intended the Green Belt to be permanent, there are no special circumstances to justify abandoning it.

I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. Without the green belt, Woking and Guildford will merge into one large conurbation. This goes directly against a promise that Central Government and Local Councillors gave to protect the Green Belt.

I object to building 400 houses and several thousand square meters of industrial space at Garlich's Arch. Any industrial development should be an extension to the existing area at Slyfield. Incidentally, the Slyfield Industrial Estate does need another access route.

The Garlich's Arch site is prone to flooding, and is covered in Ancient woodland. If brownfield site were effectively used this Green belt would not be needed.

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. The single lane road provides insufficient access. Un-safe landfill waste is in the subsoil of this site, and this is registered with Guildford Borough Council.

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. The vehicular infrastructure is totally inadequate for any more traffic.

I object to the proposed new interchange with the A3 at Burnt common.

Send Road cannot, and must not have to deal with increase in traffic that this junction would create. My children go to school at Send First and St Bedes Schools, and the risks of crossing the road outside Send First are already frightening.

I work in Guildford and it can take me 45 minutes to get to work when the A3 has come to a halt. Adding to its use in this area is a preposterous idea.

The whole concept of these developments seem to ignore all the existing issues with congestion, on the roads, getting a school place, booking an appointment at the Dr's etc.

I moved to Send to be AWAY from overcrowded suburbia, and into a Village existence.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
on one of Guildford Borough’s jewels, the Wey Navigation, and any development would be very detrimental to it. Access to the site from the A247 is by a very narrow lane just one vehicle wide far more suitable for a horse and cart than a forty-four-ton HGV. Any development at this point would detract from the openness of the land (GREEN BELT) around the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2672</th>
<th>Respondent: 15568033 / Neil Jenkins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 to new local plan

I object to Send village, Wisley, Clandon and Ripley being removed from the Green Belt. We bought our house in this village to be outside of the hustle and bustle of Guildford or Woking and to bring up our children in a small village environment. This environment will be ruined by these plans.

I object to the number of homes that the plans intend to deliver.

I object to the new 4-way on/off ramp to A3 at Burnt Common (A43a). This will not alleviate traffic in Send, Ripley or Clandon. I believe it will make it worse. And it will enable further development.

I object to the inclusion of Green Belt within the proposed new Village boundaries (which is very likely to lead to more development in the future)

I object to Garlick's Arch proposal (Policy A43) to build 400 houses and 7000 sq. Metres of light industrial warehousing. This is literally on our doorstep and the increased traffic and noise would be unbearable.

I object to the destruction of the Green Belt in this area, including the development of 2,000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow (Policy A25) which is in clear contravention of the central Government's stated commitment to Green Belt protection.

I object to the last minute inclusion of new sites with less than 2 weeks notice. Due process has not been followed.

I object to the limited consultation period which doesn't give residents enough chance to digest everything and the impact this will have on their lives.

I object to policy A44 involving 1.9 ha of land to be designate for 40 homes and 2 travellers' pitches. This is new and was not included in the regulation 18 draft, and has not be consulted upon previously. Development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent Green Belt Status.

The Green Belt was intended to be permanent, as required by National Planning policy Framework, and there are no special circumstances to justify abandoning it. Send's Green Belt provides an essential buffer stopping Woking and Guildford becoming one conurbation.

If we had wanted to live in an urban environment we would have bought a house in Guildford or Woking. We bought into the beautiful countryside on our doorstep. These plans will be devastating for the villages of Send, Clandon and Ripley and I wholeheartedly object to them.

I would like my comments to be given to the planning inspector.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2694  Respondent: 15569345 / Alexander Alexiou  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **I object to Send being removed from the Green Belt.** The Green Belt was established as a permanent feature required by the National Planning Policy Framework and not something that can be taken away under pressure from property developers, unjustified government targets or a Borough Council who prefers to develop in the areas that they believe will give them the least resistance.

There are no special circumstances to justify Send losing its Green Belt status and as a buffer to separate Guildford from Woking it is essential that its Green Belt status be retained.

Local councillors and central government gave a clear election promise to protect the Green Belt. The current proposals renege on those promises.

1. **I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery.** This is a ridiculous idea. Tannery lane is a narrow and bendy road joining Send Road at a very difficult and potentially dangerous junction. The traffic in Send is already heavily congested and further traffic emerging from Tannery Lane will only make this worse. Traffic improvements at the junction will not help, as the congestion is the result of bottlenecks at both the Burnt Common and Old Woking roundabouts. The future traffic has already been exacerbated by planning permission for 64 apartments and a marina further down Tannery Lane.

1. **I object to building 400 houses and 7000m² of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch.** Ancient woodland! Subject to flooding! Plenty of brownfield sites already available in the borough! Slyfield is already the industrial centre of Guildford Borough so why create another one especially as there is an over supply of industrial space in the area at the moment and for the foreseeable future. In addition, Guildford’s housing plan requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and when challenged, the council refuses to release their calculations.

1. **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.

1. **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:
1. I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery - there is already a high volume of traffic and the roads cannot take any further traffic. The roads are particularly windy and very dangerous to all road users. By building additional properties this will compound the existing issues with dire consequences.

2. I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq ft of industrial space at Garlick's Arch. This is in the greenbelt area and there are definitely brown belt sites in the area that are ripe for development and would keep the green belt in tact. I also understand that the requirement for housing in the Guildford area is not as high as has been specified.

3. 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.

4. I object to the a 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:

1. I OBJECT to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. There is no justification for abandoning the Green Belt framework and its rationale; nor for the breach of pre-election promises. Abandoning Send's Green Belt status will inevitably be the first step in Woking and Guildford becoming one rambling and unacceptable conurbation

2. I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nurseries. Our access on to Send Road is from Sandy Lane, opposite Tannery Lane: this is a difficult and dangerous junction at the best of times; and things will be made worse by this additional building

3. I OBJECT to the proposed development at Garlick's Arch. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The proposed industrial development is not required in this Green Belt site

4. 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

5. I OBJECT to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. This will inevitably increase the traffic, pollution etc in Send 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?
I write to **OBJECT** to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework required that the Green Belt was intended to be permanent and there is no justification for abandoning or reneging that policy. The Green Belt area of Send and the surrounding district is an essential ecological and bio-diverse area; to deviate from that status would open the floodgates to Developers and create a sprawling urbanisation.

I also **OBJECT** to the construction of 45 houses Clockbarn Nursery as it is wholly inappropriate for the existing road network in that area which is narrow and winding.

I **OBJECT** too to the proposed development of 400 houses and 7,000 square metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road. Part of that site floods and much of it is covered by ancient woodland plus the location is completely in appropriate for industrial units. I would question the need for industrial units in the immediate area but if the demand is there then it makes more commercial and economic sense to extend the Slyfield Industrial estate. If additional housing is required it would be better located near the existing residential area of Burnt Common Lane/Clandon Road but a sympathetic development limited to a maximum of 10/12 houses of mixed configuration.

I also wish to **OBJECT** to the proposed development of 40 houses and 2 traveller’s pitches at Send Hill because a) the area is again wholly inappropriate for 40 houses with the narrow and twisting roads. It may work with 5 or 6 extra houses but absolutely no more than that and b) traveller’s by their very nature ‘travel’ and the existing road network is far too narrow and winding for large caravans being towed behind large vans and small trucks. However, I suspect the two traveller’s sites are actually intended as permanent sites which is a fundamental contradiction of terms. If ‘travellers’ want a permanent site then they are no longer ‘travellers’ and should instead be looking for housing accommodation or vacancies on existing residential caravan parks. [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.]

Finally I **OBJECT** to the proposed new interchange with the A3 Ripley Bypass at Burnt Common because Ripley and Send are already heavily congested at peak times with School, A3 and M25 traffic and cannot cope with the extra traffic it and the proposed housing developments of Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill and Blackwell Farm would generate. The area would become totally gridlocked daily and the noise and pollution levels exceed safe limits for local inhabitants.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
significant changes require another full consultation under regulation 18, not the short cut of regulation 19 which GBC are trying to get away with. This invalidates the whole process.

1. I object to the evidence - GBC have failed to provide sound evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) which shows an 80% reduction in employment space from the previous ELNA carried out by GBC in 2013. This means that industrial space at Burnt Common is no longer needed. As numbers from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015 (SHMA) are highly questionable. The number of foreign students has been wrongly inflated to meet the need. The required number of 13,860 houses in the local plan is exagerrated. If the population is to grow by some 20,000 in the plan period, 8,000 new home homes are actually needed (based on 2.5 persons per home). The Green Belt does not need to be built over. 50% of the new homes could be built on brownfield sites. GBC’s Transport Assessment was not even available to councillors for the vote taken on May 24th, havin been published on 6th June. The overload to the infrastructure has been given scant consideration.

1. I object to Policy P2 - Send should not be removed from the Green Belt. Send provides a buffer between Woking and Guildford. The particularly vulnerable areas of land being taken out of the Green Belt include (i) the land behind the school, including playing fields and woodland; (ii) the land to the right of Cartbridge by the Wey Navigation up to the new boundary fence with Vision Engineering; (iii) land to the left of Cartbridge going up to the old depot on the Wey navigation.

1. I object to Policy A43 - 30ha land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common designated for 400 houses and 7,000m2 of industrial and warehousing. There is no need for any more houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the Borough. This site is new and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted on previously. It is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents further merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances. The site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered with ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th Century would be gravely endangered. The proposed industrial development of 7,000m2 is simply not required since the last ELNA in 2015 shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000m2 of industrial space it should be at Slyfield. A new four-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common would be disastrous for Send. The traffic in Send Road (A247) would be gridlocked all day. Send would become 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. The village of Send simply could not take this.

1. 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 containe 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.

1. I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and twisty to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles trying to join the main road. Planning permission has previously been granted for 64 appartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina, both of which will generate additional heavy traffic. The lane simply cannot take any more. The junction is already too dangerous and will be made much worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am writing to object to the local plan as it pertains to the village of Send, where I have lived for the last 25 years. I would like my comments to be seen by the Inspector please.

I object in particular to the number of new homes planned in total (485) without adequate consideration having been made to improving the local infrastructure to support the new residents. In particular I do not believe the main road through Send can support the extra traffic likely to arise. While I understand some money has been put aside to improve the road, it is far from clear what realistic improvements could be made, and this is already a very busy road and bottleneck during the rush hour. The additional housing together with a proposed new junction with the A3 will clearly exacerbate this existing problem. If this quantity of housing is really to be considered, then some way for traffic to by-pass the village in order to get to Woking or places further north would be required. In addition there appears to have been no plan to improve the schools in the village or the medical centre facilities, which are therefore likely to be overwhelmed.

I also object to Send being taken out of the green belt area. This will only encourage further in-building, further aggravating the existing problems.

Finally, I object on the basis that these plans overall are likely to change the rural nature of the village and surrounding areas, therefore significantly adversely affect life in the village. I am not convinced that this degree of building is required on green belt land, when there are brownfield sites still available in Guildford and other areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I also strongly object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space at Garlick's arch. This site is covered by ancient woodland and on green belt land. It seems to me that Guildford Borough council have exaggerated there housing requirements whilst refusing to disclose their calculations to its borough residents, surely this wrong. There is an adequate site at Slyfield which could take the extra industrial site metres if it is actually needed at all. I strongly object to this development proposal.

Finally I would like to reiterate that my village Send cannot cope with any of the proposals that I have listed above. The local amenities and infrastructure are not up to it. Schools are full, the doctors surgery is full and roads are already at bursting point. To implement any of these proposals is not right in a designated GREEN BELT area and I strongly object to them.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I have objections to the proposals in the Local Plan for the following reasons:

- I object to Send village being removed from the Green Belt. It is inappropriate to change the boundaries solely on the basis of enabling the development sites that are currently protected by being in the Green Belt. Brown field sites such as that at Slyfield are being discounted because of the time it would take to prepare the sites for building!

- I object to the destruction of woodland at Garlick's Arch, to allow for the building of 400 houses and 7,000 sq m of industrial space. This site is a NEW addition to the Local Plan and has not been consulted upon previously. It's inclusion is only because of the above mentioned issues to increase the size of the Slyfield site. There are no exceptional circumstances and the local facilities in Send and Ripley cannot take the extra people and the existing infrastructure cannot take the additional traffic. Many of the roads in these villages are lanes.

- I object to additional slip roads to and from the A3 near Burntcommon, this area is already congested at peak times of the day around the Burntcommon roundabout and the surrounding roads.

- I object to the Send Hill development of 40 houses and traveller pitches, this site is another NEW addition to the Local Plan. It has previously been landfill and contains documented unsafe landfill waste. Again the roads in this location are lanes and unsuitable to take more vehicles.

- I object to the development of 2,000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm, this site is very close to Send Village and the impact of traffic through the village would be substantial for vehicles not going north or south on the A3 but instead coming through the centre of Send. The building of the new junior school on the same site as the primary school will already increase pedestrians and traffic on Send barns lane and Send Road which are already extremely busy at peak times.

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 strongly object to Send village being removed from the green belt. I have only moved in less than a year ago to Send, having moved out of Bellfields in Guildford. The reason my family and I have moved here is precisely for the reason that it is in the green belt and therefore by law is protected and should remain in its current state and free from further development. The green belt was intended to be permanent protection by law to ensure we do not hand over an overdeveloped sprawling mega city to our children, the countryside must remain and there is no special circumstance in this case why the law should be ignored. Local councillors and central government have given clear election promises to always protect the green belt, no matter what and this is a complete retraction of the promises and policies that lead to election.

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>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business park from the green belt because;

- It will generate further traffic that will clog up the area to the detriment of all those currently living here
- It is an areas of outstanding beauty and is quite rightly protected as green belt that would be completely destroyed by this change
- there is no exceptional circumstance why the current green belt allocation should be changed for this purpose

Please take every one of these objections into consideration for the local plan

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>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT TO Send Village being removed from the Green Belt.

I OBJECT TO the disproportionate amount of development in one area of the Borough

400 HOUSES AND 7000sq METRES OF INDUSTRIAL SPACE AT GARRICKS LANE

40 HOUSES AND TWO TRAVELLERS PITCHES AT SEND HILL

45 HOUSES AT CLOCKBARN NURSERY
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT TO Send Village being removed from the Green Belt.

I OBJECT TO the disproportionate amount of development in one area of the Borough

400 HOUSES AND 7000sq METRES OF INDUSTRIAL SPACE AT GARRICKS LANE

40 HOUSES AND TWO TRAVELLERS PITCHES AT SEND HILL

45 HOUSES AT CLOCKBARN NURSERY

WISLEY SITE 2000 HOMES STILL IN THE LOCAL PLAN GOSDEN HILL 2,200 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? ( )

I object to Green Belt, Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15 (Send Business Park) being taken out of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3017  Respondent: 15584065 / Amy Gervasio  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 facilities in Send/Ripley to cope with the extra people who come and live here. The doctors and schools are already bursting and cannot take any more residents.

I OBJECT to the lack of thought put into the road infrastructure to accommodate all the development suggested: Send has one road winding through it which then snakes through flood plane into Old Woking. These roads are already too busy. The amount of cars resulting from the developments around Send/Ripley will just overload these roads. The traffic will be unbearable and the pollution from stationary and slow-moving vehicles will cause a health hazard to local residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/577  Respondent: 15585313 / Kim Styles  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object 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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/567  Respondent: 15585345 / Wanita Styles  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. I object 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 its 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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/449</th>
<th>Respondent: 15585409 / Vanessa Styles</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 removing Send Business Park from the Green Belt (4.3.15).</td>
<td>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. 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: PSLPA16/3124</th>
<th>Respondent: 15587169 / Sylvia Denison</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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>Concluding Comments</td>
<td>The views I have expressed above are based on my experience as a resident in this area for some 16 years and have experienced the various traffic routes which are in issue with the current proposals, as a regular driver at peak and off peak times. It is inevitable that an increase of residential housing and industrial use at the level proposed, brings an increase in the population and traffic. The current infrastructure (medical, educational and policing) is clearly at its limit to provide for the current population. GP appointments on the day of need are already difficult to obtain and requests to make an appointment at a future date becoming quite a rarity. Police visibility is no longer valued it seems. It is said that resources now need to be matched to risk for example, cyber crime, historical crimes against the vulnerable, and other areas of major crime. Patrol presence is a feature of policing long ago, and is no longer in the best interests of the community (National Council of Police Chiefs). In accepting this as a feature of national policing policy and practice, I remain more concerned that increases in a population still carries with it potential conflicts between individuals and cars. 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: PSLPA16/3275</th>
<th>Respondent: 15590529 / Linda Mumford</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I strongly object to the high number of houses intended for this area which is currently small villages connected by narrow country roads which are already overloaded, poor quality and impossible now to walk down safely. Trying to keep abreast of what Guildford’s intention is for the area requires an eye for attention to detail. Developments come and go and some are slipped in at the last moment to confuse and baffle us.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

In particular I have issues with Guildford’s plans for the following developments as they do not show consideration for their surroundings, the impact the influx of large numbers of people will have on village life or the roads that will receive increased traffic flow.

I OBJECT TO development of Clockburn Nursery, Tannery Lane (45 houses) covers an area where there is already a marina and 64 apartments planned. Tannery lane is a single track road that already takes far too much traffic. The quality of the road is poor and the edges non-existent and walking along these roads impossible. It emerges at Send Road at a cross roads that is already horrendous to navigate.

I OBJECT TO development of Garlick’s Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road, (400 houses and 7,000 sq. Metres of industrial space) slipped in at the last moment in the hope it would be overlooked. This particular site reeks of underhandedness and it would be interesting to know who has a vested interest in this going ahead. Such a large number of houses and industrial buildings on virgin green fields is criminal in the extreme. Guildford has plenty of existing industrial complexes that would welcome expansion and which already have the infrastructure in place to take the traffic generated. Such a large number of houses and influx of people will totally change the character of the area. Where are the extra schools and doctors to support these numbers? We are struggling now to get appointments with our doctors and our children into our schools of choice right now, increase the population by 25% and it will be impossible.

I OBJECT TO 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:
I object to the 2016 draft Local Plan for the proposed insetting (policy P2) of the green belt land within the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon. The proposals fly directly in the face of the council’s stated objective to protect the local green belt land. “Most valuable green belt will be a ‘no, no’ in Guildford's local plan, borough council leader says” (quote from getSURREY, 15-Feb-2016. There are numerous existing brown field sites available within the borough and there is no need to irreversibly destroy valuable green belt areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3330   Respondent: 15593665 / Thomas Cope   Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT specifically to Ripley and Send Villages being removed from the Green Belt. The green belt was intended to be permanent, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, and there are no special circumstances to justify abandoning it. Send’s Green Belt provides an essential buffer stopping Woking and Guildford becoming on conurbation. Local councillors and central government gave a clear election promise to protect Green Belt ad this reneges on it, Developers will be quick to take advantage and there will be nothing to stop them

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3348   Respondent: 15594849 / Andrew Thomas   Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.

I 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: PSLPA16/3352   Respondent: 15594945 / Sally Thomas   Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3354</th>
<th>Respondent: 15594945 / Sally Thomas</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/3366</th>
<th>Respondent: 15595297 / Caroline Davison</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 Send Village being removed from the Green Belt, I can see no reason whatsoever for this being necessary for the local community. The Green Belt / flood plain prevents Send from being swallowed up by Woking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: pslp173/227</th>
<th>Respondent: 15595553 / Carol Davis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt as this location is next to the River Wey navigation next to beautiful countryside. As mentioned above the road, Tannery Lane, is totally unsuitable for additional traffic and is a narrow country lane. This is a totally unsuitable area for further development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3393</th>
<th>Respondent: 15596129 / Kim Beauchamp</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 **Send being removed from the Green Belt.** The Green Belt was established as a permanent feature required by the National Planning Policy Framework and not something that can be taken away under pressure from property developers, unjustified government targets or a Borough Council who prefers to develop in the areas that they believe will give them the least resistance.

There are no special circumstances to justify Send losing its Green Belt status and as a buffer to separate Guildford from Woking it is essential that its Green Belt status be retained.

Local councillors and central government gave a clear election promise to protect the Green Belt. The current proposals renge on those promises.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
To whom it may concern

In regards to the planning consultation for the area of Send and in particular the Send Hill proposal I wish to strongly object on the following grounds.

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 unfortunately immediately degrade the neighbourhood 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.

I wish to add further notes:

1. I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.
2. I 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.
3. I object to the exaggerated “housing need” figure of 13,860 which is far too high and results in the completely unnecessary development of the Green Belt. The way students, economic need and affordability are calculated inflates the housing need.
4. I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.
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.
7. 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.
8. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.
9. I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.
10. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.
11. I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for
vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

12. 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: PSLPA16/3882  Respondent: 15602529 / Darren Lambert  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send  
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 unfortunately immediately degrade the neighbourhood 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.

I wish to add further notes:

1. I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.
2. I 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: PSLPA16/3474  Respondent: 15602625 / Margaret Lambert  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In regards to the planning consultation for the area of Send and in particular the Send Hill proposal I wish to strongly object on the following grounds.
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 unfortunately immediately degrade the neighbourhood 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 wish to add further notes:

1. I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.

2. I 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.

3. I object to the exaggerated “housing need” figure of 13,860 which is far too high and results in the completely unnecessary development of the Green Belt. The way students, economic need and affordability are calculated inflates the housing need.

4. I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.

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.

7. 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

8. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.
9. I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

10. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

11. I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

12. 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: PSLPA16/3543</th>
<th>Respondent: 15602625 / Margaret Lambert</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The 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 unfortunately immediately degrade the neighbourhood 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 wish to add further notes:

1. I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.

2. I 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.

3. I object to the exaggerated “housing need” figure of 13,860 which is far too high and results in the completely unnecessary development of the Green Belt. The way students, economic need and affordability are calculated inflates the housing need.

4. I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.

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.

7. 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.

8. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

9. I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

10. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

11. I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

12. 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.

13. 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.
14. 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.

15. I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

16. I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4088  Respondent: 15604129 / Poppy Greener  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As you are intending to destroy the Village for future generations it is incumbent upon me to let you know the feelings of my daughter:

Poppy Greener, aged 10:

“I object because where I am growing up there is loads of green space. If you take Send out of the greenbelt there will be none of these things and we will have to stay in the garden and there is no space to ride our bikes in the garden. I like watching all the wildlife but again if you take Send out of the greenbelt there will be none of these things to watch or do”

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3567  Respondent: 15609089 / Catherine Pelling  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. The green belt was always intended to be forever as required by the National planning Policy Framework, and there are no special circumstances to justify the green belt being lost in part. The green belt in Send creates a divide between Woking and Guildford and should this be built on this divide will be lost forever. The protection of the green belt was promised by both local councillors and central government and development and development of Clockbarn Nursery, Garlicks Arch, Send Hill, A3 Burnt Common interchange would breach this promise.

I object to the construction of 45 new houses of Clockbarn Nursery because of very poor access and the increased traffic volume. Tannery Lane is not fit for purpose to take additional traffic, especially with previous planning being given for 64 apartments and the Marina at the Tannery. The lane will not be able to take any more than this plus the junction onto Send Road is already hazardous and extra traffic on this junction will make matters much worse.
I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial spaces at Garlicks Arch, opposite to Send Marsh Road. The site is liable to flooding and is covered in ancient woodland. The industrial space is not required in Send, any further industrial space should be sited at Slyfield in Guildford. Proper use of brownfield sites would eliminate the need to develop on Green belt sites.

I object to development of 40 houses and 2 travelers pitches at Send Hill. The single access narrow country road in not appropriate for access. The subsoil at the proposed site contains unsafe landfill waste which has been registered at GBC. Any development would spoil the beautiful countryside at this site.

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt common because Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 new homes at Wisley Airfield and 2000 homes at Gosden Hill in Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. The increased traffic would cause cause the already strained Send Road to become gridlocked and noise and pollution levels would become intolerable. This can not happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. The green belt was always intended to be forever as required by the National planning Policy Framework, and there are no special circumstances to justify the green belt being lost in part. The green belt in Send creates a divide between Woking and Guildford and should this be built on this divide will be lost forever. The protection of the green belt was promised by both local councillors and central government and development and development of Clockbarn Nursery, Garlicks Arch, Send Hill, A3 Burnt Common interchange would breach this promise.

I object to the construction of 45 new houses of Clockbarn Nursery because of very poor access and the increased traffic volume. Tannery Lane is not fit for purpose to take additional traffic, especially with previous planning being given for 64 apartments and the Marina at the Tannery. The lane will not be able to take any more than this plus the junction onto Send Road is already hazardous and extra traffic on this junction will make matters much worse.

I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial spaces at Garlicks Arch, opposite to Send Marsh Road. The site is liable to flooding and is covered in ancient woodland. The industrial space is not required in Send, any further industrial space should be sited at Slyfield in Guildford. Proper use of brownfield sites would eliminate the need to develop on Green belt sites.

I object to development of 40 houses and 2 travelers pitches at Send Hill. The single access narrow country road in not appropriate for access. The subsoil at the proposed site contains unsafe landfill waste which has been registered at GBC. Any development would spoil the beautiful countryside at this site.

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt common because Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 new homes at Wisley Airfield and 2000 homes at Gosden Hill in Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. The increased traffic would cause cause the already strained Send Road to become gridlocked and noise and pollution levels would become intolerable. This can not happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I have been a resident of Send for 20 years. I am incensed at these plans. You have no idea, or do not care about the impact on the villages that these plans will have. Ill-conceived plans - you are destroying peoples way of life and reducing the buffer zone between Woking and Guildford. I am outraged at this. It is irreversible what you are planning on doing, do you not understand what you are doing? Do not hide behind the 'we need extra housing' excuse to cover up on your failure to fulfil the Green Belt promise. This is about money and contracts! Last year we had the destruction of woodland off Send Road to build a factory and now this.

1. I object to Send being removed from the Green Belt. The Green Belt was established as a permanent feature required by the National Planning Policy Framework and not something that can be taken away under pressure from property developers, unjustified government targets or a Borough Council who prefers to develop in the areas that they believe will give them the least resistance.

There are no special circumstances to justify Send losing its Green Belt status and as a buffer to separate Guildford from Woking it is essential that its Green Belt status be retained.

Local councillors and central government gave a clear election promise to protect the Green Belt. The current proposals renege on those promises.

1. I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. This is a ridiculous idea. Tannery lane is a narrow and bendy road joining Send Road at a very difficult and potentially dangerous junction. The traffic in Send is already heavily congested and further traffic emerging from Tannery Lane will only make this worse. Traffic improvements at the junction will not help, as the congestion is the result of bottlenecks at both the Burnt Common and Old Woking roundabouts. The future traffic has already been exacerbated by planning permission for 64 apartments and a marina further down Tannery Lane.

1. I object to building 400 houses and 7000m2 of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. Ancient woodland! Subject to flooding! Plenty of brownfield sites already available in the borough! Slyfield is already the industrial centre of Guildford Borough so why create another one especially as there is an over supply of industrial space in the area at the moment and for the foreseeable future. In addition, Guildford’s housing plan requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and when challenged, the council refuses to release their calculations.

1. 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.

1. 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:** PSLPA16/3571  **Respondent:** 15609249 / Melanie Leigh  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write as required ahead of 18 July 2016 to object to the Draft Local Plan currently available for comment.

I have lived most of my life in Send Marsh. I visit regularly from my principal London working week residence.

Please confirm receipt of this letter and take regard of my submissions as follows:

I object to removal of Send Village from the Green Belt

I object to removal of Ripley and Send Marsh from the Green Belt

I object to removal of Ripley from the Green Belt

The previous draft local plan was withdrawn after generating widespread local opposition. Mole Valley MP Sir Paul Beresford observed:

“This catalogue of errors and omissions has led to a situation in which the Local Plan as presented has no detectable support from Guildford residents and has managed only to anger and worry so many of those who stand to lose the unique and valuable rural village lifestyle they currently enjoy in the Mole Valley Wards of Guildford Borough”.

Sir Paul’s commentary applies to the revised plan.

I object to this new or second Draft Local Plan (as Sir Paul anticipated it) because Guildford Borough Council still has not recognised local feeling and opinion in formulating it. I object to the failure to consult in any responsible way and to the approach taken for all of the reasons recited by Sir Paul which seem to have been ignored in compiling the new or second Draft Local Plan.

Infrastructure in Send, Ripley and Send Marsh and Clandon being already overloaded such that the smallest disruptions cause gridlock over much of our essentially rural roads network please also note that:

I object to an expanded A3 interchange at Burnt Common,

I object to housing and business development proposed for land described as Garlick’s Arch,

I object to housing development at Clockbarn Nursery,

I object to housing development at Send Hill,

all of these sites being unsuitable and in the Green Belt.

The rural character of these villages will be destroyed if these plans proceed as proposed.

I look forward to hearing from you.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attach documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3680</th>
<th>Respondent: 15616513 / Sarah Harrison</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 send village being removed from the green belt. Send provides an essential "gap" or buffer stopping Guildford and Woking becoming one continuous urban area. If Send were removed developers would be quick to take advantage without protection of the green belt.

I object to 45 houses being built at Cockburn nursery. The road infrastructure cannot cope with this volume of additional traffic associated with this level of development. Tannery Lane is just that a Lane, twisty and narrow. There is also a very hazardous junction to Send Road.

I object to building 400 houses and 7000sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's arch. Send simply could not support such an increase in housing. The site often floods and I believe this is an area of ancient woodland.

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. The access is via a narrow single land road which is insufficient.

I would be grateful if my comments were shown to the planning inspector and please send confirmation of receipt of this communication.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attach documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3771</th>
<th>Respondent: 15627393 / Brandon White</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 all the proposed sites in Send because they were not included in the previous consultation in 2014. Unlike the rest of the borough Send has not been properly consulted and all its sites have been changed substantially.

I object to the 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 reduced.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attach documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3849</th>
<th>Respondent: 15633217 / Emma Cooper</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>PSLPA16/3864</td>
<td>Respondent:</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 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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</strong> to the 2016 draft local plan for the following reasons and would like my comments to be seen by the inspector: I object to Send, Ripley and the surrounding villages being removed from the green belt. Our MP promised to protect the green belt yet the local plan is proposing to remove 15 villages from Green Belt, this is unacceptable. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPA16/3865</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15634177 / John Davies</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object</strong> to both Sends removal from the Green Belt, the reason a lot of the local residents have chosen to live in and around send is because of its green belt and thus it green fields and open spaces. It also provides us with a buffer from both Woking and Guildford. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPA16/3884</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15637377 / Cieran Leigh</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Please confirm receipt of this email and take regard of my submissions as follows:**  
- I object to removal of Send Village from the Green Belt  
- I object to removal of Ripley and Send Marsh from the Green Belt | |
• I object to removal of Ripley from the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3886  Respondent: 15637633 / Scott Kent  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.

I object to the building on the Green Belt at Send at Garlick’s Arch, Clockharn 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: PSLPA16/3930  Respondent: 15640897 / Jackie van Heesewijk  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

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?
Comment ID: PSLPA16/3938  Respondent: 15641505 / Annabella Goldsmith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The inclusion of Garlicks Arch, the four traveller pitches at The Paddocks and the overdevelopment at the Talbot.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3940  Respondent: 15641569 / Trevalyn Gregory  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In regards to the planning consultation for the area of Send and in particular the Send Hill proposal I wish to strongly object on the following grounds.

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 unfortunately immediately degrade the neighbourhood 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 removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary buffer between Woking and Guildford.

I 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:** PSLPA16/4046  **Respondent:** 15651009 / Miranda Pigram  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building on the Green Belt around Send at Garlick’s Arch, Clockbarn Nurseries and Send Hill, because there are no special circumstances for justifying these developments 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:** PSLPA16/4077  **Respondent:** 15658465 / Michael Cuell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Specifically I object to:

- All and any erosion of the green belt
- The site at A43 Garlicks Arch
- The site A43a, the on and off ramp at Clandon, which will cause increased traffic problems in the villages.
- The site A45 The Talbot, this constitutes overdevelopment of a conservation area.
- Site A57, The Paddocks – which is unlawful.
- Any in setting of villages from the Green belt is an outrage; it is the same as removal destroying the historical fabric of the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/4082  **Respondent:** 15658497 / Philip Williams  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 15 villages, including Ripley and Send, from the green belt. This will lead to wholesale, and often inappropriate developments.
I OBJECT specifically to Ripley and Send Villages being removed from the Green Belt. The green belt was intended to be permanent, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, and there are no special circumstances to justify abandoning it. Send’s Green Belt provides an essential buffer stopping Woking and Guildford becoming on conurbation. Local councillors and central government gave a clear election promise to protect Green Belt ad this reneges on it, Developers will be quick to take advantage and there will be nothing to stop them.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4133</th>
<th>Respondent: 15664609 / Diane Pengilly</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 the Guildford Local Plan 2016

I object to the Local Plan as 13,860 new houses without adequate infrastructure will damage this area of Surrey in many ways (Policy S1) - it is not sustainable:-

There are insufficient schools and hospitals in the area to accommodate this number of homes - it will bring around a minimum of 50,000 people to an area which is rural/semi-rural and green belt. I object to the destruction of green belt for planning purposes. We have green belt in order to protect greenbelt areas... this makes a mockery of have green belt areas in the first place. 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 surrounding roads will be absolutely backlogged with the additional traffic. The A roads and cut throughs through villages all leading to the M25 will be impassable in rush hour if you introduce this volume of people and their cars (because there is no infrastructure for public transport in these areas around Garlick Arch so they will have to all drive - all the parents, all their offspring, all their visitors).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4144</th>
<th>Respondent: 15665697 / Elizabeth Cross</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 15 villages, including Ripley and Send, from the green belt. This will lead to wholesale, and often inappropriate developments.

I OBJECT specifically to Ripley and Send Villages being removed from the Green Belt. The green belt was intended to be permanent, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, and there are no special circumstances to justify abandoning it. Send’s Green Belt provides an essential buffer stopping Woking and Guildford becoming on conurbation. Local councillors and central government gave a clear election promise to protect Green Belt ad this reneges on it, Developers will be quick to take advantage and there will be nothing to stop them.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4246</th>
<th>Respondent: 15667489 / Tibbalds (Jon Herbert)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design is the appointed planning consultant acting on behalf of Send Parish Council. These representations relate to the June 2016 consultation of the Proposed Submission version of the Local Plan: Strategy and Sites document, which is open for consultation until Monday 18 July.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This supporting statement challenges the overall level of proposed housing provision in the Borough, focusing specifically on draft housing, employment and transport allocations in Send, Send Marsh and Burntcommon. This statement sets out objections to the following allocations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site A42 – Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send – 45 homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site A43 – Land at Garlick’s Arch – employment and 400 homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site A43a – Land for new north and south facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh / Burnt Common</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site A44 – Land West of Winds Ridge – 40 homes and 2 traveller pitches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SRN9 A3 northbound on-slip at A247 Clandon Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SRN10 A3 southbound off-slip at A247 Clandon Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send Parish Council also request that the Local Plan provides 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.</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: PSLPA16/4218</th>
<th>Respondent: 15673185 / Simon Jefferies</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 insetting of Send</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: PSLPA16/4353</th>
<th>Respondent: 15700353 / Edward Warren</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 removing Send from the greenbelt because it will substantially erode the buffer between Guildford and Woking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary space between Woking and Guildford.

The Local Plan is a serious threat to Send and Ripley and should be rejected.

My wife objects too. Please feel free to verify this via her email address above.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the Wey Navigation.

There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tanner Lane in both directions.

Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/24  
**Respondent:** 17159553 / Vicki Groves  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 inset Send Business park from the Green Belt because it will be situated in an area of outstanding beauty within the countryside adjacent to the Wey Navigation and there is highly restricted access along Tannery Lane in both directions. Children regularly use Tannery Lane as a cycle route away from the main roads in order to get to Send Park, and this will increase the risk to other road users, especially on bicycles. Further development of this area directly ignores the openness of the greenbelt and the value to which it provides within our community.

I request that my comments and objections are shown to the Planning Inspector and also request a confirmation to that you have received this objection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/47  
**Respondent:** 17166241 / Eloise Knights  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Green Belt, Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/48  
**Respondent:** 17167969 / Harry Knights  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Green Belt, Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate
I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/49  **Respondent:** 17168001 / Henry Knights  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Green Belt, Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15**

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/50  **Respondent:** 17168033 / Jacqueline Knights  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Green Belt, Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15**

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/58</th>
<th>Respondent: 17178049 / Cam Pulham</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 location is already congested and the road not up to the current demands of the area. The land is green belt, and apart from the business units, a beautiful area. This will only lead to more unsightly development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/59</th>
<th>Respondent: 17178113 / Laura Frankland</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from Green Belt because I believe that further expansion or development at this location totally detracts from the openness of the green belt and it is inappropriate. Tannery lane is a country lane with restricted access in both directions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I moved from West Byfleet to Send because of the proposed development of West Byfleet. I do not want to live in a built up, polluted, noisy and traffic ridden environment. Our green spaces and areas of natural beauty must be protected from over development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/81</th>
<th>Respondent: 17200641 / Lucy Baker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider 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 write to lodge my objections to the changes to the local plan. It is inconceivable that consultation is still ongoing about this. The local and wider public made their views totally clear the first time round and were largely ignored. This is absurd in that councillors are elected by and for the people and their views were that there is too much building and on greenbelt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary objections this time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Housing at Garlicks Arch would be on greenbelt, harmful to the Land and existing villages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Travelling plots are inappropriate, ill-designated and unnecessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is not the space or proper consideration given to Burnt Common proposals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The site at Tannery Lane cannot support such numbers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please consider this and the other thousands of objections.</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:** pslp173/89  **Respondent:** 17221025 / Stuart Morgan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the above Policies A42, A43, A58 and Green Belt Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15 since I consider any encroachment on Green Belt areas is morally and environmentally wrong - given the Brown Field Sites available in the area (including, for example, most of the vast Wisley Airfield site).

Local Plan 2017 is a clear failure of the proper planning process which was the basis of all the tens of thousands of objections to it in its previous guise of Local Plan 2016. However, local Plan 2017 has ignored all those earlier objections and proceeded with even worse schemes, bearing in mind the clearly inadequate surrounding social infrastructure and road links.

Please desist from wasting tax payers' money on such pointless anti-social planning exercise and listen to the wishes of those tax payers in the future.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/197  **Respondent:** 17289697 / Carolyn Sanson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

The removal of Send Business park from the Greenbelt in an area of outstanding natural beauty enjoyed by many villagers and visitors to the area should be kept as it is. The Wey Navigation is used by holiday craft and local fishermen and many birds can be seen in this area.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/201  **Respondent:** 17291329 / Charmian Leach  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I also object to the proposal that removes Send Business Park from the green belt (policy 2, para 4.3.15) as it is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of beautiful country side adjacent to the Wey Navigation Canal and there is restricted vehicular access along Tannery lane in both directions.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/200  Respondent: 17291361 / Ron Leach  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also object to the proposal that removes Send Business Park from the green belt (policy 2, para 4.3.15) as it is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of beautiful country side adjacent to the Wey Navigation Canal and there is restricted vehicular access along Tannery lane in both directions.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/204  Respondent: 17291521 / Barbara Phillips  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I feel that the villages of Ripley & Send are being targeted by the Local Plan for overdevelopment on Green Belt land, in flood areas, creating even more traffic gridlock when there are other more suitable sites available without destroying communities and creating mayhem on the local roads and surrounding area. I therefore strongly object to the above Policies A43 and A58.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/205  Respondent: 17291585 / John Phillips  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I feel that the villages of Ripley & Send are being targeted by the Local Plan for overdevelopment on Green Belt land, in flood areas, creating even more traffic gridlock when there are other more suitable sites available without destroying communities and creating mayhem on the local roads and surrounding area. I therefore strongly object to the above Policies A43 and A58.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/206  Respondent: 17291617 / Matthew Phillips  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I feel that the villages of Ripley & Send are being targeted by the Local Plan for overdevelopment on Green Belt land, in flood areas, creating even more traffic gridlock when there are other more suitable sites available without destroying communities and creating mayhem on the local roads and surrounding area. I therefore strongly object to the above Policies A43 and A58.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/207  Respondent: 17291649 / Ian Phillips  Agent:  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I feel that the villages of Ripley & Send are being targeted by the Local Plan for overdevelopment on Green Belt land, in flood areas, creating even more traffic gridlock when there are other more suitable sites available without destroying communities and creating mayhem on the local roads and surrounding area. I therefore strongly object to the above Policies A43 and A58.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/255  Respondent: 17301473 / Lynda Turner  Agent:  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Our villages raised a huge number of valid objections by our residents in the 2016 consultation and yet the Borough Council have increased the housing, travelling/showpeople pitches and industrial development allocations despite a reduction in the boroughs’ overall target This shows we have not been listened to , our concerns ignored.

With the following proposals – 3,700 houses at Gosden Hill Farm and Wisley airfield (Policy A35) within The vicinity and for proposals for the village of Send, Send Marsh/Burnt Common to have an extra 500 homes, 10 travellers pitches, 7,000 sqm. Of industrial development and slip roads to A3, I HEREBY STRONGLY OBJECT TO EVERY SINGLE ONE OF THESE PROPOSALS ON THE GROUNDS THAT THEIR SEVERE AND ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL (INCLUDING ATMOSPHERIC POLLUTION FROM THE INCREASED TRAFFIC) IMPACT AND UNJUSTIFIED SACRIFIC OF PRIME AGRICULTURAL GREEN BELT AND HISTORIC WOODLAND

PLEASE ENSURE THAT THIS LETTER IS BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE GOVERNMENT’S PLANNING INSPECTORATE AND UNLIKE THE JUNE 2016 PROCESS MAKES OUR OBJECTIONS IN THIS CONSULTATION WORTHY OF ITS NAME

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp173/294  Respondent: 17308417 / Shirley Bowerman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object strongly to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt.

I object because this is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside next to the tranquil and pleasing River Wey Navigation. It is a sore thumb in an area of natural beauty.

I object because of the very restrictive road access for traffic from both ends of Tannery Lane.

I object because expansion or development of this area detracts from the rural nature of the Green Belt and is totally inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/328  Respondent: 17322945 / James Janion  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please see my objections to the local plan for Guildford but more specifically to Site A43 Garlicks Arch, A58 Burnt Common and Site A42 in Tannery Lane.

• Allocation of housing to green belt in Ripley seems unbalanced against the entire borough plans and indeed it is not clear how the plans resolve increased traffic and population to several villages which seem wholly inappropriate considering other non green belt site availability.
• The inclusion of 6 Travelling Show people plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the Green Belt and there is no identified need within the Local Plan
• The allocation of 6 Travelling Show people plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. The Plan is self-inconsistent and therefore not properly constituted.
• 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
• 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 in A42 Tannery Lane does not demonstrate any care or consideration to the accessibility and traffic flow of this rural lane. As a cyclist this road is already a dangerous route to use and an substantial increase will further increase risk to road users, including pedestrians (who have to walk in the road) and cyclists.
• The A42 Tannery Lane proposal does not make any consideration to the impact on the road joining the main carriage way to the A3. What is already a dangerous junction the increase in traffic will further add to the danger the cross roads with Sandy Lane already creates with poor visibility, cars parked creating hazards and lead to increase bottlenecks during peak traffic times as well as danger to other road users such as cyclists and pedestrians.

As a council, this proposal represents a clear disregard for a beautiful part of our land, your proposal does not add value to this area but will cause and create damage to several villages, untold people and has the potential to cause danger to local residents, cyclists, pedestrians and wildlife in the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/377</th>
<th>Respondent: 17366145 / Tara Cooling</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 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.</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: pslp173/396</th>
<th>Respondent: 17380161 / Nicola Banham</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because: The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate</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: pslp173/399</th>
<th>Respondent: 17383969 / Maureen Mitchell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send</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 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 its 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.</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>
I object 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 its 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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I would like to strongly, wholeheartedly object to the ridiculous and unnecessary plans for construction in and around the Send area. I am limited only in objecting to the latest changes to the proposals but I will include my arguments against the entire campaign to construct in and around our town as part of the GBC Local Plan. I hope you will take my voice into consideration.

Firstly, there is overwhelmingly little support for such plans, local opinion suggest that they didn't want, or were not supportive of, any more construction around the Guildford Borough area. The fact that we, as a community of your constituents, have rejected plan after plan should be more than enough of an indication that we do not want any more
housing construction here. Hundreds of us have objected dozens of times to more construction, do you respect us or our views at all? I will state this directly, how is it that hard a concept to grasp?: We don't want any more houses here. I object to any and all plans or changes to plans in regards to construction in Send.

Secondly, the stress that new people and their families will bring to the infrastructure and public services has not been even mildly considered by Guildford Borough Council. It is within the boundaries of the law to reconsider construction, or any changes to plans, when infrastructure is inadequate. The small roads in and around Send are already jam packed with traffic, imagine the increase in issues we will have if more families arrive. Traffic problems along Send Road, Tannery Lane, the A247 junction and the roundabout at Burnt Common are already unbearable enough as they are. Let's theorise an average and say each family consists of two parents and two children. That's already two cars when the children are young but that will increase to three or four when they are teenagers. So for the 500 or more houses that are being suggested that's at least a thousand additional cars on an already over filled road system. I take the 462/3 bus to Guildford for work every morning, it is already incredibly behind schedule during present traffic conditions, this will only worsen as more houses arrive. The drivers should not face the wrath of another angry letter writer (like me) because of the shortsightedness of the council. Road works, of which there is plenty of (and I am genuinely grateful for the work and effort that goes into the road improvements) will only compound this issue even further.

Our water and sewage systems will also be affected, our already intensely overfilled and last remaining school, Send First, will be overfilled even more, and our sole doctors surgery will be overworked with the arrival with several thousand more patients. We also share much of our infrastructure with our neighbours in Woking, how will this be affected? Actually, has any sort of investigation into whether the infrastructure of the surrounding area can take the plans in Send been initiated or even been considered by Guildford Borough Council? It certainly doesn't feel like it.

Thirdly, the environmental impact of these plans would be devastating to the local wildlife and scenery. This foolhardy crusade to construct as many houses as possible in our tiny community has completely ignored the fact that this is the Green Belt, which is supposedly not meant to be constructed on. We chose to live here because we do not want to live in a city or an over-urbanised area, Guildford Borough Council seems intent on denying us this and assimilating Send and Ripley into the surrounding cities. The plans that you are forcing upon us are not justified under the Green Belt policies. I will use two of the more outrageous plans, but make no mistake I and our entire village, objects to all of these and the additional plans. In Garlicks Arch, an area of ancient woodland that has been spared from construction by law since Elizabeth I, you are suggesting construction. This is wrong. How does this justify as "exceptional circumstances in Green Belt policy? Destroying an ancient and beautiful area of forest to build 400 homes and some travellers sites is unthinkably, unfathomably stupid. Guildford Borough Council is also forcing upon us plans, and changes to plans, to construct warehouses and industrial units in Green Belt land. There is no local demand for these and there is actually a decline in demand for industrial land, so much so that there are empty sites in nearby Guildford and Slyfield. Repurpose those, don't shove them in here just to save a few pounds. Fitting in the "minimum" 7000 square metres of industrial shows how little the Borough Council understands about industry, our views and their lack of care about the environment in an age of unbelievable environmental stupidity. Prove us wrong and scrap these plans.

Fourthly, the fact that this is clearly a cash grab for the wealthy housing businesses already bloated on overcharged rates and prices for housing. The fact that these houses are being constructed for private sale, not social housing, makes the prospect that they are for the purposes of affordable housing and relieving pressure on the market absurd. We would object to social housing regardless but this push for yet more private housing utterly negates any arguments Guildford Borough Council has that this is anything but appeasing rich housing businesses that caused all these issues in the first place. The fact that this plague of housing is being considered here, next to London and the more affluent areas of the country, where the house prices are high is clearly to take advantage of the housing crisis caused by the over construction of houses just like these. A suggestion to the council and the government in general. Why not construct houses further north in the country where there is a demand for them, where they are more affordable and not inflated by the high land value that the green belt and Send in particular, offers? Why are you putting the benefit of overly rich construction firms, estate agencies and landlords above the wishes of your own constituents? With the apocalyptic economic disaster that is Brexit fast approaching, I understand the need to construct industrial and commercial areas, but why here? Why not further north in the country where people need housing, jobs and money?

Fifthly, and this is a point I am at odds with in terms of its respectability to a group of people, but there is not desire for any travellers sites and show-peoples pitches in Send. I admit I have limited experience with travellers, but my experience with travellers is overwhelmingly negative. While I am happy to be proven wrong in regards to travelling peoples, they
are still more people living in Send if these plans and their additions go ahead. I must object to any Gipsy, Traveller and Show people's sites, parks, pitches and any other settlements in Send and it's surrounding area. These have been disproportionately allocated in the plans for Send (a point I shall return to later) and shows the lack of respect, once more, that the Guildford Council has for our views.

I have never felt this strongly about local politics, but after a new stream of unbelievably thoughtless and, frankly insulting, plans akin to throwing paint at a wall and seeing what sticks, I had to add my voice once more to the objections, this time with a personally written letter. What made this especially galling for us was the increase to the plans were submitted to our community after Send, as one voice, objected, you decided to punish us and add to these plans.

Taking into account all of my previous points, to read that you have made changes to the initial plans, means that you have disregarded the vast majority of your constituents in Send and their calls to end construction plans around Send. That was around 32,000 people!

You are supposed to represent and listen to us. You are accountable to us. You are supposed to serve us. Don't punish us for objecting, this is our town, our community, our home. I and over 32,009 people implore you: don't destroy our beautiful town in this relentless, ignorant pursuit to build. Forgive my passion, but your refusal to listen to our community is undemocratic and draconic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/461  Respondent: 17415873 / David Elvey  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send  
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 inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

1. Any further development at this location would detract from the surrounding Green Belt countryside area and openness.

1. Tannery Lane is narrow and commercial vehicle traffic access is restricted.
2. As with the proposed development at Clockbarn Nursery any increase in traffic in Tannery Lane will cause further problems with traffic movements at its junction with Send Road (A247).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/482  Respondent: 17419777 / Nick Powell  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  

I object to Geen Belt, Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15 that Send Business Park is now taken out of the Green Belt. Tannery Lane has restricted vehicle access in both directions and further development at this site detracts from the openness of the green belt.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/489  Respondent: 17424097 / Marwan Khalek  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Finally I would like to object to the removal of Send Business Park from the Green Belt. The surrounding area is outstanding countryside and includes the beautiful Wey navigation, which would be threatened by such a proposal. Additionally road networks that surround the business park are not sustainable for further development, in particular the restricted vehicular access along Tannery lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/496  Respondent: 17424897 / Peter Sanderson-Byrne  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object 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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/503  Respondent: 17426081 / Robert Yates  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send

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 inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

• It is effectively an old non-confirming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation.
• There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions.
• Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate.

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? ( )

- It is noted in paragraph 4.3.15 that it is intended to inset (exclude) a number of developed sites from the Green Belt, Send Business Park in Tannery Lane being one of them even though there are no ‘Special Circumstances’ put forward to justify this.
- The site is a non-conforming use within the Green Belt however this alone does not justify its exclusion from the Green Belt, in fact there are a myriad of such sites throughout the entire National Green Belt.
- The site is NOT a major developed site within the Green Belt and therefore does not warrant exclusion. The group of existing buildings is not excessive and is surrounded by open fields and the River Wey Navigation therefore the site has an open character (an essential characteristic referred to in Policy P2 paragraph 4.3.12 and 14) and makes an important contribution to the Green Belt.
- If exclusion of this site from the Green Belt designation is intended to promote further development, residential or commercial, then this will only serve to increase the problems of traffic congestion and highway safety along Tannery Lane and its junctions with Polesden Lane and Send Road particularly at peak flow times.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

1. General Policies relating to Send Parish. Sites (A42, A43, A58)
   - Traffic levels and associated environmental issues. I OBJECT to the proposed significant developments in Send because these will increase both traffic movement levels throughout the Parish and the level of traffic related pollutants over wide areas in and surrounding the Parish.

Housing Numbers: I OBJECT to the scale of development within Send because the increased number of houses proposed (500 + 2 traveller pitches + 8 Traveller /Showman Pitches/Plots) will grow the number of houses in Send by 25%. This is incompatible with maintaining Send’s current rural nature and cannot be supported by existing infrastructure, including education and medical facilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Process: **I OBJECT** to the failure of Guildford Borough Council to recognise and act on the large number of objections relating to proposals for Send and made during the 2016 consultation activity.

1. General Policies relating to Send Parish. Sites (A42, A43, A58)

   ◦ **Traffic levels and associated environmental issues.** **I OBJECT** to the proposed significant developments in Send because these will increase both traffic movement levels throughout the Parish and the level of traffic related pollutants over wide areas in and surrounding the Parish.
   
   ◦ **Housing Numbers.** **I OBJECT** to the scale of development within Send because the increased number of houses proposed (500 + 2 traveller pitches + 8 Traveller/Showman Pitches/Plots) will grow the number of houses in Send by 25%. This is incompatible with maintaining Send’s current rural nature and cannot be supported by existing infrastructure, including education and medical facilities.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

Total records: 715.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common
**Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/58</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 8562305 / Chris Goulding</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</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? ( )**

**NEW LOCAL PLAN - SEND MARSH**

I am writing to object to the change to the Green Belt in Send Marsh.

I see from Appendix H Maps on page 360 that a large section of the Green Belt to the south of properties in Danesfield, west of properties in Polesden Lane and north of properties in Send Marsh Road has been removed from the Green Belt. This change is not highlighted on the Map. The boundary has just been redrawn.

This not shown as a Site Allocaton so why has this been done?

Which other sections of land, not yet designated as Site Allocations have been removed from the green belt in Send/Send Marsh? The Plan does not highlight these. It should.

The Plan is not being honest about all the changes.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/635</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 8608225 / Valerie Jenner</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</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 very strongly to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2017) and in particular to the changes affecting Ripley and Send, which make the Plan even worse than the 2016 proposals.

These are my main reasons:

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick's Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl, half a mile away from where I live. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople sites in A43 Garlick's Arch as the development only includes 400 houses and therefore no provision is necessary as this is not compliant with the minimum of 500 as stated in section 4.2.24 of the plan.

I object to the hiding of development by "deferment" for sites A24, A25, A26 and A43. I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick's Arch. The potential of an increase at site A43 will be extremely
harmful to the rural natures of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause an urban site as buildings abut local boundaries.

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.

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.

I object to the removal of brownfield sites from the Plan (Sites A4, A34 and A44). The Council claims to have adopted a "brownfield first approach" (page 5 of Plan) but this is clearly not the case and is contrary to national guidelines.

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).

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42) which has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. Local rural roads are unable to handle this type of increase in traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/636  Respondent: 8608225 / Valerie Jenner  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to removing Send Business Park from the Green Belt (4.3.15), this is only a small collection of local businesses and there are no exceptional circumstances as required by the NPPF.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites A43 and A42. The lack of any plan for either the physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlick's Arch and the A42 Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan and should not go ahead.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/315  Respondent: 8854785 / Desmond McCann  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

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.

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 its insiting (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.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5: 
"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/622   Respondent: 8900161 / Peter Gelardi   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT

I am writing to register my firm objection to the changes in the Guildford Borough Local Plan currently under consultation.
The fundamental objection to the changes is that they have failed to address ANY of the fundamental issues raised in many thousands of objections that GBC received in relation to the original plan on which these changes are based.

My objections relate to the continued inclusion of the 'strategic' site at Wisley Airfield and the additional inclusion of another 'strategic' site at Garlic's Arch.

The addition of Garlic's Farm is predicated on the SHMA calculation for the original plan, which was fraudulently calculated then and remains so now. It requires a rate of housing expansion DOUBLE that of any of the neighbouring boroughs of similar size, in spite of the fact that half of Guildford is an AONB and much of the rest is Green Belt. The fact that GBC refuse to release the details of the calculation is disgraceful and demonstrates the fraudulent base on which both the original plan and the changes are based.

Further, in relation to the elements of the new plan dealing with Wilsey Airfield and Garlic's Arch.

THEY DO NOT

A Address the fact the road infrastructure in the Ockham, Wisley, Horsley area is inadequate to handle the additional traffic. So that, regardless of plans related to the Junction 10 expansion, until there are slip roads onto and off the A3 at Ockham and Burnt Common and an upgrade of all roads in the area, this development cannot possibly be accommodated and any start on this MUST be deferred until these works are completed. A few cycle lanes and bus routes are not going to do it!

B Recent AIR QUALITY tests by Ripley Parish Council have indicated that traffic levels in neighbouring Ripley are above EU limits and are poisoning the population. There should therefore be no substantial development in this area until the AIR QUALITY levels are back well below the EU set limits.

C Among the many Green Belt regulations that these development trample over is the one relating to the visual impact from afar. The impact of either of these developments on views fro the Surrey Hills will be dramatically negative.

D There are much better places to build strategic sites on brownfield sites in Guildford and elsewhere in the country.

E The Green Belt is a fundamental protection of amenity for London as a whole. The urbanisation south west of London as far as the M25 has turned the whole area into a concrete suburb and it is up to YOU, THE PLANNERS, to stop local politicians making this this happen outside the M25.

Some other objections relating to specific changes in the plan document are included below and form part of my objection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
channelling M25 traffic bound for Woking onto roads totally unsuitable to accommodate it. Joined-up thinking seems to have escaped them when they recently gave planning permission for a new school on that very road when it could have been constructed in a less dangerous position.

3. I object to the 'insetting' of villages like Send in order to accommodate proposals like Clockbarn Nursery. Send is a good example of a 'ribbon' village set in rural Surrey and is distinct from neighbouring towns like Woking for a reason. The continued 'nibbling away' at the surrounding Green Belt like this destroys its character and creates more problems than it solves.

4. I object to the removal of the 'Ewbanks' site from the list of GBC's preferred brown-field sites on the grounds of proximity to Send and the spurious need to comply with the 'merging of settlements' provision. That being the case, then the site at Gosden Hill Farm must also be removed from the plan due to its proximity to Burpham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/418  Respondent: 8913985 / Lynda Newland  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This plan still ignores the principles of the green belt and fails to explain the methodology behind the disproportionate number of houses proposed for Send Marsh as compared to the rest of the Guildford.borough. I therefore strongly request a further review of this plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1992  Respondent: 9323361 / Paul Holden  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to removal of Ripley and Send Marsh from the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/221  Respondent: 10438209 / Anna Beagles  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I am writing to express my objections to the 2016 local draft plan.

I strongly object to any erosion of the green belt.

I live in Send GU23 & with regard to the local proposed building plans: I strongly object to the number of houses which are proposed for, we do not have the infrastructure in our village to sustain all the additional residents & traffic. Do not destroy our green belt, our beautiful countryside. Do not overload/over stretch our village with extra people & cars, we already have difficulties getting school places & doctors appointments.

In addition for these local plans I highly object to the limited consultation period given.

Please re consider - there must be other "brown" sites which could be built on which have the added infrastructure of being within larger towns?

Thank you for your consideration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/630  Respondent: 10638209 / Wendy Rockhill  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

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.

The Plan has become even more biased against the North East part of the borough. Guildford Borough covers an area of over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes currently proposed in the Plan, over 40% (4613) are within 3 miles of Ripley, Burnt Common and Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unnecessary and unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough. 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 places an unnecessary burden on the northeast section (Ripley and Send).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/231  Respondent: 10683457 / Margaret Bruton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I applaud the statement in the” Guildford borough Proposed Submission Local Plan” that “Our new Local Plan for 2015 - 2034 is central to delivering Guildford’s vision for the future. It deals with key issues of local importance and gives direction to deliver a high quality of life in a sustainable way.”
I am pleased that the plan acknowledges that (para 2.10a) “Pressure on existing infrastructure and additional stress caused by planned growth must be addressed if we are to maintain and enhance the borough’s prosperity and quality of life. Many people are attracted to Guildford by the quality of life and environment.”

As a resident of Send I must OBJECT to the changes in the plan since June 2016.

The increased development in Send in the June 2017 version of the plan will put an extra, unjustifiable pressure on the infrastructure of Send.

The current version of the plan with its increased amount of development in Send does not provide the infrastructure for the increased pressure on an already overstretched road network. Consequently this will certainly decrease my quality of life and also the quality of life of other residents in Send.

The increased number of houses and businesses will increase the volume of traffic and as a result will increase journey times as well as increasing the amount of pollution which the local school children will be subjected to as they walk to school (see SCC policy on walking to school).

These alterations to the 2016 version of the Local Plan are not consistent with your stated criteria for drawing up the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/637  Respondent: 10721601 / Vivienne Holden  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write as required ahead of a 24 July deadline to object to the New Draft Local Plan 2017 because:
• I object to removal of Send Village from the Green Belt,
• I object to removal of Ripley and Send Marsh from the Green Belt.

Although previous draft local plans were withdrawn after widespread local opposition there has been no recognition of local feeling and opinion in formulating this third version.

A blizzard of paperwork renders the plan opaque to a yet greater extent. Impenetrable lists of changes of no substance to complainants' responses require a massive effort to engage with at even a superficial level.

GBC assert that objections will only be accepted if related to the New Plan changes; I say that is wrong.

Nevertheless I hereby object to the New Plan changes to ensure my complaints are recorded:
• Clockbarn, Tannery Lane Policy A42- an increase to 60 additional dwellings will worsen traffic problems and damage our green belt,
• Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh Policy A43- 400 dwellings and 6 traveller plots are not appropriate in the green belt,
• Burnt Common, Policy A 58- industrial/warehouse development in the green belt isn't needed or appropriate,
• Green Belt Policy 2 (para 4.3.15)- inset of Send Business Park is an inappropriate green belt intrusion.
Each of these changes would increase traffic, spoil the countryside and defeat the green belt protection carefully husbanded for 75 years.

I fully support the Save Send Acton Group's propositions in their attached commentary leaflets.

Sir Paul Beresford our Mole Valley MP has said of the plan process:

"This catalogue of errors and omissions has led to a situation in which the Local Plan as presented has no detectable support from Guildford residents and has managed only to anger and worry so many of those who stand to lose the unique and valuable rural village lifestyle they currently enjoy in the Mole Valley Wards of Guildford Borough."

Sir Paul’s commentary applies to the revised plan; his observations seem to be ignored.

Infrastructure in Send, Ripley, Send Marsh and Clandon being already massively overloaded, small disruptions cause gridlock over much of our essentially rural roads network so please also note that I still object to:

• an expanded A3 interchange at Burnt Common,
• housing and business development proposed for Garlick's Arch,
• housing development at Clockbarn Nursery,
• housing development at Send Hill.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/42  Respondent: 10773025 / Graham Wright  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a Burnt Common resident I would like to make it clear that I object to the amount of Green Belt being removed from Send/Ripley in the new local plan.

I object to the way that the Garlick’s Arch development was added to the local plan.

I object the lack of evidence that these high numbers of houses are actually needed.

I object to the fact that we purchased a house on Burnt Common Lane with views over fields and now the local plan want to remove this view and replace with 400 houses + industrial units + slip roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/184  Respondent: 10774881 / Kate Cheyne  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

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 inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt (Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15) because:

1. This is an area with prolific birds and wildlife
2. It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
3. There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions
4. Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/196  Respondent: 10781505 / Donna Joyce  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

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 the council's proposal to build all along the A3 corridor.

I find it incredible that these proposals have been put forward!!

The A3 itself is a major concern as it is already a very congested major road link often suffering from horrendous accidents most of those often occurring at the wisely interchange.

I don't need to mention the absurd pressures on our local services as I know this is a huge concern to many!!

I also feel that our wildlife is being vastly overlooked we cannot j deep plundering the green belt it is just not on!!!!

I wonder how much of this proposed development will be affordable???? I cannot afford to live in Ripley and I have been a homeowner for 24 years now.

So who will be buying these proposed properties or are they social housing????

I live in Send and We paid a fair price to live a semi rural life. We do not wish to be placed in a new town.

Look elsewhere for new housing not the A3 corridor.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/632  Respondent: 10782689 / Murray Dudgeon  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to express my strong disagreement to the latest revisions to the plan.
1) The plan to now provide 12,426 new homes seems excessive and based on erroneous projections and could lead to a needless loss of Greenbelt.

2) If the plan is adopted it could also lead to too much land being developed and potentially providing homes for Woking. Why should Areas of Natural Beauty be threatened to provide homes for Woking? This seems totally unfair and ill thought through.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/345  Respondent: 10812289 / Deborah Clover  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Finally, I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because this would give free reign to build expensive new houses here in the future in an area of outstanding natural beauty, adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation. Also, as I have already mentioned there is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions & any development causing more traffic along this road would be a mistake!

Send represents 11% of the borough, yet 40% of GBC proposed development has been targeted in our area! This is disproportionate & will cause over-development of our village & misery to all that live here. Our roads are already frequently blocked before any more development is made & we stand to lose beautiful areas of countryside. We choose to live in a village & not a town because of its rural setting & care passionately about our environment! Please listen to our objections.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/411  Respondent: 10828737 / Claire Dawson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

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 planned 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: pslp173/292</th>
<th>Respondent: 10829281 / Kevin Nicholls</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</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 am writing to object to the following:

- Policy A43 - Land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh.

I am extremely disappointed that GBC have decided to completely ignore the significant weight of objection from its local people and return with an even worse set of proposals.

It proves that GBC would rather prioritise a few ‘travellers’ than heed the comments from thousands of local residents - shame on you!

The latest plan will have an even worse affect on our local road networks and infrastructure, the consequences of which have been completely overlooked. The plan will destroy local green belt and devastate the villages of Ripley and Send.

The Burnt Common proposals were previously deleted from the 2014 plan due to the level of objections, so why have they been added now? To emphasise my point above, GBC have included the word ‘minimum’ in relation to the area to be considered, instead of ‘maximum’ from the previous plan. By threatening to increase the size of the industrial site, rather than decrease it, GBC have demonstrated they are not willing to listen to our concerns.

As a local resident of over 30 years, I am particularly worried about the impact the plan will have on our already congested roads. GBC’s own transport strategy recognises that the borough’s main roads are in ‘a bad place’ and yet are content to build thousands of homes without any contingency in place to manage the significant increase in traffic these plans will cause? I use the A3 trunk road every day so know what I am talking about.

The plan will also worsen the flood risk - why are GBC ignoring the current flood zone 2 allocation?

I hope GBC will come to its senses and recognise this is a flawed plan, completely disproportionate with the area and designed only to ruin local green belt and ancient woodland.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/970</th>
<th>Respondent: 10852097 / Bryan Wakefield</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</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? ( )**

What are the plans for additional health and education facilities to support the increase on population?

During my time in Send Marsh I have witnessed many planning attempts to blight the villages along the A3 with mindless developments. The latest GBC Plan has to be the most appalling attempt so far to turn pleasant Surrey villages into ghettos.
The concept of the Green Belt was introduced to give communities green space, countryside, and identity. In the quest to build houses, GBC seems to have completely ignored the concept of quality of life for those who live in the Borough and who through their efforts, contribute to the very existence and wealth of the Borough and the County.

BEFORE any further developments are even considered the present infrastructure needs to be addressed. Traffic management on the A3 and feeder roads from the M25 to south of Guildford can only be described as a complete farce. Road congestion both morning and evening is an utter disgrace. It has been like it for years and clearly demonstrates a complete lack of nouse demonstrated by GBC Planning.

Is GBC just going through a numbers game? “We have been told we have to build thousands of homes, so we will just stick them along the A3”. With the advent of Brexit, the whole future housing requirement must be questioned, as should why is this part of the Borough is being so heavily targeted. It really does beg the question who are the beneficiaries of this plan. The lateness of the addition of Garlicks Arch will clearly result in many people asking many FOI questions for a long time to come.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/39  Respondent: 10866657 / Ron & Pat Bixley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Both my wife and I object to policy A 42,A 43, policyA 58, and greenbelt policy paragraph 4.3.15 within the Send borough as this will have A dramatic effect within the village

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/171  Respondent: 10870177 / Sue Bolton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to register my objections for the proposed plans for developments in Send. namely policies A42, A43, A43a, A44 and A58. All these proposals will mean a greatly increased demand on the infrastructure which at present is not adequate. The traffic along Send Road and throughout the village is overstretched now and the medical centre and school is functioning at full capacity.

I do not understand that as Guildford has REDUCED the numbers of houses planned why the Village of Send’s contribution has been INCREASED.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/472</th>
<th>Respondent: 10903265 / M Stokes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 not sure where the GBC is going with this plan but I find it completely unacceptable and strongly object to the proposals as it stands. Whilst I understand there is a need for future housing within the villages the proposed numbers is excessive and I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan. With the removal and reduction in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. It would seem that because of our villages proximity to the M25 and A3 of the proposed 11350 homes in the Plan, 40.6% are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of which are on the 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: pslp173/774</th>
<th>Respondent: 10906145 / Joe Gervasio</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 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 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 insertion (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.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/626</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 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2017) and in particular to the changes affecting Ripley and Send. These actually serve to increase the impact on local areas by
increasing the number of houses, traveller’s sites and destruction of even more of the Green Belt, rather than as promised, take account of the thousands of objections to the 2016 Plan and many of its unnecessary proposals. By definition, the Green Belt, introduced following the second world war, was intended (and has generally succeeded thus far) to provide breathing lungs encircling large towns and cities, to improve air quality, increase opportunities for city dwellers to experience countryside and fresh unpolluted air, and generally to assist in preserving quality of life. Not only do many of the proposals serve to include Guildford Town in the over populated and congested south east even more than at present, if puts the opportunity for ‘breathing lungs’ even further from inner city dwellers reach, and increases the problems caused by potential over-crowding and congested living. The proposals focus on housing, without consideration of health, transport and education provision, unless funded by the sale of property to fund the necessary infrastructure.

There are many now disused brownfield sites, which are excluded from proposed developments included in this plan, which rather seeks to destroy woodland, desecrate open green spaces and will effectively do nothing more than provide the unaffordable housing for local people, in inappropriate and seemingly desirable settings, without supporting infrastructure.

My objections are as follows

1. **I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.**

The Plan has become even more biased against the North East part of the borough. Guildford Borough covers an area of over 100 square miles. Of the 11,350 homes currently proposed in the Plan, over 40% (4,613) are within 3 miles of Ripley, Burnt Common and Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unnecessary and unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough. 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 places an unnecessary burden on the northeast section (Ripley and Send).

1. **I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)**

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan".

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

1. **I object to the rationale resulting in the need for massive increase in housing stock in the borough which is based on flawed evidence.** Guildford Council’s assessment of housing need is overestimated by about 40% because of inaccurate assumptions about the number of students seeking to remain in the area once completing university studies.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/627</th>
<th>Respondent: 10967489 / Jenny Jackson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</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>

1. **I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)**
I object specifically to ‘Garlick’s Arch’ (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

1. 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: pslp173/628  Respondent: 10967489 / Jenny Jackson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the principle of hiding of development by “deferment” (A24, A25, A26, A43)

This version of the Plan openly conceals some development planned to take place by “deferring” it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This is designed to have 2 effects:
   i) to hide the number of housed actually being built (A24, A25, A26 – total of 1100 deferred, but still being built!), and
   ii) give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 – 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/629  Respondent: 10967489 / Jenny Jackson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object 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.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/257  Respondent: 11008225 / Russell Pascoe  Agent:
I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation.
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions.
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

SEND BUSINESS PARK POLICY 2 AT PARA. 4.3.15

We are back to Tannery Lane and all the problems that ensue together with the development for the Marina, which nobody in Send wanted. Further development in this area would be a disaster. I object to this proposal.

I do wonder how many of you live in Send, travel in Send during the rush hours, try to make a doctor’s appointment in Send and notice how difficult this area is becoming because of the development, and that is without all the proposals listed above.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to Policy A42: Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane.

I object to Policy A43: Garlick’s Arch. Send Marsh/Burnt Common/Ripley.
Because, the 2014 proposal for 430 house in Send was reduced to 185 in April 2016. In May 2016 policy A43 was added with 400 houses and Industrial units. At June 2017 we have 500 houses and 10 Traveller/Show people plots.

I object to these latest changes because of the increased pressure on local facilities, Doctors, Schools etc. that 500+ homes would bring to Send.

500 new homes would generate circa half a class for Send school, which has no capacity for these extra pupils.

Send does not need, nor do we want a 25% increase in population.

I object because GBC have exaggerated the need for the 12,426 houses currently in the local plan. A population increase of 20,000 in the plan period would require just 8,000 homes based on 2.5 soles per habitat.

**I object to Policy 2 paragraph 4.3.15 Send Business Park, Tannery Lane, removal from Green Belt**

Because, these buildings are traditional non-conformers, adjacent to the National Trust owned Wey Navigation Canal/River. An area of outstanding countryside and natural habitat for birds and wild life. The night time Owl spotting is marvellous.

Further development will only increase traffic in this narrow lane, single track in parts, to an already dangerous junction with the A247.

I see these developments solely as commercial gain for the developers and of no benefit to the existing residents of Send, Ripley and the surrounding area. In fact the level of development Proposed will be detrimental to those of us living here.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
5. I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because increased traffic from proposed sites at Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill, Burpham and Blackwell Farm (approaching 6,000 houses in total) that needed to reach Woking and its railway connection with London, would have to go through Send. Send Road is already overloaded with traffic – its roundabout connection at Broadmead with Old Woking is always a stress point now – this extra traffic will swamp it! Noise and pollution levels, already dangerously high, will become toxic!

6. I request that my objections as detailed in items 1 to 5 above are shown to the Planning Inspector who will decide on each of the planning sites concerned.

7. Please confirm that you have received this letter.

In overall terms, Send residents are overwhelmingly opposed to the destruction of the Green Belt and the increase in traffic, pollution and lack of suitable infrastructure implicit in building significant numbers of new homes in Send. The continual eroding of the democratic process in Surrey, whereby local objections are not given due consideration by local planners has got to be reversed. Please listen to what local people are saying – it is incumbent on you that you do so!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Marsh. In addition there are also developments of warehouse/industry capacity, a travelling show people site and a waste management facility in the same area. The use of Green Belt land has been prioritised over Brownfield options (I note A34 and A44 for example and the change of use of A4 from homes to provide more retail facilities), it is totally unacceptable to use green belt instead of brownfield sites (policy P2, particularly around site A43). I also see the proposed plan as an unfair allocation of development in the north east of the borough that has not been well justified. In addition I object to the lack of local infrastructure planning that has been shown in this proposed plan, particularly around A43 and A42, our villages have not got great road infrastructure, nor lots of capacity in schools, doctors or dentists etc.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/642  Respondent: 11061185 / Peter Komisarczuk  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I summarise the key issues from my perspective as a resident around many of the proposed developments:
• A43, removal of Garlicks Arch from Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances as required by the National Planning Policy for this removal. Building circa 650 houses etc. here is not appropriate.
• A43, 6 travelling show people sites in A34 Garlicks Arch, not required as A50 has an allocation of 14 plots. No “need” extra facility at Garlicks Arch.
• Hiding of development by “deferment” (A24, A25, A26, A43). I applaud your strategy of deferring some development beyond the period covered by the plan! This results in some 1,100 additional houses being approved in A24, A25, A26 and up to 650 in A43 for development in the future. This sort of shenanigans is bordering on predatory behaviour by Guildford Borough Council, by targeting the north east of the borough.
• A43 and A58. It is clear that the “required” industrial space should more than adequately be provided in A58 and does not need the development within A43. In addition the “separation issue” previously used should be applied to A43 Garlicks Arch as that includes ancient woodland etc. and so should be preserved.
• A58 – Waste Management Facility. This is mentioned in policy 4.423a. This policy does not allow for full and proper consultation and is an inappropriate inclusion in the proposed plan. This provision of these facilities is highly contentious.
• A4, A34, A44. As mentioned earlier, I object to the removal of brownfield sites, or their redevelopment for retail (we already have a lot of that in the borough), if that results in the removal of some area of the Green Belt.
• Increase in A42 housing proposal. The proposal is to increase by a further 1/3rd which will impact the road infrastructure further. It is already pretty bad, with tiny lanes that are unsuitable for large numbers of additional cars, let alone construction traffic and there is no proposal in the plan to improve the infrastructure. I presume it is too expensive and would reduce the profits of the developers (in line with your new policy).
• Removal of Send Business Park from the Green Belt. Why? Its some small businesses – what are the “exceptional circumstances” as required to make this change?
• Lack of infrastructure improvement within the proposal – basically there is no analysis and no proposal to improve the infrastructure, which is unacceptable. This needs to be investigated and agreed before the proposed plan can be implemented. I am sure I have missed many other aspects in the proposed plan, however I hope that this objection will have a positive impact on the proposed plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/14  Respondent: 15068737 / Angela Blaydon  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common
**Comment ID:** pslp173/38  **Respondent:** 15108065 / Claire Cable  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (), is Sound? (), is Legally Compliant? ()

I object to Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15, because it is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation. There is also extremely narrow and restrictive access to this area in both directions making heavy vehicular access very difficult. Further development here is inappropriate and again will be imposing on Green Belt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/119  **Respondent:** 15129473 / Sharon Tedder  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (), is Sound? (), is Legally Compliant? ()

Policy A42/A43/A58

I object to all of the above policies mainly because it is building on Green Belt land - isn't there Green Belt for a reason??

The increase in traffic is already evident through send marsh and ripley on the lead up to the M25 this will only increase. This is a main school route so there will be an increase in accidents within the area.

Pollution will increase. And unnecessarily increase over development. One of the reasons we moved to send marsh from Guildford was because we wanted a quieter less traffic polluted area.

Where is the demand for Travelling Showpeople.

From what I understand from previous objection meetings I have attended this is down to land being "gifted" from a farmer and is clearly being offered a huge sum of money from the council to develop this land - that comes down to greed and nothing more. These developments are not required and as a local resident makes me angry that GBC would even consider some of these plans. Perhaps look at some of the other issues which require more attention and not just developing for the sake of developing!!!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have not followed the correct process for Send and Ripley developments. Any significant changes to the 2014 proposals, such as the proposal development of Garlicks Arch, should have required another full consultation, which did not happen. This invalidates the whole process.

I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have failed to provide sound evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment which shows that industrial space at Burnt Common IS NO LONGER NEEDED.

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 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.

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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/217  Respondent: 15153569 / Christopher Slinn  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1) I object to the junction with the A3 at Burnt Common not being built until several years after the housing development. The transport infrastructure should be fixed before development starts.

2) I object to the totally inadequate budget for road improvements. Noise and air pollution is already bad. I believe there are new forms of Tarmac that reduce road noise.

3) I object to the poor transport plan. There is already gridlock frequently through Ripley, Send and Clandon.

4) I object to the erosion of the Green Belt.

5) I object to the disproportionate amount of development in one area of the Borough.

6) I object to the last minute inclusion of new sites with less than 2 weeks notice.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/190  Respondent: 15195969 / Carrie Wheeler  Agent:

---

Section page number  
Page 21 of 41  
Document page number  
1490
I am a resident of Send Marsh and have been for the last 40 years. As you can imagine I have seen some changes over that time, which I have accepted and adapted to, as they were well thought out and managed to maintain the character of the villages of Ripley and Send, BUT the draft plan devised for this area in the last 18 months is the destruction of the character community and picturesque landscape of our loved villages.

I object to the increased number of houses planned at Clockbarn nurseries from 45 to 60. This is an increase of 33% and objections were made on the original development! An increase will just further hit the already struggling infrastructure, clogged roads with too much traffic, road surfaces getting damaged, increased risk of accidents and health hazards from fumes, from the volume of cars.

Our green belt will become less and less, countryside views will be a thing of the past and there will be an increased risk of flooding as the area is allocated as flood zone 2. More houses will inevitably upset the already tested water table putting our homes at risk!

I object to the increased number of houses to be built at Garlick's Arch, also giving provisions for 6 travelling show people plots - Why? As far as I am aware there is absolutely no need for making allowance for that many plots, the circus does not come to town in Ripley and Send regularly so why are these areas necessary?

Why is it thought a good move to build on our preserved green belt land and have no distinction between the 2 villages? They will simply morph into one and all the individual character of the villages will be destroyed, the area will become one large waterlogged traffic jam!

It should also be noted that the area is contaminated with lead shot, accumulated over 50 years, which would be a hazard for building on.

I object to the new allocation of a Minimum of 7,000 sq m. Given to industrial and warehousing space. On the original plan this figure was given as the Maximum allocation of space. The call for these sites, seems rather excessive as areas such as Slyfield in Guildford have empty sites and the 2017 Employment Land need assessment showed that there has been a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land, our allocation is equivalent of 10 hectares of land and on GREEN BELT land!

With the traffic already on breaking point if all the housing plans go ahead, the addition of Lorries, and delivery trucks etc. Will just cause total gridlock So all in all I object most strongly to all the new proposals, stating many of the reasons in my letter. I completely understand that additional houses are required in the area, but Ripley and Send are already struggling. Surely if we had wanted to live in a town, we wouldn't have come to live here! We pay a lot of money to live here, in property prices council tax, and maintaining the charm and beauty of the area, please respect our views, we are a united front in our upset at these ruinous plans and I beg you please to listen to our concerns and appreciate that these proposals are far too excessive and will bring nothing but problems upset and bad feeling.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The site known as ‘Send Business Centre’ comprises the main building complex to the north of Tannery Lane comprising some 7,400sqm floorspace, the industrial curtilage to its west, the car and truck park and storage to the south of Tannery Lane and the island to the north of the complex between the Canal and the New Cut; in all approximately 3.2ha (8 acres).

The site has been used for industrial purposes for over 200 years originally as a tannery. The present owners were tenants in 1939 and purchased the freehold in 1948. moving to Send at the outbreak of World War 2 on 5th September 1939. This was due to an explosion and fire at their existing plant in Arbutus Street, London which required the owners to find a new factory site.

At that time, most of the site was operated as a tannery processing rabbit skins. Following the purchase of the site’s freehold in 1949, the original tannery was gradually closed and the whole site turned over to the manufacture and processing initially of gum and resins to meet supply contracts with the MOD, the Admiralty, and Ministry of Food. Due to war shortages, goods arrived both by lorry and barge from the London docks and were unloaded along the site’s wharf for processing on the Island due to the contaminative nature.

After the war the site operated principally as a chemical grinding and milling works. These heavy industrial operations continued in tandem with other business uses of the site up until about 5 years ago, when the manufacturing operations ceased and moved to Teeside, thus freeing up the whole of the site to be used as a Business Centre.

The house known as Cheriton and its former garden has been part of the curtilage of the site since the last war and a barge dock was excavated into the former garden of Cheriton to facilitate barge turnarounds and loading. It was also used to transport Gum Damar to and from the northern site’s island curtilage for processing in one of the company’s industrial stills. The iron framework of the still remains in situ on the land forming part of the curtilage of the site between the River Wey Navigation canal and the New Cut. The still was operated remotely from the rest of the buildings due to the hazardous nature of the processes as volatile solvents were used in the process.

The area for the future expansion of the Business Centre therefore originally comprised ‘Cheriton’ a house and its former garden that was brought into the industrial complex and additional land to the west acquired in 1961. The former garden to Cheriton was used to extend and improve the wharf whilst the house provided lodgings for German and Italian prisoners of war working as indent labour on site. When the post war economic conditions improved in the 1970s and housing and labour became more freely available, Cheriton was occupied by the site’s security guard and factory foreman as part of the 24/7 manufacturing operations whilst its former garden continued to be used for industrial operations.

The open land adjacent to and west of Cheriton that was acquired by the company in 1961 was used to store pallets, burn surplus packaging and as open storage. This land had its western boundary planted with cypress trees to screen the open storage and industrial operations from the village in the 1960s and the road frontage was also fenced shortly after its acquisition. In order for it to be used as part of the industrial complex, large areas of hardstanding and road planings were put down to enable forklift access to move pallets and redundant packaging out of the works for disposal or to be burnt on the open land. The area is subject to low grade, but non-migratory, contamination as the result of its long term continuous use for pallet storage and waste consolidation and disposal and incineration. This land is still in use today as open storage, car parking and the hardstanding also provides access to the recently refurbished and enlarged barge dock granted planning permission in 2016. It is also used as an entrance for Tannery Studios by HGV construction vehicles.

That part of the site immediately adjacent to and south of Tannery Lane has been used as car and truck parking, open storage for pallets, chemical drums, packing and containerised goods for the entire length of time since planning consent was granted for it in 1961.

Over the years of ownership a wide range of planning applications have been made over the entire site’s curtilage varying from replacement buildings, car parking, etc. In 2006 permission to realign Tannery Lane to the site’s southern boundary was granted so that the entire complex can be operated without Tannery Lane running through the middle. This consent is still extant since a lawful start was made on the re-aligned road and correspondence with the council confirmed that to be the case. The company plans to complete the road re-alignment as soon as it has sufficient funds to do so to complete the consolidation of the site’s entire 3.2ha (8 acre site).

Send Business Centre presently provides for the employment needs for a range of start-ups and innovative business as well as more established companies. The site is focussing on the fast-growing creative digital sector with a view to
providing a regional hub to meet the demand from the unique local supply chain of companies as well as liaison of the self-employed creative sector activities such as studios, video, sound & post production and app development. Moreover, LEP funding has already improved fibre infrastructure and promote innovation support at the site.

An important part of Send Business Centre is Tannery Studios (TS). TS is collaborating with both Enterprise M3 LEP and the Surrey Research Park based start-up incubator ‘Set Squared’ to develop TS’ facilities into a globally significant hub specialising in digital media / creative companies. Successful companies at TS will interact with locally based companies such as Guildford’s EA Games, thereby benefitting the Borough. However, site capacity within the existing buildings will be reached shortly and there is a need to provide much needed additional space to reflect the LEP priority of Digital employment in a sector that Guildford is especially strong.

TS already has numerous innovative and expanding companies such as:
• Lifelines Limited, a recipient of the Queens Award for Commerce;
• Tactic Games, the sales agent of the Angry Birds game;
• Ben Preston, the producer for Rhianna and music for the Harry Potter Films
• Alemba – VM software

The demand for multi-purpose studio space is forecast to grow exponentially due to demand from onsite companies and the localised supply chain. Send Business Centre extends to some 3.2ha, and comprises over 7,400 sqm of B1 and R&D employment floorspace. The Local Plan refers to ‘Strategic Sites’ as those that account for over 100 jobs. By comparison, Send Business Centre presently employs 195 people and is therefore well above the minimum parameters for being designated as a ‘Strategically Important Site’ in the Local Plan. Moreover, as referred to above, it is the home of a number of innovative and expanding companies who provide local employment and contribute significantly to the local borough and national economies.

The appeal of Send Business Centre is demonstrated by research that the creative businesses prefer “interesting space” over traditional office stock. Send Business Centre has played to its unique strength of canal views and is also developing its green credentials to attract the next generation of millennials and the creative class.

Send Business Centre is a major recipient of The Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) support and Government funding through the LEP. In 2013, the Enterprise M3 LEP Board decided to proceed with two projects as being recipients of a total of £6.8M funding, Tannery Studios - which is an integral part of Send Business Centre - was one of the two recipients. The allocated £1.3 million is being used to create a purpose built 1,900 sq. m Innovation Centre at Send Business Centre that will deliver a range of bespoke facilities specifically designed to support the needs of high growth creative companies. The facilities will include video studios, sound studios, a live room, editing suites, innovation units and offices which will benefit local ACM and University of Surrey’s Tonmeister Course graduates. Additionally, Guildford’s recognised world strength in the computer games industry through ties to TIGA and the fast-growing audio-visual creative sector.

Commenting on this project Geoff French, Chair of the Enterprise M3 Board, said:
“I am very pleased to announce that the Enterprise M3 Board has approved a further two projects to receive funding from our Growing Enterprise Fund. These projects are very exciting examples of what both the private and public sector are doing in the Enterprise M3 area to stimulate long-term economic growth.
In our Strategy for Growth, the LEP has identified four key priority areas – enterprise, skills, innovation and infrastructure – that we will be addressing to deliver economic growth in the Enterprise M3 area. Both of these two successful bids that we are announcing today is focused on at least one of these areas and therefore is a very worthy recipient of Growing Enterprise Fund funding.” This all points to the strategic importance of Send Business Centre and reinforces the need for it to be recognised as such. Not only does it provide significant floor space and jobs well in excess of the requirements of the Local Plan but perhaps it is how that space has been and will be continued to be used that justifies its inclusion as a Strategic site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Analysis
There is an acknowledged lack of suitable and diverse employment sites that discourages investment from new companies in the Borough and encourages existing firms to relocate to other parts of the UK or overseas. Moreover, the lack of supply is hampering the aspirations of ‘start-up’ businesses. Accordingly, it is right to look at potential land, including those sites in the countryside that provide for sustainable development locations and provide enough employment land to meet the expected employment needs of existing and new residents. This is particularly the case where a number of established employment sites in the countryside can provide for sustainable expansion without harming countryside interests. The rural wards of the Borough accounted for almost half of the new jobs created in Guildford Borough between 2002 and 2008 according to the Guildford Economic Strategy 2011 - 2031.

In the short term, the need for employment land may be met through the intensification and redevelopment of existing sites and the protection of employment use on key strategic sites. This relates to both urban sites and established employment sites in the countryside. In this regard, it is anticipated that with the more efficient use of the existing space at Send Business Centre that a limited amount of more modern space can be made available. However, it is acknowledged by the research undertaken that this and similar sites elsewhere are unlikely to be sufficient in the medium to long-term and does not allow for any choice for potential occupiers or flexibility within the digital studio market. The land on the western side of Send Business Centre is therefore ideally placed to provide choice for businesses to start up as well as supporting existing businesses to expand. Such expansion would be in accordance with para 3.35 of the previously published Local Plan Strategy and Sites Issues and Options paper that advised “… the Local Plan needs to continue to support job creation and business in rural areas.”

The case for expansion of Send Business Centre and Tannery Studios is:
• the shortage of the specialist studio facilities within the borough and wider afield to meet identified demand
• the need for Tannery Studios to improve its production facilities to meet that demand
• the potential of Tannery Studios in providing for growth
• the pool of expertise and facilities already present at Tannery Studios
• the economic benefits of employment particularly job creation builds on an area which Guildford is already particularly strong and foresees expansion in the years to come with a projected growth of the digital film, television and throughout the media industry
• Government’s policy of supporting sustainable economic growth and support for the creative industries
• the existing legacy electrical infrastructure from the site’s manufacturing history offers the large scale resilient power required for lighting and digital storage. The site also offers resilient fibre having invested heavily in two alternative internet routings.

The planned expansion onto the site’s western curtilage is likely to provide in the order of an additional 6,500sqm (70,000 sqft) of business space as outlined in the Design Principles below.

Key Design Principles
The western part of the site is generally flat, is not liable to flood and as referred to above has formed part of the industrial complex for many decades. It is bounded on its northern side by the canal, its eastern side by the existing built complex, Tannery Lane to the south and a belt of trees along its western boundary.

Beyond the western boundary, construction has commenced implementing planning permission for a new marina, chandlery buildings and car park for 70 cars. The proximity of the canal (which forms part of a conservation area), the site’s location within the Green Belt and adjoining and adjacent land uses and feature have all informed the layout of the proposed expansion of the site. Wey Estates Ltd. are in discussions with the owners of the marina development to collaborate with this development with the objective of making use of their permitted dual use 70 space car park in connection with Send Business Centre thus meeting sustainability objectives whilst minimising demands for car parking in the Green Belt and allowing a safe cycle route through both sites.

Since there are well founded policies in the Development Plan to resist the loss of residential buildings, Cheriton is to be relocated to a more appropriate location on the edge of the site and thus there will be no loss of residential
accommodation. Buildings
The council have recently issued a Lawful Development Certificate for external and internal improvements to the existing Business Centre complex for use as design studios and other related facilities. This will bring into use some additional 1,900sqm (20,500 sq ft) redundant and underused space within the existing built complex.

As to the expansion of the Business Centre onto its adjoining site, the Masterplan envisages that this can provide an additional 6,500 sqm (70,000 sq ft) of new business space, primarily used in connection with Tannery Studios contained within 8 separate but linked buildings to provide flexible accommodation to future tenants but with an emphasis on the space being used to provide bespoke facilities specifically designed to support the needs of high growth creative companies associated with the digital sector. The new space will therefore cater primarily for this sector providing:

- the production of web-based video and sound content
- film production
- television productions
- video games and digital content services
- sound post production and additional studios
- music

over and above what are presently planned within the refurbished buildings which can only offer small floor plates below 2,500 sq ft. Together with the refurbished space means that the site can deliver a significant and strategic component to the Borough’s specialist employment needs which is not met elsewhere within the borough.

The expansion space will predominately be 80% to 90% either Class B1 and R&D business uses. A small ancillary use of sui generis, and/or class D will provide amenities such as a yoga studio / staff gymnasium or public / exhibition space / crèche or nursery. Having regard to its countryside and Green Belt location, the proposed units will be linked will by glass atriums thus allowing views between and around the buildings. In terms of built ‘footprint’ there will only be 20.5% site coverage by business buildings meaning that approximately 80% of the site will be free of buildings thus maintaining as far as possible the openness of the site.

In terms of the bulk and scale of the buildings it is anticipated that the accommodation can be contained in a mix of two and three floors and it is anticipated that the buildings will not need to exceed the height of the existing buildings on site.

The architects have arranged the accommodation in such a way to maintain the ‘canal-side’ setting of the existing buildings with the footpath adjacent to the wharf and new barge dock extended along the canal side to the extent of the site boundary.

Landscaping will be an important component of the Masterplan. Not only will the site boundaries be soft landscaped with indigenous broadleaf trees and hedgerows but the parking and turning areas will similarly be soft landscaped cognisant of the site’s semi-rural location. Movement

The site is located some 600m north east of the A247 through Send and is reached via Tannery Lane. The first half of the route from the junction with A247 has commercial and residential frontages but then the road becomes a rural lane with hedgerows on both sides. There is an existing (unsurfaced) public footpath which runs along the south eastern side of this section of Tannery Lane, beyond the roadside hedgerow.

The existing business park development comprises some 7,400sqm of employment floor space currently in B1 and R&D type uses. The site employs a minimum of 195 people and there are approximately 170 car parking spaces. Tannery Lane runs effectively through the middle of the site being immediately adjacent to the buildings and between the buildings and the car parking. Due to the site’s historical B2 and B8 uses, it continues to generate a significant number of HGV movements every day, although HGV use is declining as the site moves to business within the B1 and R&D classes.

Because Tannery Lane effectively divides the existing business park site into two, it compromises the owners’ ability to develop and improve the site in a comprehensive manner. Accordingly, planning permission was obtained to divert that section of Tannery Lane to a new alignment running along the south eastern boundary of the site. That consent remains extant because a lawful start was made on its construction and a Lawful Development Certificate was issued at that time by the Council. The company plans to complete the road realignment when it has sufficient funds to do so as part of the consolidation of the entire site. This would improve the overall efficiency and safety of Tannery Lane through that section of the highway.
A requirement of the road realignment consent is that the length of the existing Tannery Lane which becomes bypassed should be formally stopped up. The land will then revert to the company’s ownership and can be incorporated into future improvements of the site. The current Master Plan is based upon a minor adjustment to the alignment of the proposed new section of road, moving it a small distance to the south east so as to maximise the site. Access into the Master Plan area will remain in the same location, however, as on the currently approved road realignment scheme.

The latest Master Plan layout drawings indicate an expansion of some 6,500sqm gross floor space for the Business Park and an additional 200 or so car parking spaces. Whilst that level of car parking provision is a little below the Council’s parking standards (one space per 30sqm) comparison with the existing use of the Business Park site indicates that what is proposed will be sufficient to meet demand. Moreover, the owners are collaborating with the developers of the adjoining site such that there is a likelihood that an additional 70 spaces will be available for use in connection with the Business Park.

The current floor area of 7,400sqm has 170 car parking spaces associated with it and experience proves that this is sufficient to meet the demand. That level of car parking is a ratio of one space per 44sqm. The 200 car parking spaces proposed with the new floor area of 6,500sqm is a ratio of one space per 33sqm, and the resulting car parking provision for the expanded Business Park as a whole (comprising a total of 14,530sqm with 370 car parking spaces) is a ratio of one space per 39sqm (leaving aside the additional 70 spaces on the adjoining site). That is an increase of some 16% in the parking ratio compared with the current provision.

The new development will, of course, incorporate a range of effective travel planning measures to reduce car usage, together with cycle parking in accordance with the Council’s standards.

As previously described the site is some 600m from A247 in Send where there are hourly bus services operating between Woking and Guildford. The site is also just 4.3km from Clandon Railway Station which operates four trains per hour in each direction between Guildford and London Waterloo, as well as being approximately 5km from the major rail interchange at Woking where there are some 15 trains per hour to London Waterloo at peak times. Both of those stations are within comfortable cycling distance of the site and offer opportunities for people to get to and from work without using cars. The site already has in place a green travel plan and is in discussions with another employment site in Send regarding running a peak hour direct bus service to Woking and Guildford city centres. The majority of car trips generated by the existing Business Park travel via Tannery Lane to and from the A247 at Send. Although much of this section of Tannery Lane is a narrow rural road it accommodates the existing levels of traffic without undue difficulty. There have been no injury accidents along that section of Tannery Lane between the Business Park and the A247 junction or in the car park adjoining Tannery Lane during the last five years. As part of the Master Plan proposals it is intended that improvements will be carried out to the extent that this is feasible within the existing highway boundaries and these measures will improve forward visibility around bends and create passing bays.

Whether or not improvements are required at the junction of Tannery Lane with A247 will depend upon the outcome of a detail Transport Assessment. Previous development proposals for the wider area demonstrated that practical measures to improve capacity and safety can be achieved at the junction if justified. The proposal is likely to reduce the demands of HGV’s as the businesses that would occupy the newly designed buildings would be more R&D based rather than industrial. Access is likely to be primarily from the A247. Deliverability and Phasing

The first phase of the improvements to Send Business Centre by bringing back into use the redundant space is presently under way and it is anticipated that this will be completed by 2018.

In terms of phasing the new build units on the open land to the west, it is anticipated that this would be phased over a 10 year period, commencing in 2020 thus ensuring the deliverability of the employment space within the currency of the Local Plan by 2030.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  masterplanv8.pdf (2.7 MB)
Yet again I find I must write to you regarding your proposal to remove Send and Ripley from the Green Belt. I am so disheartened that you appear to disregard the perfectly valid plea of the local residents and that the infrastructure of our locality is already stretched and many of your plans seem unnecessary, vicious and petty.

I object to the fact that I find my breathing laboured as a direct response to the already heavy weight of traffic which crawls past my house in gridlock, not just domestic traffic but the increase HGV is remarkable in the last few years, and my house now shakes as some of these vehicles pass my house belching pollution into the air we breath, and you feel happy to increase the threat to our health in this way, may I remind you we have a primary school on the road you wish to increase the traffic on, I object to the fact that although there seems plenty of small building projects locally, (indeed I understand there is permission for six more properties on my neighbours garden recently agreed), this is happening all over Send and Ripley, but still not enough to satisfy GBC who really don't care that it is so difficult to get a doctors appointment in our surgery, that we are already subject to local flooding.

I object to the fact that you have a total disregard for the beauty and peace of Ancient Woodland that benefits us all but you wish to heartlessly bulldoze through the heart of British countryside.

I object that you have brownfield sites unused and available but you still feel it necessary to scar our land with more empty warehouses.

I cannot believe that you now plan to increase by over 30% the number of houses you want built in Tannery Lane.

I object to the fact that you need our votes and money but you do not listen, you are prepared to increase the toxicity in this area, you are apparently happy to destroy ancient natural beauty and you make no sense, you are a lazy council, unprepared to listen, to use sites already available, and you still expect unquestioning support. I am completely disheartened, sad, that you have so little heart and fight.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/901  **Respondent:** 15313697 / Eloise Haxton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Having lived at the above address my whole life, I have spent my childhood playing in the fields and woodlands, and been able to enjoy growing up in a village community which will be lost if the proposed developments go ahead. The traffic has increased already, and the roads are not designed to allow for even more traffic that this will cause.

My objections are;

I OBJECT to the removal of 15 villages, including Ripley and Send, from the green belt. This will lead to wholesale, and often inappropriate developments.

I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have not followed the correct process for Send and Ripley developments. Any significant changes to the 2014 proposals, such as the proposal development of Garlicks Arch, should have required another full consultation, which did not happen. This invalidates the whole process.

I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have failed to provide sound evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment which shows that industrial space at Burnt Common IS NO LONGER NEEDED.

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 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.

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.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
plans to make this a similar environment, that I, and others, have strived to move away from. I therefore object to any plans that will remove, our ever disappearing countryside.

I object to the building of houses at Clockbarn Nursery, for the same reasons as above, and additionally for the extra strain this would mean on local roads.

I object to the building of houses and industrial space at Garlick's Arch. Again, for the same reasons as stated in my first paragraph. This development would be detrimental to the woodland and green fields it would involve.

I object to the development at Send hill. This is now a pleasant area, since being transformed from a previous landfill site, and feel it should be left in its current appearance.

I object to a new interchange at the A3 at Burnt Common, as this would funnel even more traffic into this area, resulting in more pollution and vehicles using Send road.

Finally, can you confirm to me that you have received these objections, and that comments have been shown to the planning officer.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/987</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 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</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 moved to Send Marsh 25 years ago with my wife and young family attracted by it’s rural qualities and subsequently we enjoyed the fact that it (and other local villages) benefited from protection from major redevelopment by being protected from major development by virtue of protection of the green belt. I understood that due to legislation passed shortly after WW2 that the green belt boundaries would remain intact in perpetuity.

I OBJECT to the removal of 15 villages, including Ripley and Send, from the green belt. This will lead to wholesale, and often inappropriate developments.

I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have not followed the correct process for Send and Ripley developments. Any significant changes to the 2014 proposals, such as the proposal development of Garlicks Arch, should have required another full consultation, which did not happen. This invalidates the whole process.

I OBJECT to the fact that the first notification I received of the proposed changes to include development of Garlicks Arch was in early June via a leaflet distributed by a concerned neighbour and not via Guildford Borough Council.

I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have failed to provide sound evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment which shows that industrial space at Burnt Common IS NO LONGER NEEDED.

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 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.

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.

Please take into consideration the genuine concerns and objections of people living in these areas who would be seriously detrimentally affected by these proposals and reconsider your proposals.

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 Send village losing its green belt status. The green belt stops Woking and Guildford becoming one conurbation. There are no special circumstances to justify this proposal.

I object to the proposed development at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane is far too narrow to cope with additional traffic, and the junction with Send Road is already difficult for vehicles to emerge safely.

I object to building of houses and industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. The site includes ancient woodland and is subject to flooding.

I object to the development at Send Hill. The road access is insufficient. The site contains unsafe landfill waste.

I object to any proposal that increases traffic along Send Road. This road is already under severe pressure during ‘rush hour’.

Please pass my comments to the Planning Inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

We have the following objections to Current Local Plan as detailed below and wish our views are taken note of. It is relevant that these views are shared by the majority of Send residents and we have not attempted to modify the comments already made by others, as we concur with these views entirely:

1. **WE OBJECT to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt.** The Green Belt was intended to be permanent, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework and there are no special circumstances to justify abandoning it. Sends Green Belt provides an essential buffer stopping Woking and Guildford becoming one conurbation. Local councillors and central government gave a clear election promise to protect the Green Belt and this reneges on it. Developers will be quick to take advantage and there will be nothing to stop them.

2. **WE OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery** because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and twisty to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles trying to join the main road. Planning permission has previously been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina, both of which will generate additional heavy traffic. The lane cannot take any more. The junction is too dangerous already and will be made much worse.

3. **WE OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch,** opposite Send Marsh Road. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial space is not needed but if
it were it should be at Slyfield. Guildford's housing requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and they have refused to disclose their calculations. With proper use of Brownfield sites this Green Belt site is not needed.

4. **WE OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 traveller’s 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 and furthermore, any visit to Send Hill by GBC during the times that children are collected from school by their parents will reveal that traffic chaos is already well developed.

5. **We 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:** pslp173/779  **Respondent:** 15397793 / Sheila Collins  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object 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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp173/123  **Respondent:** 15406145 / Paul Moore  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

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 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?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2601</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 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</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>Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I moved to Send Marsh 25 years ago with my husband and young family attracted by its rural qualities and the fact that it benefited from protection from major redevelopment by the green belt. I understood that the green belt boundaries would remain intact in perpetuity.</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: pslp173/576</th>
<th>Respondent: 15585313 / Kim Styles</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</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>Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</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: PSLPA16/3916</th>
<th>Respondent: 15639905 / Alison Azzopardi</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</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>Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I sincerely hope that all the views of residents in this wonderful part of the Borough are listened to and acted upon. The area surrounding Burnt common, and Send should not be subject to such a range of disjointed development plans, they are in my opinion simply not workable in almost all instances.</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 wish to object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because:

- Development or further expansion at this location detracts from the openness of the green belt, and this is highly inappropriate
- Tannery Lane in both directions has severely restricted vehicular access
- It is in effect and old non-confirming user, adjacent to the beautiful Wey navigation, in an area of outstanding countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I OBJECT TO THE POLICIES

- A42 CHANGE AT CLOCKBURN IN TANNERY LANE
- A43 CHANGE AT GARLICK'S ARCH, SEND MARSH
- A58 CHANGE AT LAND AT BURNT COMMON, LONDON ROAD
- 2 AT PARAGRAPH 4.3.15 regarding the removal of SEND BUSINESS PARK FROM THE GREEN BELT

BECAUSE:

- these developments are in opposition to local requirements, infrastructure and against the desire of local residents
- this is a careless, callous destruction of the green belt, and it will negatively affect us and future generations

There is no evidence supporting the approach and requirements GBC are promoting, and GBC are acting without the support of the community - in fact, GBC are acting in complete contradiction to the community and are disregarding the objections raised by the community.

I call for full financial and relationship interest disclosure of every member and their immediate families/significant others of GBC. This is a common practice where individuals and companies are regulated in financial commercial practice, and I believe it is in the interest of the community to have this visibility.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/87  Respondent: 17210721 / Ann Cameron  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

IN GENERAL, I OBJECT TO DEVELOPMENTS AROUND SEND, TOGETHER: policies A42, A43, A58
I object to changes to these Policies in the Plan on the grounds:
1) Since 2014, GBC has repeatedly changed its mind on what is appropriate for Send, showing lack of co-ordinated strategy. Again now, it is relentlessly and unfairly targeting the area with developments, regardless of previous objections to these excessive plans.
2) The local “village” services, roads, transport, doctors, etc, barely cope as it is. But, under the Plan the population of Send will increase so much that I think that local services will be “unsustainable”, and that is against the fundamental principles of “proper” planning.
3) The Burnt Common area will become “traffic chaos” in peak hours, having 3 major new developments nearby: a huge new housing estate, industrial park, and new A3 slip-road.

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 term 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.

IN PARTICULAR, POLICY A43 – Land at Garlick’s Arch
I object to the changes in this policy, because:
1) This development is far too large for the local area to cope with. It will effectively join villages of Send, Send Marsh, and Ripley, to form one contiguous built-up area; forming, within a short time, a new town effectively.
2) I object to space being allotted to accommodate Gypsies and/or Travelling Showpeople in this area. Around here, these are [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: pslp173/114  Respondent: 17247169 / Ben Greaves  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

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 446 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:</th>
<th>pslp173/180</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>17285473 / Paul King</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</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? ( )

With reference to the planned developments in and around Send Village.

1. I object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt because the village and its countryside provides a necessary
buffer between Woking and Guildford.
2. I 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.
3. I object to the exaggerated “housing need” figure of 13,860 which is far too high and results in the completely
unnecessary development of the Green Belt. The way students, economic need and affordability are calculated
inflates the housing need.
4. I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the
development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brown field areas much closer to
existing transport hubs.
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.
7. 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.
8. I object to the development at Garlic's Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last
moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing
need either for the village or the borough.
9. I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required
since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required
employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it
should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.
10. I object to the development at Garlic's Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is
covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also
subject to flooding.
11. I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far
too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for
vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery
and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.
12. 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.

13. 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.

14. 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.

15. I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

16. I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp173/211  Respondent: 17293025 / Donna Deam  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

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.”

So the developer doesn’t even have to provide any ‘affordable’ homes, just to make a negotiated payment to the Council. This is very unlikely to result in the construction of these ‘affordable’ homes.

Furthermore, the 2016 Plan used to state (section 4.2.40) “In general, a need to make profit over and above the standard developer’s profit in order to fund other community benefits will not be accepted as an abnormal cost [i.e. a reason for not delivering affordable houses]. That has now been removed, thereby accepting that needing to make greater than normal profit IS to be an acceptable reason not to deliver affordable homes. This is a shocking sop to the developers.

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 13,860 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 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 its 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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/252</th>
<th>Respondent: 17301409 / JENNIFER BEDDOES</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</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 would like to object to a number of the policies contained in the above plan.

1. The existing Send Business Park is a good example of the use of buildings in a rural environment. The significant changes in the plan will change the feel of the area and the natural environment……the buildings are too close to the River Wey Navigation.

The single lane highway access in Tannery Lane is already heavily used by cars and commercial vehicles. With development, it is inevitable that the traffic flow would be substantially increased by traffic from the new marina and the proposed Clockbarn development. The road lacks a footpath and has no public transport links.

For these reasons the site should not be expanded or classified as a strategic employment area.

1. I object to the proposed changes to Send Business Park.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/419</th>
<th>Respondent: 17399681 / Anthony Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Plan contains a disproportionate imbalance across the Borough. The Borough is over 100 square miles in area. The Plan designates land for the development of 11,350 homes. Of these, 4,613 (40.6%) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh. This is a wholly disproportionate and unreasonable concentration of development, most of it on Green Belt, in that 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: pslp173/606</th>
<th>Respondent: 17419649 / Fiona Angus</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</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? ( )

It is grossly unfair that around 40% of the proposed new homes in the plan are within 3 miles of Send Marsh. The allocation of new homes needs to be rethought and spread more fairly around the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/542  Respondent: 17433665 / Nancy Hamilton  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also object the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because of the increased traffic this will cause and the removal of the openness of the River Wey corridor which is exceptional at this part of the river valley.

In summary the local plan fails to meet the needs of the residents of Send. It will substantially affect the conservation of the area with overdevelopment causing large changes to the setting of Send, affecting the natural and historic context of the villages. The local plan fails to meet NFFP chapt. 11. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Residents of Send know that the proposals will have a massive negative affect on local wildlife and cause increases in pollution, putting their health at risk. The local plan fails to meet NFFP Chapt 9. Protecting Green Belt land in Send and Ripley, by developing in green belt land without exceptional circumstances being met. The historic environment of the villages will be changed irrecoverably with the proposals in the local plan (NFFP Chapt 12), these proposals in the local plan are completely out of proportion with the small village environment. Both Ripley and Send have a long history of settlement and retain many aspects of a rural village, e.g. annual fairs, active local farms, immediate access to countryside, distinct village centres these will be lost with the proposals.

In brief the local plan proposes excessive and unnecessary changes to the villages of Send and Ripley and the residents of these areas do not want this plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/558  Respondent: 17440705 / Chris Brown  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 proposed insetting around Send and Send Marsh. If the new insetting boundary is adopted, then the land and all the surrounding fields for several miles around our village, by default, will become available for development and building, attracting builders to develop and build on large swathes of open countryside.
This is a completely irresponsible and reckless policy with no regard to co-ordinated planning and will lead to an out of control building frenzy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/631  Respondent: 17462657 / Malcom Scott  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have made representations to you on previous drafts of the plan which have been ignored, however I ask you to take into account my objections to Guildford Borough Local Plan June 2017 for the following reasons:

1 the unfair imbalance of the plan across the borough as regards housing, becoming 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:

Total records: 68.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Shalford North
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2708  Respondent: 8566881 / Mrs Diane Girling  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (north)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to object most strongly to the proposed change to the Shalford Green Belt and Settlement Boundary contained within the new version of the Guildford local plan.

These changes, to which over 700 residents signed a petition objecting to the proposed settlement boundary change last year, will destroy the open character of our village. The fields provide a wonderful setting for the local community facilities, the tennis club, the bowls green and the village halls. The elevation of the land, some 32 feet above King’s Road, if built upon would tower over these community facilities and the surrounding area.

Access to the proposed site is via Chinthurst Lane, an already a very heavily congested country lane, where parking is currently unrestricted. During the daytime there is nose to tail parking from King’s Road along to Ashcroft and access along the lane is at best difficult, and at worst, a fatal accident waiting to happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2798  Respondent: 8672609 / Warren Hazelby  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (north)

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 proposal to move the green belt boundary to exclude the fields behind Shalford Village Hall. The idea behind the green belt is to protect our country side from development. However I understand that as new roads are built and towns expand there is a case in extreme cases to change this, for example the area either side of the A3 between Guildford and the M25. THIS IS NOT THE CASE in Shalford, there are no new roads or motorways, expanding Town etc, and therefore no case to infringe the green belt. Being next to the Village Hall this is an area in constant use and the path leads to the beautiful area of Chinthurst Hill. Also the elevation of this land means that any housing development would be visible from most of the village.

One of the biggest problems for Shalford is the rush hour traffic. The failure of Surrey County Council to build a North/South bypass has meant the A 281 is the only North/South road and has to go through the centre of Guildford. Both the A281 & A2128 (from Cranleigh) meet at the Shalford round about and very long queues form. Many cars now use Chinthurst Lane as an alternative route and this often backs up past my house making it difficult to turn right from my drive. Coming back is almost impossible because of parked cars on the right makes Chinthurst Lane a one way Lane in rush hour. I think it would be irresponsible to allow any development South of Guildford until a viable alternative route through Guildford is built.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3403  Respondent: 8714721 / Michael Cox  Agent:
Objection to Guildford Borough Council’s proposal to (1) move the green belt boundary to include the fields behind Shalford Village Hall, (2) extend the village settlement boundary to include these fields, making it easier to develop

Once again I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to Guildford Borough Council’s proposal to significantly reposition the Shalford settlement boundary which will result in the inclusion of land at the rear of the Village Hall.

If Guildford Borough Council support the expressed views of the local residents to protect the fields from development, they should retain them within the current green belt boundary and keep them outside the village settlement boundary. The boundaries have been there for a long time so there is no valid reason for change.

Over 700 residents signed a petition objecting to the proposed settlement boundary change last year. This issue has united the local community with widespread support across local clubs and other organisations.

This land is in the Green Belt and in an Area of Great Landscape Value, both of which designations are meant to be permanent. If the boundary is changed, the protection afforded by the Green Belt and AGLV will be lost, the consequence of which is likely to be a planning application for housing.

As a resident of Shalford for 34 years, I strongly object to the repositioning proposal and to any planning application for housing on this piece of land, which would create a precedent for further development on other Green Belt and AGLV land.

I am horrified that the removal of the protection of Green Belt land is even being considered. This designation is intended to be a permanent protection for our beautiful countryside for our enjoyment and that of future generations.

This land contributes to the open character of the village and provides an attractive setting for the village’s community facilities. Any development on this land would be clearly visible from the road and significantly impact upon the open character of the village and green nature of the locality.

At 32 feet above King’s Road, the land behind the Village Hall is one of the highest elevations in the area and any housing development built on it would tower over the village community facilities and the surrounding area.

Any development would also impact on the local infrastructure which is already limited, including poor vehicle access, inadequate provision of schools and doctors’ surgery; the latter is already stretched to its limits.

Of particular concern is vehicle access to the site, which would be via Chinthurst Lane, which is not able to take any more traffic, being already highly congested, especially during rush hours when it is used as a “rat run” by drivers trying to avoid the traffic jams on the A281 from Bramley/Horsham and the A248 from Chilworth/Wonersh/Shamley Green/Cranleigh. Chinthurst Lane is a narrow, winding country lane; it is single carriageway along most of its length with hardly any pavements. It is unsuitable for the amount of traffic it already has, let alone any additional. It also has to be borne in mind that because of the increased congestion in Chinthurst Lane that would result from additional housing, it is inevitable that Summersbury Drive and Poplar Road would also become “rat runs”. This would be dangerous as they are narrow, residential roads.

Because of the Green Belt and AGLV status of the land and inadequate infrastructure for additional homes and traffic, I am appalled that this proposal is even being considered.

Please leave Shalford’s settlement boundary where it is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Objection to Guildford Borough Council’s proposal to (1) move the green belt boundary to include the fields behind Shalford Village Hall, (2) extend the village settlement boundary to include these fields, making it easier to develop

Once again I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to Guildford Borough Council’s proposal to significantly reposition the Shalford settlement boundary which will result in the inclusion of land at the rear of the Village Hall.

If Guildford Borough Council support the expressed views of the local residents to protect the fields from development, they should retain them within the current green belt boundary and keep them outside the village settlement boundary. The boundaries have been there for a long time so there is no valid reason for change.

Over 700 residents signed a petition objecting to the proposed settlement boundary change last year. This issue has united the local community with widespread support across local clubs and other organisations.

This land is in the Green Belt and in an Area of Great Landscape Value, both of which designations are meant to be permanent. If the boundary is changed, the protection afforded by the Green Belt and AGLV will be lost, the consequence of which is likely to be a planning application for housing.

As a resident of Shalford for 34 years, I strongly object to the repositioning proposal and to any planning application for housing on this piece of land, which would create a precedent for further development on other Green Belt and AGLV land.

I am horrified that the removal of the protection of Green Belt land is even being considered. This designation is intended to be a permanent protection for our beautiful countryside for our enjoyment and that of future generations.

This land contributes to the open character of the village and provides an attractive setting for the village’s community facilities. Any development on this land would be clearly visible from the road and significantly impact upon the open character of the village and green nature of the locality.

At 32 feet above King’s Road, the land behind the Village Hall is one of the highest elevations in the area and any housing development built on it would tower over the village community facilities and the surrounding area.

Any development would also impact on the local infrastructure which is already limited, including poor vehicle access, inadequate provision of schools and doctors’ surgery; the latter is already stretched to its limits.

Of particular concern is vehicle access to the site, which would be via Chinthurst Lane, which is not able to take any more traffic, being already highly congested, especially during rush hours when it is used as a “rat run” by drivers trying to avoid the traffic jams on the A281 from Bramley/Horsham and the A248 from Chilworth/Wonersh/Shamley Green/Cranleigh. Chinthurst Lane is a narrow, winding country lane; it is single carriageway along most of its length with hardly any pavements. It is unsuitable for the amount of traffic it already has, let alone any additional. It also has to be borne in mind that because of the increased congestion in Chinthurst Lane that would result from additional housing, it is inevitable that Summersbury Drive and Poplar Road would also become “rat runs”. This would be dangerous as they are narrow, residential roads.

Because of the Green Belt and AGLV status of the land and inadequate infrastructure for additional homes and traffic, I am appalled that this proposal is even being considered.

Please leave Shalford’s settlement boundary as it is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
It is my understanding that proposed changes will remove the field's current protected status and leave them more open for housing development.

I have been informed that professional Chartered Land Surveyors have undertaken measurements from various places to the fields behind the Village Hall. From the Village Hall to the fields there is a rise of over 25 feet and from King's Road it is over 32 feet. Add on to this houses of potentially 25 feet plus and it will be a very imposing development looming over the Common and Shalford as a whole and out of character with this part of Shalford.

The land surrounding the Shalford Village settlement boundary includes the Surrey Wildlife Trust beauty spot of Chinthurst Hill – any development on the land behind the village hall would be clearly visible from this area too and much of the area around the hill. This area not only provides beautiful walking paths and recreational areas for the local population, but also for walkers and nature lovers from all over the County.

As a resident I am particularly concerned about the increased traffic volumes that will result if access to future housing development is via Chinthurst Lane. The road is already used as a “rat run” during peak hours as drivers seek to avoid the extreme congestion on the main Cranleigh / Guildford road, backing up from the Shalford roundabout. Chinthurst Lane is single carriageway along most of its length and it is not designed to take the traffic it currently does, let alone additional vehicles. Recent redevelopment of the Railway station car park has also resulted in an increased number of cars parking down Chinthurst Lane during the day and reducing the width of the carriageway further.

This land contributes to the open character of the village and provides an attractive setting for the village's community facilities.

I believe that any development of this land would undermine the character of the village and also add to the pressures on the limited infrastructure that already exists.

Green Belt and AGLV designations are there to protect our beautiful landscape and to protect the open character of this land for the enjoyment of current and future generations, not to be withdrawn as and when the GBC deem appropriate. I am very concerned that if this loss of Green Belt and AGLV goes ahead, it will set a precedent for future development on AGLV in the heart of the village.

Shalford as a village, as we know it, will cease to exist if all the proposals for building go ahead. The essential nature of Shalford will be undermined, which conflicts with another Council policy of retaining the character of the villages that surround Guildford. These fields should remain outside the settlement boundary and remain green belt and AGLV designated.

As a resident of Shalford Village, living in Chinthurst Lane, I strongly object to the repositioning proposal and to any resulting planning application that may result in the development of housing on this Green Belt and AGLV land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
It is some time now since as a village we handed in a petition signed by over 700 residents objecting to the proposed settlement boundary change. Having looked at the latest version of the local plan GBC are proposing I am concerned to find that there is still a plan to move the green belt boundary to exclude these fields. Although it appeared that GBC agreed that the site is unsuitable for development and supported the expressed views of the local residents to protect these fields, it would seem logical that this could only be achieved by retaining the current boundary. The current boundary is perfectly defensible and has existed for years. There is no valid reason, as far as I can see, to change this unless the plan is to aid development of this site. By extending the village settlement boundary to include these fields you will do exactly that.

A developer has taken an option on the site and has been having talks with the GBC so money is being spent to attempt to go against the original spirit of the covenant on the land, which deemed that these fields should always be kept as green space for the village to enjoy and should, as such, therefore be protected. I know the covenant has now been broken but this is a lengthy and controversial issue in and of itself.

The sheer elevation of this land makes it unsuitable for development without destroying the open character of the village and urbanising the pretty lane where they are planning an access road. This land has always contributed to the beautiful and open nature of the village. It has been both green belt and AGLV for some time. What possible reason could there be, for removing this protection now? At that part of Chinthurst Lane there are no footpaths and it could not cope with additional traffic without placing pedestrians in danger, including children, who have to walk in the road. There isn’t room to make footpaths apart from the fact that they would spoil the lane's natural rural character. The planned road would also be between two blind bends and right between two busy houses' drives. It just would not be safe.

Shalford, has undergone a great deal of development over the last 5 years. Station Road is unrecognisable with 3 new developments. The Kings Road has new terrace houses, Dagden Road has a new development and many more houses are planned in this little village but with no plans to deal with the heavily congested roads. There is a feeling in the village that Shalford has done more than its fair share of providing new houses and that this central peace of land, these simple beautiful fields which provide the frame to the backdrop of the hills should remain protected and there for all to enjoy.

I do hope you will consider these points and work with the village residents who are deeply concerned, to protect this precious heart of virgin green within Shalford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The extension of the AGLV across the whole built up area of Shalford may be an error. I object to that proposal as the inclusion of intensive development within the AGLV would devalue existing AGLV. The existing AGLV boundary in the Shalford area should remain where it is and has been for many years.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3145  Respondent: 8840929 / Sandra Hawkins  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (north)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Regarding the new version of the Local Plan, I strongly object to the following proposals:

To move the green belt boundary to exclude the fields behind Shalford Village Hall (the map shows a new area in this location bounded in pink), and which I understand is proposed to be Open Space.

Extend the village settlement boundary to include these fields, making it easier to develop.

These fields must continue to be protected as previously concluded by The Guildford Landscape Character Assessment & Guidance published in 2007 by Guildford Borough Council and Landuse Consultants.

The proposed changes will remove the field's current protected status and leave them more open for housing development. Any development would in addition exacerbate the existing traffic problems in the adjacent Chinthust Lane and Shalford as a whole.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3215  Respondent: 8856801 / David Hawkins  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (north)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

To move the green belt boundary to exclude the fields behind Shalford Village Hall (the map shows a new area in this location bounded in pink), and which I understand is proposed to be Open Space.

Extend the village settlement boundary to include these fields, making it easier to develop.

These fields must continue to be protected as previously concluded by The Guildford Landscape Character Assessment & Guidance published in 2007 by Guildford Borough Council and Landuse Consultants.

The proposed changes will remove the field's current protected status and leave them more open for housing development. Any development would in addition exacerbate the existing traffic problems in the adjacent Chinthust Lane and Shalford as a whole.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I am writing to object to the proposed settlement boundary change in Shalford in respect of the area behind Shalford Village Hall. This area of land sits in the heart of the village and is essential to its character and rural feel of the village, despite only being a couple of miles from Guildford. I live in Corner Cottage and any future potential development on this site will have a material detrimental effect on my property as the land in question sits above, and looks down upon, my property and garden.

There have been multiple attempts to change the settlement boundary in respect of this land. This was suggested in the last version of the local plan and was vehemently objected to by over 700 local residents. This latest attempt comes despite the council not responding to or addressing the multiple objections to the last attempt. In fact, it would appear that the council has brushed the previous objections 'under the carpet' in the hope that these will not be raised again this time. This is disappointing, to say the least. By repeated attempts to, essentially, do the same thing (i.e. rezone this land) it brings a heavy cloak of suspicion down on the council, as the only reason that can be seen for bringing these changes about appears to be to facilitate future development on this land. If this isn't the intention, then it must be asked why the council are wasting time and money on this when it could be to using this on value adding activities.

Repeatedly asking the same question also suggests that the council is hoping that the local residents will get 'objection fatigue' and start to tire of objecting, allowing this proposal to sneak through. This is not democratic - in fact, it's the opposite, with locals beginning to think that the council has its own agenda regardless of what the local residents think. If the public don't engage because they do not believe that they will be listened to, this cuts across democratic principles.

I would also like to draw you attention to the following objections:

- A report was provided to the council in 2007 (the Landscape Assessment Study, 2007, by Chris Burnett, which reported that Shalford requires protection not further development, with the area sensitive and vulnerable to change. This area requires protection from the council, not rezoning.

- The land behind the village hall was donated to Shalford Parish Council a long time ago by a local villager, for the SPC to protect as open green field land for the whole village to enjoy ‘in perpetuity’. The council previously thought that the green belt and AGLV status would protect the land forever and so they could honour this resident’s wish of it being protected ‘in perpetuity’. This brings into question as to why there should be any change.

- As GBC policy is to protect AGLV land unless in exceptional circumstances it makes no sense to move the settlement boundary behind the village hall as this would open up this green belt and AGLV land to development. No special or exceptional circumstances appear to have been stated.

- This steep elevation on this land would mean that any eventual potential development which could take place would be clearly visible from the village green and the surrounding village. The land is 32 feet higher than the nearby main road and over 25 feet higher than the village hall. As such these elevated fields very much contribute to the openness of the green belt and the attractive village setting - they are in fact like a green oasis of peace which the whole village can enjoy when either playing tennis, bowling or attending meetings or functions in the village hall. This field acts as the green lungs for the already 'developed' village and as such are something which so many people feel passionately about protecting for future generations to enjoy.

- Around the field behind the village hall there are already existing established hedges which have been in existence since before the 1950s. These established hedge rows and fences clearly mark the edge of the
settlement boundary and have done so for decades, however they are not visible from aerial maps which also
cannot pick up the unusual elevation of the land behind the village hall when calculating settlement boundaries.
These form clear ‘defensible’ boundaries to de-mark the settlement boundary and so I see no need to alter the
boundary for this reason.

- The Shalford Settlement boundary was originally drawn so that the land behind the village hall which is green
belt and AGLV land remains outside of the settlement and thereby retains its critical protected status.

- Local traffic congestion is already a major issue with Chinthurst Lane, where the access would be to the site
behind the village halls, already highly congested at rush hour. Chinthurst Lane has also become a favoured
parking spot for commuters at the local railway station - which makes the lane almost impassable during the
working day. This has resulted in cars mounting the kerbs by the Common to pass each other. Further up
Chinthurst Lane, it is a narrow country lane without pavements and is already a dangerous place for young and
old to walk along. As someone with a young child, this is of considerable importance to me.

In addition to the concerns above, any development (which surely must be with the intention behind the proposed
boundary change) will affect the sight lines from the back of my property as this area is noticeably higher than the rest of
the village. Due to this height, any possible future development will be able to look straight down into the windows at the
back of my property (and a significant number of the surrounding properties). Of considerably more concern to me is that
this area of land provides a significant drainage utility for the lower village. Even now, there is some 'run-off' which can
be easily identified running down alongside Chinthurst Lane. The scale of this was demonstrated during exceptional wet
weather in winter 2013/2014 when the corner of the Common and Chinthurst Lane flooded on a number of occasions (as
the lowest point in the area). Development on this site will prevent any existing drainage resulting in increased surface
'run-off' which will run down hill and is highly likely to cause flooding to the lower lying properties (including my own)
and the Common on a regular basis. Guildford Borough Council has a duty to ensure that this does not happen.

I very much hope that the Council appreciates the strong level of feeling in Shalford with respect to the proposed
settlement boundary change and is willing to see sense and not make any such change to the boundary.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3734   Respondent: 8917249 / Tadhg Bowe   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (north)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I want to bring your attention to a settlement boundary change in one part of the village of Shalford.

I live at [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the
provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] and behind us is a small triangular field which belongs to [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've attached a map of the field in question. I've highlighted in different colours the current situation and what I'd like to
see changed. Basically:

- I believe the the proposed boundary change in blue is not correct and it's an accidental mistake. There is a lot of drama
surrounding the fields behind the village hall. I think the residents of our part of Christmas Hill have got caught up in this
unnecessarily.

- The preferred solution would be to leave the boundary unchanged (in red).
As you can see in the map the field at the back of Findon Lodge has changed over time. The garden now extends back the whole way (in between the lime and white lines). The original field would have covered all this area hence the existing red boundary line.

Because of the garden changes I have suggested two alternative boundary lines in lime and white.

**The main point here is that the small triangular field needs to remain in green belt please!**

- Over 700 residents signed a petition objecting to these boundary changes last year.

- We live in an area of outstanding natural beauty. Although this small piece of land currently has no intentions of being anything else we need to protect it. You just have to look across to Chinthurst Hill to see how badly this would be affected if something bad were to happen.

- If the fields behind the village hall were not up for consideration then I’m sure the boundary near us would not be changing either. It's a very small correction.

I'm happy to show you what I mean from my back garden. I'll throw in a cup of tea too. If you'd like to chat then please do call me on [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 also want to object to the proposed boundary change to the fields behind the village hall. The big danger here is that the current owner wants to build houses on it.

- Over 700 residents signed a petition objecting to these boundary changes last year.

- The elevation of this land and where it sits in the village contributing to the open character of the village should be protected.

- We live in an area of outstanding beauty. If these fields become less protected then it's such a great shame. I know we need new housing but I think Station Road has given well above the quota needed in our area!

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:  📐 ChristmasHillPlan - BoundaryChange.PNG (1.9 MB)**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3254  **Respondent:** 8968801 / Mary Howard  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (north)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (  ), is Sound? (  ), is Legally Compliant? (  )

I object to your plan to move the historic settlement boundary of Shalford village. I also object to the proposal to eat into the Green Belt surrounding this delightful village, for new housing. Protect the interests of our children in the future.

I object to the congestion this would add to the access road: Chinthurst Lane.

This plan should be put on ice until the effects of Brexit are more obvious, and immigration levels can be assessed.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
As a resident of Shalford and a member of Shalford LTC I wish to make known my objections to the current version of the local plan which removes the fields behind the Village Hall and Tennis Club from the Green Belt and puts them in the Shalford settlement boundary.

Although these fields have been classified as "open spaces" there is no explanation or confirmation to say that this would give them the same degree of protection as the Green Belt from housing development.

Any Construction on these fields which are 25ft above the village hall would tower over the tennis courts and bowling green and totally destroy the Green lung of the village.

The considerable traffic from a development would have to exit on Chinthurst lane not only adding to the traffic chaos and pollution but increasing the potential for an accident.

By implementing a small adjustment back to the 2003 boundary GBC could protect these fields and ensure they remain open spaces.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I am writing regarding the fields behind Shalford village hall, and its status within the new local plan.

I note that the land has still not been returned to its former AGLV status and is still included within the village’s settlement boundary. I would like to object to this in the strongest terms.

I am gratified that the land has now been designated as open space, because at least that is a recognition from the council of how important the area is to the life of the village,

As the fields adjoin the tennis club, bowling green and a public footpath, it gives the village an open character and is a huge contribution to the quality of life of the inhabitants. It is no wonder that a covenant had been placed on the field in the past, to try and ensure the landscape of the village is preserved for future generation (a covenant that was lifted in dubious legal circumstances).

However, even though open space sounds nice, I am very aware that ‘open space’ has no definition in law at this stage, so there is no guarantee that this designation cannot be circumvented by a persistent developer. It is a fig leaf that gives no protection to the land in law.

This unease is compounded as the GBC still insist on placing it within the settlement area of the village, despite all the protests thus far. This, I understand, could strip it of its green belt/AGLV status and make is much easier for a developer to propose building on it.
When it was first proposed that his land be placed within the settlement boundary, a petition was given to the council protesting the move. Some 715 signatures were collected from the people of Shalford, which showed the strength of feeling within the community towards the preservation of the land. It seems that the strength of feeling and strength of numbers carries little weight.

There is little need to allow this land to be developed, only the intention of the current landowner and the development company he is in partnership with to make money. The land itself is on the highest point of the village, and would ruin the landscape surrounding it, and would be seen from the whole village. Also, the only access to this site is a narrow track leading out into an already congested road with no pavements. An increase in traffic would surely jeopardise the welfare of families and children who have to walk along the road to get to the local school and the bus and train stations.

To reiterate, there are any number of sites within Shalford that are suitable for development and are being developed. The only reason that this beautiful area of Shalford is the greed of the local landowner who bought the land for next to nothing (as it was protected by covenant at the time) and now wishes to make a lot of money out it.

I hope that this state of affairs can be rectified to the satisfaction of the people of this village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3980    Respondent: 10823265 / Holly Hubbard    Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (north)  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  
I am writing to object to the proposal to move the fields behind Shalford village hall to fall within the village settlement boundary and outside the green belt.  
These fields lie at the centre of village life and are a contributing factor in what makes Shalford special, and feel not too built up.  
Please don’t make changes for the sake of it, but listen to what the people in Shalford say about our village, and how we want to protect this land so that the whole village can enjoy the open space and character they help create.  
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  
Attached documents:  

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3150    Respondent: 10840801 / Carolyn Kurk    Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (north)  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  
To move the green belt boundary to exclude the fields behind Shalford Village Hall (the map shows a new area in this location bounded in pink), and which I understand is proposed to be Open Space.  
Extend the village settlement boundary to include these fields, making it easier to develop.
These fields must continue to be protected as previously concluded by The Guildford Landscape Character Assessment & Guidance published in 2007 by Guildford Borough Council and Landuse Consultants.

The proposed changes will remove the field's current protected status and leave them more open for housing development. Any development would in addition exacerbate the existing traffic problems in the adjacent Chinthurst Lane and Shalford as a whole.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3503  Respondent: 11076993 / Jim Philpott  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (north)

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 insetting of Shalford as mentioned in the Guildford Plan 2016.

I live in an area of outstanding natural beauty and wish it to stay this way. The plan has not properly been thought out and the roads that are suggested to be used for more traffic are not appropriate for use and will increase CO2 pollution in the local areas suggested.

Please rethink your planning with a more environmentally sound concept. Plenty of homes are not occupied in the local area, why not work to use what already exists rather than create more housing monstrosities in a beautiful area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3461  Respondent: 11170305 / Paul Reynolds  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (north)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I live adjacent to Shalford Village Hall on the Common and I am writing to strongly object to the above new version of the Guildford Local Plan. I have written to the Council before but feel I need to make my feelings clear again by objecting to this proposed extension of the village settlement boundary to include the fields behind Shalford Village Hall.

If this land in question is incorporated into the new village settlement boundary, it will lose its green belt and area of great landscape value (AGLV) status.

This would be a huge mistake as the land would then be open to other further development in the future. Due to the height of the land, which is 32 feet above the Kings Road, any development would be clearly seen and tower over the village community facilities and the surrounding area, detracting from the village feeling of space and open character we have at present. These boundaries have been in place for a long time and there is no valid reason for them to change.

We cannot allow the development of 20 houses on these fields with access via Chinthurst Lane. This would create a disastrous traffic situation where we already have considerable congestion and overcrowded village roads. A further 20 houses on this site would potentially mean a further 40 cars (minimum) using the access road on a daily basis, together with visiting cars. This traffic would be in addition to the already heavily congested country lane we have at present.
The lower end of Chinthurst Lane, leading off from Kings Road, is an impossible drive with the continuous parked cars on one side. Further housing development behind Shalford Village Hall would reduce this road to a standstill. Widening the lane, which I understand has also been proposed, would only further degrade our village from retaining its rural character.

I also object to the fact that the infrastructure has not been properly assessed and is inadequate to deal with current housing levels. The local roads in the area, the schools and local amenities will not be able to cope. Development of this site will surely lead to further areas of beauty being scarred forever.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Thakeham Homes Ltd are submitting representations to the Guildford Pre Submission Local Plan as local stakeholders. Thakeham are a house builder based in Sussex with a track record for delivering high quality, sustainable schemes across Surrey, Sussex and Hampshire. We are progressing a number of potential development sites within this Borough at varying stages of the planning process, therefore our representations specifically relate to the role of the emerging Local Plan in the delivery of the Borough’s housing need over the plan period.

We wish to support the progression of the Local Plan and make comments within our representations on the basis that the proposed housing numbers should be increased in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to meet the full, objectively assessed housing needs of the Borough.

We also wish to make representations with regard to the need for a clear and robust supply of housing sites in the first five years of the plan period, including through the identification of additional specific, deliverable sites for residential development. In addition, we also make representations to the proposed affordable housing policies and the need for flexibility to adapt to change. As such, these representations concern Policies S2 and H2 of the Pre Submission Plan and their relationship with the evidence base documents.

**Land to the east of Chinthurst Lane, Shalford**

These representations are submitted in respect of Thakeham Homes’ interests on land to the east of Chinthurst Lane, Shalford (‘the site’). The site is also known by Land Availability Assessment (LAA) reference 2034, and has been previously promoted to the Local Plan, including to the LAA and was assessed in the Green Belt and Countryside Study.

We support the proposed insetting of Shalford within the Green Belt in the Pre Submission Local Plan, however we wish to promote the land east of Chinthurst Lane for release from the Green Belt to provide much needed residential development in a sustainable location.

We confirm within these representations that the site is available and deliverable within the plan period and that it is set within a highly sustainable location. As such, we wish to make representations on the policies contained within the Pre Submission Local Plan, before addressing how these relate to the site.

**Representations relating to Policy S2 ‘Housing Provision’**

Since the publication of the NPPF in 2012, the central thrust of the Government’s planning strategy has been to ‘significantly boost’ the supply of housing, including a requirement for Local Planning Authorities (LPA) to meet the full, objectively assessed needs (OAN) for housing within their areas. Policy S2 sets out how the Council intends to meet the housing needs of the Borough over the plan period, therefore these representations relate to the adequacy of this policy in meeting these needs, with particular regard to the issues of the deficit in supply, the need to account for market signals, and the duty to cooperate. We suggest that potential solutions to housing supply could include the identification of additional housing site allocations and an increased windfall allowance to allow flexibility to adapt to changing needs.

**Supply Deficit**

As stated above, it is important that the plan genuinely addresses the full OAN for the Borough if the Council are to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply in the early years of the emerging plan period. Significantly, the NPPF requires that where there has been a persistent under delivery of housing, a buffer of 20% should be applied to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply.

We note that housing supply within Guildford Borough has been somewhat low in recent years. The Council’s Land Availability Assessment (LAA) published February 2016 notes that as of the monitoring year 2015/16, there is an existing shortfall of at least 1,351 units, which is expected to increase to 2,019 units by monitoring year 2017/18. Based on the Council’s housing delivery expectations, the emerging Local Plan will not address this shortfall until the year 2026/27.

On the basis of the housing supply identified within the Pre Submission Local Plan, we do not consider that the Council would be able to sustain a 5 year housing land supply into the plan period, therefore it is our view that further sites should
be identified to enable the Council to deliver more housing within the first 5 years. This will enable the Council to meet its OAN prior to larger strategic sites coming forward in accordance with the housing trajectory in the LAA.

**Improving affordability, having regard to market signals**

The NPPF explains at Paragraph 17 that there are certain underlying principles which should be applied when assessing housing need. One of these is the need to take into account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability:

“[Local Plans] should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area”

Expanding on this, the NPPG emphasises the importance of providing for relevant market signals in providing the full, objectively assessed housing needs of the area:

“The housing need number suggested by household projections (the starting point) should be adjusted to reflect appropriate market signals, as well as other market indicators of the balance between the demand for and supply of dwellings. Prices or rents rising faster than the national/local average may well indicate particular market undersupply relative to demand.”

NPPG, Paragraph 19

The Council acknowledges the increasing gap between earnings and average house prices, which is higher than the average for Surrey and significantly higher than the national average. The House Price Index (HPI) uses the Land Registry’s dataset of completed sales, and is reported on a monthly basis. In the most recent monthly report on 14th June 2016, the HPI revealed an 8.7% annual increase in house prices in Guildford to £418,806, compared with the national average house price of £224,731. Furthermore, the Index of Private Housing Rental Prices (IPHRP), which is produced by the Office for National Statistics on a quarterly basis, shows a 3.4% annual increase in private rents across the South East, compared to 2.6% in England and Wales as at May 2016.

It is our view that the extraordinary price and rent increases in the Borough are a market signal that additional housing is required in order to meet demand. This is at least a partial consequence of previous under delivery in the first 3 years of the plan period, and will likely worsen throughout the plan unless there is a significant boost to the supply of housing. With this in mind, we would recommend a number of additional housing site allocations to account for market signals in accordance with the NPPF and to enable the Council to demonstrate an ongoing five-year housing land supply.

**Duty to Cooperate**

The NPPF duty to cooperate requires that LPAs demonstrate evidence of having effectively cooperated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts, including the delivery of housing development to meet the full objectively assessed needs of the area:

“Local planning authorities will be expected to demonstrate evidence of having effectively cooperated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts when their Local Plans are submitted for examination. This could be by way of plans or policies prepared as part of a joint committee, a memorandum of understanding or a jointly prepared strategy which is presented as evidence of an agreed position. Cooperation should be a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking through to implementation, resulting in a final position where plans are in place to provide the land and infrastructure necessary to support current and projected future levels of development.”

NPPF 2012, Paragraph 181

The NPPF requires Local Plans to seek to deliver “the unmet requirements of neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development”

NPPF 2012, Paragraph 43

The West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) September 2015 identifies important cross boundary interactions not only within the HMA, but also with neighbouring authorities:

“Although weaker than the core relationships, there are identifiable and important functional interactions with adjoining authorities of East Hampshire, Rushmoor, Surrey Heath, Runnymede and Elmbridge. In the context of the Duty to
Cooperate, these authorities in particular should be engaged in strategic housing issues not only in the preparation of the SHMA but also the subsequent development of plan policies.”

SHMA 2015, Paragraph 10.5

There is an unmet need for housing in Guildford’s neighbouring authorities, including Surrey Heath Borough, which has a claimed housing land supply of just 3.67 years, including a backlog of at least 721 dwellings since monitoring year 2011.

In addition, London is expected to have an unmet need of up to 200,000 dwellings over its current plan period (2015-2025). Research carried out by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners for the consultation on the Further Alterations to the London Plan, indicated that Guildford could be expected to provide up to 2,177 dwellings over this period. At present, there is no indication of making any provision for this wider need within the Pre Submission Local Plan.

It is our view that opportunities still exist throughout Guildford Borough to deliver some or more housing in the most sustainable settlements in line with the objectives of national planning policy and in the spirit of the duty to cooperate. As such, it is our view that additional housing allocations are required to assist in meeting some of the identified need within neighbouring authorities, whilst also supporting the vitality of the communities within the towns and villages across the borough.

We consider that given the above uncertainties and the need for housing delivery in the first five years, a higher windfall allowance is required to enable flexibility in supply and facilitate suitable sites coming forward in the early years of the plan period.

Allocated Housing Sites

The Pre Submission Local Plan provides for the delivery of 13,860 dwellings in the plan period 2013-2033, including a number of smaller site allocations to deliver housing in the period 2019/20 to 2022/23. If delivery is provided in line with the plan, then the LAA housing trajectory estimates that there will be a cumulative deficit of around 900 dwellings after the first five years of the plan period.

There is therefore an additional need for housing within the first 5 years of the plan period. This can be best delivered by identifying a number of further housing site allocations in sustainable locations across the Borough and in the areas of lowest constraint to enable the Council to meet both its own housing need as well as assisting with meeting that of neighbouring authorities.

Representations Relating to Policy H2 ‘Affordable Housing’

The current thread of Government policy is clearly angled towards delivering a wide range of type and tenure of new housing, along with significantly boosting supply. Therefore, it is essential that local plans acknowledge the Government’s ambitions and seek to deliver the required level and type of housing required for their communities. As required through the tests of soundness, Policy H2 needs to be consistent with national planning policy, effective to ensure delivery over the plan period and also flexible enough to deal with changing circumstances.

Recently, the delivery of housing, especially affordable housing, has altered dramatically with various new proposals aimed at increasing the delivery of housing numbers. This wide range of housing now incorporates products such as starter homes, shared ownership, shared equity, discounted market rent, rent to buy and first buy products, along with market housing and affordable and social rent.

It is considered that, given the wide range of all housing products available, planning policy should be flexible enough to allow delivery of the appropriate mix of tenure and type without being overly prescriptive.

In addition we note that following the order of the Court of Appeal dated 13th May 2016 and the subsequent update to the NPPG, the Council need to amend the policy with regard to the thresholds for the provision of affordable housing – which should no longer be required on schemes of 10 units or fewer:

“There are specific circumstances where contributions for affordable housing and tariff style planning obligations (section 106 planning obligations) should not be sought from scall scale and self-build development. This follows the order of the
Court of Appeal dated 13th May 2016, which gave effect to the policy set out in the Written Ministerial Statement on 28th November 2014 and should be taken into account. These circumstances are that:

- Contributions should not be sought from developments of 10 units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floodspace of no more than 1000sqm”
  NPPG Ref. 23b-031-20160519

**Land to the east of Chinthurst Lane, Shalford**

Thakeham Homes wishes to recommend the site for residential development and as such supports the indicated changes to inset Shalford however we consider that the settlement boundary could be extended to include this site to provide much needed housing towards addressing the Borough’s objectively assessed needs. The red line location plan for the site has been appended to this representation at Appendix 1.

*Figure 1. Extract from Appendix H, showing the insetting of Shalford into the Green Belt.*

The site is located adjacent to the proposed inset settlement boundary east of Chinthurst Lane. As such, the site is set within a sustainable location, within walking distance of many local services and facilities, including a railway station and an infant school. Physically, the site benefits from few constraints, with a flat topography and good screening provided by trees, offering limited views in from the surrounding area. The site is located within flood risk zone 1, where there is considered to be the lowest risk of fluvial flooding.

This site is set within a highly sustainable location on the edge of the village, and would be suitable as an extension to the existing built area to provide much needed housing to meet the Borough’s needs.

**Availability**

The NPPG provides the following guidance in regard to considering whether a site is available for development:

“A site is considered available for development, when, on the best information available, there is confidence that there are no legal or ownership problems, such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips tenancies or operation requirements of landowners. This will often mean that land is controlled by a developer or landowner who has expressed an intention to develop”
  NPPG Paragraph 021 Ref. 3-020-20140306

As highlighted within this representation, the site is controlled by Thakeham Homes Ltd and we will be actively engaging with the council to promote the site for the delivery of much needed residential development.

Thakeham has a proven track record for delivering a number of high quality residential schemes across Surrey, Sussex and Hampshire and will be seeking to deliver circa 20 dwellings on the site with a view to commencing development on site at the earliest opportunity.

**Suitability**

The NPPG provides the following guidance when considering whether a site is suitable for development:

“Sites in existing development plans or with planning permission will generally be considered suitable for development although it may be necessary to assess whether circumstances have changed which would alter their suitability”
  NPPG Paragraph 019 Ref. 019-20140306

The site lies adjacent to the settlement boundary of Shalford, which is proposed to be inset from the Green Belt within the Pre Submission Local Plan. We support the proposed insetting of the village, and consider that this site could provide an extension to the built area to provide housing. The insetting of the settlement reflects the sustainability of the village and the suitability of the area as a location for some level of growth in the plan period.
As stated above, the site is set within a sustainable, edge-of-settlement location adjacent to the proposed settlement boundary. As such, we consider that the site is suitable for the delivery of residential development and should therefore be removed from the Green bet for this purpose.

**Achievability**

In determining whether a site is achievable for development, the NPPF provides the following guidance:

“A site is considered achievable for development where there is a reasonable prospect that the particular type of development will be developed on the site at a particular point in time. This is essentially a judgement about the economic viability of the site and the capacity of the developer to complete and let or sell the development over a certain period”

NPPG, Paragraph 021 Ref. 021-20140306

Given the acute housing need within the Borough and the relative lack of constraint affecting this site, it is considered that there is a reasonable prospect of residential development being achieved on site within the plan period.

As stated above, Thakeham has a proven track record for delivering schemes of a similar size and scale throughout Surrey, Sussex and Hampshire, and has the capacity to deliver the development of the site to provide much needed new homes within the plan period.

**Deliverability**

For the reasons above, the site is considered to be available, suitable and achievable, and therefore deliverable in accordance with the NPPG. We have appended to this representation an indicative site plan without constraints to illustrate where development could potentially be delivered on the site.

**Conclusions**

In conclusion, we consider that an increase in housing land supply is required if the plan is to be consistent with national policy and therefore ‘sound’ with respect to the NPPF.

With regard to the expected shortfall of circa 2,000 dwellings by 2017/18, it is our view that at least a further 400 dwellings per annum are required in the first 5 years of the plan period, to enable the Council to meet its OAN prior to larger strategic sites coming forward in accordance with the housing trajectory in the LAA. In addition, we consider that the plan should account for market signals and the duty to cooperate, to ensure a robust and realistic housing land supply.

Given the issues discussed within this representation, it is our view that the council should work proactively to identify and include additional housing site allocations in sustainable locations in the towns and villages and areas of least constraint. This would allow the Council to bring forward housing more quickly in the early years of the plan period in a way that fits the overall strategic vision of the Local Plan.

We have demonstrated within these representations that the land east of Chinthurst Lane, Shalford, is available, suitable and deliverable for residential development in accordance with the relevant NPPG. As such, we recommend that this site is allocated to assist with meeting the Borough’s housing land supply shortfall, as the site is deliverable within the first 5 years of the plan period and provides a sustainable location for residential development.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
- [2016 07 18 GBC Pre Submission LP Representations Shalford East of Chinthurst Lane Appendix 2.pdf](#) (4.6 MB)
- [2016 07 18 GBC Pre Submission LP Representations Shalford East of Chinthurst Lane Appendix 1.pdf](#) (1.3 MB)
- [2016 07 18 GBC Pre Submission LP Representations Shalford East of Chinthurst Lane.pdf](#) (506 KB)
Site 81 Shalford Railway Station

- There is a large area currently used as a commercial self storage facility in both an old railway shed / warehouse and many stacked up rows of shipping containers
- Does this have potential for a park and train facility with maybe a shuttle train to Guildford central and the new proposed east and west stations

Site 168 Land to north of Stonebridge Depot

- The red square identifies a former landfill site - does this have potential for a Park and Ride on the A 281 helping to mitigate any Dunsfold effect?
- Just below the red square is a Police & Ambulance vehicle maintenance site and opposite that is SCC Wey House School - do these have potential for other uses

A 281 Footpath / cycle path

- Shalford suffers in my view by not having a contiguous and paved footpath along the western side of the A 281 between the Tillingbourne Bridge and the war memorial by the church green - meaning that pedestrians have to short cut through the grave yard or cross over the A281 by the Tillingbourne Bridge - difficult and dangerous at any time due to traffic volume. If some of the St Mary Church land could be taken it would allow an upgraded pathway along the western side.
- GBC may argue that pedestrians and cyclists could use an alternative route along Dagley Lane, via the Thames Water Treatment site and the Shalford Park cycle way. In fact many women will not use that pathway as they feel unsafe walking through that wooded area

Dagley Lane is in turn part of National Cycle network NCN 22 - and in winter time from the area south of Thames Water it is impassible for cyclists due to being unpaved and extremely muddy. An extension of this route to more effectively cross the Shalford Commons and join to the Downs Link would also be of value

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPA16/360  Respondent: 15188449 / Richard Harriss  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (north)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have recently heard about the amendment to the local plan and the impact that this will have on Shalford village, and would like to state my objection.

I believe this amendment will significantly and irreversibly alter Shalford village to the detriment of this area - the character of the village will be completely lost.

The services cannot cope with additional housing. The local roads already suffer from severe congestion at key times of the day.

I believe there is no valid reason to wreck the village of Shalford in this manner.

I object to this proposed development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/361  Respondent: 15194689 / Maria Stewart  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (north)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objection to Shalford Green Belt/ Settlement Boundary

I object to the above proposal.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1288  Respondent: 15386081 / Gary Wicks  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (north)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In the local plan under consideration, the fields behind Shalford Village hall and the tennis courts, have been designated as "OPEN SPACES" and as such- although we can find no full definition of open spaces - we understand are no longer considered for housing.

We the Committee of Shalford Lawn Tennis Club are greatly encouraged by this classification which designates those fields in line with the intention and spirit in which the land was gifted over 5 decades ago for the inhabitants of Shalford and the neighbourhood "for use for meetings.... and other forms of recreation and leisure -time occupations with the object of improving the conditions of life for the said inhabitants".
However, we are deeply concerned and disappointed that Guildford Borough Council have totally ignored the numerous objections from this Club and residents of Shalford and are sticking to their proposed 2014 settlement boundaries to include this land and other openland within the built up area of Shalford. Without the protection of its Green Belt Status this so called "Open Spaces" would invite housing development proposals and may not achieve the Council's intentions for the site. A clear and full explanation of the open space notation would therefore be appreciated.

The Assessment of Open Spaces, Sports and Recreation prepared by ETHOS within in the new local plan "Acknowledges the value of play in NATURAL OUTDOOR spaces towards healthy learning and development" Shalford Lawn tennis club subscribe totally to this ideal. We are a club of over 400 members. Our joining and annual subscription fees are kept at an enviable affordable level. We manage and maintain 3 courts one of which is open to public use. Over one third of our members are juniors for whom coaching is available. In conjunction with local schools we have run free introduction to tennis days to encourage children to participate and keep active in Sport.

All who play, and many who have visited to play, have expressed their pleasure and enjoyment in our natural village surroundings with the pond, football, and cricket pitches below, and the open fields above. Any buildings on these fields, which are 25ft above the village hall and 32ft above the Kings road, would destroy not only the character of the tennis club but the very Green heart of the village itself. Furthermore, the extra traffic exiting on Chinthurst Lane would increase the potential for accidents on a narrow lane and worsen the existing chaotic flow and pollution.

If Guildford Borough Council are genuinely, sincerely and honestly wanting to support the bold statement of the Ethos report then they need to change the boundaries back to the 2003 plan and give these fields the protection they deserve and match the wishes of the original generous donor.

Finally, if the intention is that fields "are to be used for recreation purposes or for potential recreational use "and are protected against housing development then we are keen to explore the possibilities of if and how we could participate as we already see a need for further courts.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2159  Respondent: 15480353 / Seorais Graham  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (north)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I understand that the village of Shalford along with others near Guildford (Chilworth, Peasmarsh etc.) may lose their 'Green Belt' status as a result of the proposed Guildford Local Plan.

Whilst I appreciate the need for new housing, both locally and nationally, I can only foresee that this proposal will diminish these villages as planning decisions could ultimately become less well scrutinised, thus allowing for development that has not been evaluated sufficiently in terms of benefit for the local community.

The roads that serve Shalford, where I live with my family, are already prone to congestion and the village is at present delicately balanced with regard to local shops, housing and recreational facilities.

The village is historically significant with many Grade II listed buildings set in the beautiful Surrey Hills, an area of outstanding natural beauty. If this village, along with the others included in this proposal, are not in 'The Green Belt', then which, if any, villages can be considered to be worthy of this status?

Considering the above and other objections that have, I imagine, been submitted by other concerned individuals, I urge you to please reconsider 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: PSLPA16/3221</th>
<th>Respondent: 15589313 / Ilona Briant</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (north)</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>

New Version of Guildford Local Plan – **Objection to Shalford Green Belt/ Settlement Boundary**

Please register my objection to the above plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3415</th>
<th>Respondent: 15598209 / Peter Unsworth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (north)</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.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/360</th>
<th>Respondent: 17348225 / Thakeham Homes (Katherine Munro)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (north)</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>

Land to the East of Chinthurst Lane, Shalford

As set out in previous representations (dated 29th November 2013 and 18th July 2016), Thakeham Homes wishes to recommend the site for residential development and as such supports the changes to inset Shalford from the Metropolitan Green Belt. Albeit we consider that the settlement boundary could be extended to include this site to provide much needed housing towards addressing the Borough’s objectively assessed needs. The red line location plan for the site has been appended to this representation at Appendix 1.

The site is located adjacent to the proposed inset settlement boundary East of Chinthurst Lane. As such, the site is set within a sustainable location, within walking distance of many local services and facilities, including a railway station and an infant school. Physically, the site benefits from minimal constraints, with a flat topography and good screening provided by trees, offering limited views in from the surrounding area. The site is located within flood risk zone 1, where there is considered to be the lowest risk of fluvial flooding.
This site is set within a highly sustainable location on the edge of the village, and would be suitable as an extension to the existing built area to provide much needed housing to meet the Borough’s needs.

The site is identified as a Potential Development Area (PDA) in the Green Belt and Countryside Study Volume III (2013) (ref: E56-A). Within the assessment it notes that “the site is surrounded by defensible boundaries including hedgerows and woodland at Shalford Common to the north, hedgerows and rising topography to the east and south, and hedgerows following Chinthurst Lane to the west of the PDA”.

**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: Appendix H: Maps - Shalford South
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/965</th>
<th>Respondent: 8556161 / Alison Hubbard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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 move the green belt boundary so that the open fields behind the Shalford village hall lose their green belt protection.

I also object to the proposal to move the village settlement boundary which has existed for several decades and there is absolutely no reason to move it in this part of the village. The boundary follows the readily recognisable boundaries of mostly residential properties on the edge of the village and a public footpath. The only possible change might be to include within the village the bowling green, upper village hall and tennis courts where there is an easily recognisable boundary that is likely to be permanent.

I am extremely disappointed that the council do not appear to be listening or supporting the local residents’ wishes, which was reflected when over 700 local residents signed a petition objecting to the proposed settlement boundary change last year. This issue has widespread support throughout the entire local community, with old and young, clubs and societies all uniting behind our passionate belief that these fields should be left as they are, outside the settlement boundary.

These fields contribute to the rather unique, open character of the village and lie at the heart of village life and our community facilities which are open for all to use. The elevation of this land is the highest in the area, rising to over 32 feet above Kings Road, and so any potential development on it would dominate the entire local area and tower over the local houses and village community facilities.

The proposal for ‘open space’ in the current version of the plan does not retain the same long term protection as if the fields were left as they are, both outside the settlement boundary and within the green belt. We know that developers have already been working on a plan to develop the land, so I therefore challenge why the council would then make the above proposed changes as this would then result in this precious land losing its protection and being open for development?

I appreciate the council are by this classification of ‘open space’ acknowledging that this land is of unusual significance to the entire village, but I would ask for your support in not making changes for the sake of it when the entire local community are united behind their desire to keep this attractive and open land protected, and the settlement and green belt boundaries left as they are in relation to these fields.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/4532</th>
<th>Respondent: 8627201 / Shalford Parish Council (Nuala Livesey)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 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>

<See attached document>

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:** [SPC_Local_Plan_Comments_July_2016 (2).doc](attachment:SPC_Local_Plan_Comments_July_2016 (2).doc) (74 KB)
I wish to object most strongly to the proposed change to the Shalford Green Belt and Settlement Boundary contained within the new version of the Guildford local Plan.

These changes run the risk of destroying the Village environment that is so important to both current and future residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

I refer to the land behind the Christmas Hill properties and Shalford Village Hall.

I see that you are proposing to move the green belt boundary to exclude these fields and extend the village boundary to include these fields, making it easier to develop.

**I object to these changes because:**

The elevation of this land is 32 ft above Christmas Hill and Kings Road. Any housing development would tower over the village community facilities and surrounding area including the ancient Shalford Common. Any development would be easily seen from Chinthurst Hill, from the Chantries and the Downs link national trail.

The land contributes to the open character of the village and provides an attractive setting for the village community facilities.

Access to this land is via Chinthurst Lane, an already heavily congested lane.

Over 700 residents signed a petition objecting to the proposed settlement boundary changes last year. The Parish Council also objects to the boundary changes. As you can imagine the issue has united the local community.

If Guildford Borough Council support the express views of the local residents to protect these fields from development, they should retain them within the current green belt boundary and keep them outside the village settlement boundary.

The boundary has been there for a very long time and should remain in place.

**There is no justification for the proposed change.**

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I object to the proposal to move the Green Belt boundary in Shalford and extend the village settlement boundary especially in regard to the fields behind Shalford Village Hall and Shalford Tennis Club.

There is no valid reason to change these boundaries and the over 700 residents have signed a petition objecting to this proposal.

The land contributes to the open character of the village and would spoil the amenities of the village halls, the tennis club and the bowls club. The land is elevated above these amenities and any development would be detrimental to the village.

The access from these fields on to Chinthurst Lane is simply not suitable for further development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3377  Respondent: 8714433 / Paul and Liz Reynolds  Agent:

I live adjacent to Shalford Village Hall on the Common and I am writing to strongly object to the above new version of the Guildford Local Plan. I have written to the Council before but feel I need to make my feelings clear again by objecting to this proposed extension of the village settlement boundary to include the fields behind Shalford Village Hall.

If this land in question is incorporated into the new village settlement boundary, it will lose its green belt and area of great landscape value (AGLV) status. This would be a huge mistake as the land would then be open to other further development in the future. Due to the height of the land, which is 32 feet above the Kings Road, any development would be clearly seen and tower over the village community facilities and the surrounding area, detracting from the village feeling of space and open character we have at present. These boundaries have been in place for a long time and there is no valid reason for them to change. We cannot allow the development of 20 houses on these fields with access via Chinthurst Lane. This would create a disastrous traffic situation where we already have considerable congestion and overcrowded village roads. A further 20 houses on this site would potentially mean a further 40 cars (minimum) using the access road on a daily basis, together with visiting cars. This traffic would be in addition to the already heavily congested country lane we have at present. The lower end of Chinthurst Lane, leading off from Kings Road, is an impossible drive with the continuous parked cars on one side. Further housing development behind Shalford Village Hall would reduce this road to a standstill. Widening the lane, which I understand has also been proposed, would only further degrade our village from retaining its rural character.

I also object to the fact that the infrastructure has not been properly assessed and is inadequate to deal with current housing levels. The local roads in the area, the schools and local amenities will not be able to cope. Development of this site will surely lead to further areas of beauty being scarred forever.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/456  Respondent: 8748545 / Frank Webster  Agent:
I am writing to object to the proposal in the latest version of the Guildford Local Plan to move the green belt boundary to exclude the fields behind Shalford Village Hall and to extend the village settlement boundary to include these fields. The existing boundaries have been in place for a long time and the only reason for moving them is to permit the development of the land in due course.

The reasons for my objections are

- This is the highest land in the local area and any housing built on it would tower over the village facilities as well as the surrounding area, damaging the open character of the village.
- Access to the site would be via Chinthurst Lane, which is already very congested at peak times, especially at its north end where it serves as a *de facto* car park for Shalford Station, as well as in the single lane parts to the south. I have seen cars drive across Shalford Common to escape gridlock in the Lane, and this sort of problem would become more frequent if more traffic was generated by development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The fields behind Shalford Village Hall should be retained within the existing Green Belt Boundary and be kept outside the village settlement boundary. There is no valid reason for change. The land helps to contribute to the open nature of the village, providing an attractive setting for the community buildings. Importantly Chinthurst Lane is already congested and this rural lane would provide access to this land.

I strongly object to this proposed development.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/1953  **Respondent:** 8809217 / Betty Welland  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

"New version of Guildford local plan- objection to shalford green belt/settlement boundary."

I object very strongly to the proposal put forward—particularly as the roads around Shalford and already heavily congested. I hope this proposal never come to fruition.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/582  **Respondent:** 8810369 / C M Evans  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I **OBJECT** to GBC’s proposal for the following reasons:

- Over 700 residents signed a petition **last year** objecting to the proposed settlement boundary change. This issue has united the community with widespread support from local clubs and organisations. I cannot imagine their views will have changed.
- If GBC support the expressed views of the local residents to protect the fields from development they should retain them **within the current green belt boundary** and keep them **outside the village settlement boundary**. The boundaries have been there a long time SO **THERE IS NO VALID REASON TO CHANGE THEM**.
- The elevation of this land which is 32 feet above King’s Road is the highest in the local area and any housing development built on it would tower over the village community facilities and the surrounding area.
- The land contributes to the open character of the village and provides a green and pleasant setting.
- Lastly—access to this land is via Chinthurst I stress the word **Lane** which already suffers from fast and through traffic to the detriment and often danger of local residents and pedestrians. **This Lane does not need more traffic.**

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Comment ID: PSLPA16/597  Respondent: 8817729 / Roger and Helen Mayes  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We write to object to the proposed change to the settlement boundary to include fields behind Shalford Village Hall and Christmas Hill. The Green Belt and Settlement Boundaries have been in place for a long time and we see no good reason to change them. The only purpose for such a change would be to facilitate the development of the land involved and such development is highly likely to have a negative effect on the open character of this area of the village. As frequent visitors to the Village Halls, we are acutely aware of how much the land rises up and any development here would be likely to dominate these facilities. The green and rural nature of the land provides a very agreeable and visible backdrop to the village. In our view, the land should remain under the protection afforded by Green Belt and AGLV designation with other planned large scale local developments meeting the forecast future housing needs.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1637  Respondent: 8826241 / Charles Meade-King  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objection to proposals regarding the fields behind the Shalford Village Hall in the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2016

I strongly object to the proposed changes to the Green Belt designation and the change to the Settlement Boundary with regard to the fields behind the Shalford Village Hall for the following reasons:

- A slightly amended existing boundary following clearly defined boundaries would be more logical excluding this and other open land from the Settlement Boundary. Removing the Green Belt protection means there will inevitably be an application pursued at length by developers. The current boundary is clear, physical, readily identifiable and has proved eminently defendable to date.

- The wording in the consultation is too unclear to be consulted upon; there is no definition in the Glossary of any of the documentation of ‘Open Space’ and I do not understand the possible consequences or meaning of “currently being updated to include assessment of villages following insetting”. Why is it proposed to change the AGLV boundary to cover all of Shalford? At very short notice it is now proposed to designate the fields as “Open Space (currently being updated to include assessment of villages following insetting)”, this proposal arises from a report dated June 2016, hence the feeling of all being done in a possibly ill-thought through hurry as the Local Plan consultation covering ‘000s of pages began on June 6th. Although a Surrey County Council footpath runs past the land (Shalford PFP266) there is no public access to the fields and it is not clear how the Council could utilise the land as Open Space. It is strongly believed the arguments for changing the settlement boundary and removing the Green Belt protection are not justified by this opaque designation as “Open Space (currently being updated to include assessment of villages following insetting).”

The unkind might suspect it is a process to facilitate development, as once the Settlement Boundary is changed and the Green Belt protection removed it will be eminently possible for developers to undermine the Open Space designation, which seems to be unrealistic/unachievable.

Developers have a contractual obligation to spend significant sums of money seeking planning permission to develop this land and the uncertainty and lack of clarity in the consultation paperwork is potentially opening the door to them. If the
Green Belt protection is removed the presumption would be in favour of housing development and the current confusion would open the door to the developers to this land.

There is no logic in making the proposed changes and then designating the fields as “Open Space”. If the Council wishes to avoid the inevitability of a development on this land then the best thing would be to keep the Green Belt protection, not include the fields within the Settlement Boundary and further, declare it Local Green Space and subject to Special Protection. Calling it Open Space is, as currently proposed, unclear and likely to be easily overturned by the developers.

- The strongly held views of significant numbers and proportion of Shalford residents (as evidenced by the petition signed by over 700 residents in 2014) and those of the members of the Tennis and Bowling Clubs and Village Hall Committee together with the Parish Council, which is an important voice of the local community, all object to this proposal. The expressed view of the local community is that this land should be left undeveloped. Therefore this intention would be best met by retaining this land in the Green Belt with its additional AGLV protection and outwith the Settlement Boundary. It is understood it could still then be declared Open Space if this is possible and appropriate. It is possible that many local residents probably think there is now no longer any threat of the land being developed and therefore are not writing to object.

- The history of the fields and the intention for them to be left for the benefit of the people of Shalford and the local community and the basis upon which the covenants originally imposed by the donor were released. This land was originally protected by mutual covenants including the Shalford Parish Council as a Trustee for the Village Hall. The land which includes the Village Hall was given for the benefit of the people of Shalford and the local community in 1985 and suitable covenants imposed on the surrounding land. The current owner of the fields in question would never have been able to purchase them without agreeing to the covenants. Subsequently, the covenants were released when the Village Hall and Tennis Club wanted to expand and also build the bowling green. At the time the Parish Council was mindful of, and comforted by, the facts the fields were: outside the Settlement Boundary, part of the Green Belt, and designated an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV).

Chinthurst Lane is not wide enough to accommodate more traffic. The low key, rural character of the roads and lanes that form the boundaries of this area need to be preserved. If these fields are available to be developed it would inevitably require upgrading, widening and imposition of formal highways, street lighting and fences which would suburbanise a semi-rural part of the Village. The consultation documentation recognises the inadequacy of the current infrastructure. If there is to be any further housing development in the Guildford area, with regard to Shalford the A281 needs relief and not more traffic joining an already congested road. If, as is widely anticipated, the Broadford brown site development proceeds this will test the stretched infrastructure and should not be compounded by development on the fields behind the Village Hall. Chinthurst Lane is a rural lane without footways. Many residents, including children, those with pushchairs, walkers and runners are forced to use the carriageway. The traffic generated by additional houses would exacerbate the current vehicle/pedestrian conflict in the lane and be at odds with its attractive semi-rural character. Since land adjoining the carriageway is in part in private ownership, in part registered common land and the provision of footways would spoil Chinthurst Lane's character, the absence of footways will continue to exist. The consultation paperwork divides Shalford into a North and South. South Shalford and in particular that area south of the railway line is not urban in character and the proposed changes to the fields behind the Village Hall will jeopardise this.

- It is understood there are legal difficulties with access being gained to the fields behind Shalford Village Hall, from Chinthurst Lane.

- These fields contribute to the open character of the Village and rise 32 feet above King’s Road. Buildings of any height would change the skyline of Shalford and tower over and detract from the enjoyment of the many users of the Tennis and Bowls Clubs and the Village Hall. The report provided to the Council in 2007 in the Landscape Assessment Study by Chris Burnett and Ass. is in my view very persuasive and the conclusions drawn regarding Shalford were correct and well informed. A semi-rural aspect does still exist to the east of Chinthurst Lane and any development on the fields would inevitably require the Lane to be widened and upgraded. Is it really the case the trees bounding the Common at the King’s Road end of Chinthurst Lane will be sacrificed along with the current characteristics of the area, as described above, to allow a developer to exploit the two fields behind the Village Hall?
This open land is inappropriate for insetting from the Green Belt and being included within the Settlement Boundary of Shalford. It is possible that Council officers and members are trying to accommodate the wishes of the local community with the Open Space designation. It is submitted that all three designations should be included in the Plan; Green Belt, AGLV and Open Space for these fields and thus avoid a lengthy process while developers overturn the wishes of local residents and build on this land to the local community’s detriment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4551  Respondent: 8826241 / Charles Meade-King  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. No lawful access to the proposed site.

The proposed access road would have to cross registered common land and a public footpath. Only the Secretary of State has the power to give or withhold consent to an access being constructed following consideration of objections possibly at a public inquiry. Making an application for the construction of a road across the common would conflict with the reasons the Council gave the Land Registry for seeking guardianship in the public interest through ownership of the land. The County Highway Authority, or in dispute the Secretary of State, has to determine the necessary formal Footpath Stopping Up Order, possibly following a further public inquiry.

1. The real threat of development

Shalford residents were very concerned indeed to discover from enquiries recently made at the Land Registry that the owners of the land have been paid £20,000 for the grant of an option in favour of a large property development company enabling them to buy the land for development. The option imposes a contractual obligation on the developers to spend tens of thousands of pounds on lawyers and other professional advisers in trying to obtain planning consent for the land. It is clear therefore that the landowners and the developers will make very concerted efforts to develop the land and overturn any watered down protections given to the land in the local plan. It is clear therefore that the current status and protection of the land is already under attack. It is a clear and present danger.

If the developers are contractually committed to spending substantial sums of money over the next few years on getting planning consent they must believe that by removing the land from the the Green Belt there is every prospect that development will be permitted. The land needs to have the fullest possible protection from this immediate and current threat and a clear message sent to the landowners (one of whom it is understood now lives abroad and therefore has no interest whatsoever in protecting the local community) and the developers that the Council will never ever permit the land to be developed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1932  Respondent: 8830721 / Surrey Hills AONB (Clive Smith)  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I Object to the proposed extension of the AGLV across the built up area Shalford that has no landscape merit or role to play in the neighbouring protected landscapes. The proposed extension may be a drafting error. The nature and character of the additional area would devalue existing AGLV worthy of protection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

These comments are in addition to my previous email of objection dated 4/7/2016 which is attached for convenience.

I also attach a map of the parcel of land in question, which is the triangle of land behind Findon Lodge, 1 to 10 Christmas Hill and the 6 premises on Milkwood. Ashley house is incorrectly shown on the map.

I have researched the census records in the late 1800s and have established that properties 1-10 Christmas Hill were built prior to 1881. I suspect both Findon Lodge and the dairy on Milkwood were built then too.

It is no accident that the properties were built where they were.

Because of the ridge that runs behind these houses and is the current settlement boundary (West-East) the properties cannot be seen from the south (for example Chinthurst Hill).

The ridge immediately behind Findon lodge has been dug out at some point so that the ridge is now some metres south of the original line------ but it is still there.

I believe the existing settlement boundary behind Christmas Hill and Shalford Village Hall should not be changed. There is no reason to change it.

If GBC decide the land behind the Village Hall is to be included in the settlement, I propose the new boundary should be as indicated by the white line shown on the attached map. The new boundary would be the ridge behind the Christmas Hill properties and the ancient path that runs from Chinthurst Hill to Shalford Common to the west of the land in question/

I refer to the land behind the Christmas Hill properties and Shalford Village Hall.

I see that you are preposing to move the green belt status for these fields and extend the village boundary to include these fields, making it easier to develop.

I object to these changes because

The elevation of this land is 32 ft above Christmas Hill and Kings Road. Any housing development would tower over the village community facilities and surrounding area including the ancient Shalford Common. Any development would be easily seen from Chinthurst Hill, from the Chantries and the Downs link national trail.

The land contributes to the open character of the village and provides an attractive setting for the village community facilities.

Access to this land is via Chinthurst Lane, an already heavily congested lane.
Over 700 residents signed a petition objecting to the proposed settlement boundary changes last year. The Parish Council also objects to the boundary changes. As you can imagine the issue has united the local community.

If Guildford Borough Council support the express views of the local residents to protect these fields from development, they should retain them within the current green belt boundary and keep them outside the village settlement boundary.

The boundary has been there for a very long time and should remain in place.

There is no justification for the proposed change.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:  xmas hill.jpg (80 KB)
I am contacting you to formally object to the proposals in the above mentioned plan to move the green belt boundary to exclude these fields and for them to be included within the village settlement boundary. The proposal to designate these fields as “Open Space” is insufficient to protect these fields which are an essential part of the village life from the imminent threat of development.

I am a retired property and town planning solicitor and my family and I have lived in Shalford for over 40 years.

It is clear that you have already received a very substantial amount of objections to these proposals many of which set out in detail the planning and legal reasons why your proposals are unacceptable and I do not intend to repeat those arguments of which you will be very well aware.

The open space and rural feel provided to the Village Hall, tennis courts and bowling green must be fully protected.

The owners of the fields have granted an option to a large development company under which the developers are contractually obliged to spend many thousands of pounds on lawyers and planning consultants to get planning consent to develop the fields.

It is clear therefore the landowners (one of whom I understand lives permanently outside the UK) fully intend against the wishes of almost the entire population of the village to destroy this open space by obtaining planning consent.

The intention to develop is clearly documented and it is therefore essential that the fields are fully protected under the local plan and a clear message sent to the Developers not to waste their money or more importantly potentially the resources of GBC or the SPC in having to oppose such plans. The Council’s resources can be protected by retaining the existing status for the fields as this will send out a loud and clear message that no development will ever be permitted and much time, effort and money will be saved by all concerned.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Repeatedly asking the same question also suggests that the council is hoping that the local residents will get 'objection fatigue' and start to tire of objecting, allowing this proposal to sneak through. This is not democratic - in fact, it's the opposite, with locals beginning to think that the council has its own agenda regardless of what the local residents think. If the public don't engage because they do not believe that they will be listened to, this cuts across democratic principles.

I would also like to draw you attention to the following objections:

- A report was provided to the council in 2007 (the Landscape Assessment Study, 2007 by Chris Burnett), which reported that Shalford requires protection not further development, with the area sensitive and vulnerable to change. This area requires protection from the council, not rezoning.

- The land behind the village hall was donated to Shalford Parish Council a long time ago by a local villager, for the SPC to protect as open green field land for the whole village to enjoy ‘in perpetuity’. The council previously thought that the green belt and AGLV status would protect the land forever and so they could honour this resident’s wish of it being protected ‘in perpetuity’. This brings into question as to why there should be any change.

- As GBC policy is to protect AGLV land unless in exceptional circumstances it makes no sense to move the settlement boundary behind the village hall as this would open up this green belt and AGLV land to development. No special or exceptional circumstances appear to have been stated.

- This steep elevation on this land would mean that any eventual potential development which could take place would be clearly visible from the village green and the surrounding village. The land is 32 feet higher than the nearby main road and over 25 feet higher than the village hall. As such, these elevated fields very much contribute to the openness of the green belt and the attractive village setting - they are in fact like a green oasis of peace which the whole village can enjoy when either playing tennis, bowling or attending meetings or functions in the village hall. This field acts as the green lungs for the already 'developed' village and as such are something which so many people feel passionately about protecting for future generations to enjoy.

- Around the field behind the village hall there are already existing established hedges which have been in existence since before the 1950s. These established hedge rows and fences clearly mark the edge of the settlement boundary and have done so for decades, however they are not visible from aerial maps which also cannot pick up the unusual elevation of the land behind the village hall when calculating settlement boundaries. These form clear ‘defensible’ boundaries to de-mark the settlement boundary and so I see no need to alter the boundary for this reason.

- The Shalford Settlement boundary was originally drawn so that the land behind the village hall which is green belt and AGLV land remains outside of the settlement and thereby retains its critical protected status.

- Local traffic congestion is already a major issue with Chinthurst Lane, where the access would be to the site behind the village halls, already highly congested at rush hour. Chinthurst Lane has also become a favoured parking spot for commuters at the local railway station - which makes the lane almost impassable during the working day. This has resulted in cars mounting the kerbs by the Common to pass each other. Further up Chinthurst Lane, it is a narrow country lane without pavements and is already a dangerous place for young and old to walk along. As someone with a young child, this is of considerable importance to me.

In addition to the concerns above, any development (which surely must be with the intention behind the proposed boundary change) will affect the sight lines from the back of my property as this area is noticeably higher than the rest of the village. Due to this height, any possible future development will be able to look straight down into the windows at the back of my property (and a significant number of the surrounding properties). Of considerably more concern to me is that this area of land provides a significant drainage utility for the lower village. Even now, there is some 'run-off' which can be easily identified running down alongside Chinthurst Lane. The scale of this was demonstrated during exceptional wet weather in winter 2013/2014 when the corner of the Common and Chinthurst Lane flooded on a number of occasions (as the lowest point in the area). Development on this site will prevent any existing drainage resulting in increased surface ‘run-off' which will run down hill and is highly likely to cause flooding to the lower lying properties (including my own) and the Common on a regular basis. Guildford Borough Council has a duty to ensure that this does not happen.
I very much hope that the Council appreciates the strong level of feeling in Shalford with respect to the proposed settlement boundary change and is willing to see sense and not make any such change to the boundary.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/521  Respondent: 10695457 / Shelagh Harradine  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

With reference to your plan to change the green belt boundary in Shalford, I object to that plan for the following reasons:

The elevation of this land, which is 32 feet above King's Road, is the highest in the local area and any housing development built on it would tower over the village community facilities and the surrounding area.

Access to this land would be via Chinthurst Lane which is already an heavily congested country lane and to increase the volume of traffic would be madness.

Over 700 residents have already signed a petition objecting to the proposed settlement boundary change last year so surely the residents wishes should be respected?

This land contributes to the open character of the village and provides an attractive setting for the village's community facilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/684  Respondent: 10819009 / Sheila Griffin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)

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 latest version of the Local Plan in which GBC is proposing to move the green belt boundary to exclude the fields behind Shalford Village Hall. These fields must be kept outside the village settlement boundary in order to exclude housing development in a totally unsuitable area.

The proposed access to the land is via Chinthurst Lane which is a narrow country lane. This is already heavily congested and dangerous to drive along.

The elevation of the land, at 32 feet above King's Road, is the highest in the area and any development would tower over the village and community activities.

Over 700 residents signed a petition objecting to the proposed settlement boundary change last year.

I hope that the views of the local residents will ensure that this latest plan does not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
FIELDS BEHIND SHALFORD VILLAGE HALL

As a resident of Shalford and a member of Shalford LTC I wish to make known my objections to the current version of the Local Plan which removes the fields behind the Village Hall and Tennis Club from the Green Belt and puts them in the Shalford settlement boundary.

Although these fields have been classified as "ooen spaces" there is no explanation or confirmation to say that this would give them the same degree of protection as the Green Belt from housing development.

Any Construction on these fields which are 25ft above the village hall would tower over the tennis courts and bowling green and totally destroy the Green lung on the village.

The considerable traffic from a development would have to exit onto Chinthurst lane not only adding to the traffic chaos and pollution but increasing the potential for an accident.

By implementing a small adjustment back to the 2003 boundary GBC could protect these fields and ensure they remain open spaces.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

My wife and I would like to express our strong objections to the latest version of the Local Plan proposing the moving of the green belt boundary behind Shalford Village Hall to extend the village settlement boundary, purely to allow potential for future housing development.

We moved to Poplar Road in Shalford on retirement after 40 years in London, due largely to the unspoilt character of the local Surrey Hills villages in the Green Belt with AGLV status, and yet close to the excellent facilities of Guildford and Godalming.

Any new housing developments in this area would undoubtedly result in putting strain on the existing local roads and infrastructure and specifically, being in an elevated position behind the village hall, tennis courts and bowling green, themselves being very valuable village resources and so overlooking the village green, from which they would be clearly visible, will destroy the present rural backdrop, coupled with totally unacceptable and increased congestion in Chinthurst Lane which is already under considerable pressure with increased safety risks to residents from rat-run traffic, irrespective of any future parking restrictions.
Any proposed development would only provide benefits to the present landowner, builders and new occupants, with detriment to the village appearance and certainly no benefit to existing Shalford residents and as such, we would reiterate our objections to the granting of any approvals to this proposal.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/424  Respondent: 10958465 / Oliver Meade-King  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to any possibility of the land behind the village hall in Shalford ever being made available for development. It is part of the green heart of the village and would further increase traffic issues on already very congested roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/354  Respondent: 11064161 / Adrienne Brown  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object – Please count my objection

Dear Sir or Madam

I would like you to note my objections to any proposed planning applications and changes to boundaries on the area of Shalford by the bowling green with access to Chinthurst Lane.

1. Green Belt boundaries have been in place for decades and are in place for good reason. There is no valid reason for changing the boundaries. Apparently leaving the EU is going to save all the problems of overcrowding and immigration therefore it will be unnecessary to keep building. The only people to benefit are the already wealthy developers who do not care where they develop as long as it does not affect themselves personally. The council should not be assisting developers by ruining existing villages. The owners of this land have been trying to develop it for years. They can only interested in the profit to be made.
2. A large number of the residents of Shalford object to these proposals. The wishes of the residents should not be ignored.
3. This area of land is elevated and highly visible from the village hall, bowling green and village facilities which are regularly used by all. A housing development on this high elevation will ruin the character and setting. The land is much higher than the Village Green and Pond and will be visible. It is such a high elevation that the surrounding houses will be overlooked. The character of the centre of the village will be ruined and changed forever.
4. Chinthurst Lane is narrow and already dangerous, with many bends, single tracks with no passing places and no pavements. Because of many new developments along the A281 it has become a rat run in recent years. It is a short cut for traffic going to Guildford to avoid the very congested A281. If you listen to Eagle Radio the A 281
through Shalford gets a mention on the traffic news every day. Chinthurst Lane has traffic backed up every morning to as far back as Polar Road and it is getting worse. There is no more room for more vehicles.

5. The existing infrastructure cannot cope. Every morning cars are parked all over the village and left all day as the owners commute to work. Roads are at a stand still. Schools are unable to cope with the numbers of children.

Developments should only be allowed where our old traditional villages can remain unspoilt and where the infrastructure is in place to cope with a large influx of new residents. The importance of keeping the countryside in tact for future generations is obvious. There are numerous brown field sites across Surrey and the South East and within this borough. If development has to happen surely it is those areas that should be used first rather than changing existing boundaries at the expense of village life.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/798  Respondent: 11156897 / Ian Camfield  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed boundary changes for the following reasons:

- GBC should support the expressed view of local residents in protecting the fields behind the village hall from development. They should be retained within the current green belt and kept outside the village settlement boundary. The boundaries are long established and there is no valid reason to change them.
- Over 700 residents signed a petition objecting to the proposed settlement boundary change only last year. The local community is united in this stance.
- The land contributes to the open character of the village and provides an attractive setting for the village’s community facilities.
- The land’s elevation is 32ft above King’s Road, the highest in the area. Any housing development built on it would tower over the community facilities and surrounding area.
- Access to this land is via Chinthurst Lane, an already congested country lane which acts wrongly as an overflow parking area for Shalford Station and causes back-up on the Cranleigh Road for traffic turning in if cars are proceeding in the opposite direction. There are no passing pull-ins and dangerous reversing is often the only solution to give way.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/535  Respondent: 11157121 / D Griffin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Re: New Version of Local Plan - Objection to changes to Shalford Green Belt/Settlement Boundary.

I am writing to express my strong objection to plans to move the green belt boundary to exclude the open space behind the Village Hall and Tennis courts, and to include these fields in the settlement boundary. I understand there is much local dislike of the plans, evidenced by a large number of petition signatories who are alarmed by the plan.

The space in question is undoubtedly a key part of the local landscape, and contributes to the open character of the village...
centre. Any housing on this land would detract from the spacious vista enjoyed by users of the community amenities such as the Tennis and Bowls clubs. As a user of the Tennis club myself, I am aghast at the prospect of losing this open space. Finally, and equally damning, access to any significant housing development on the fields would place an unsustainable burden on the traffic capacity of Chinthurst Lane, which is already heavily congested during rush-hours.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/613  **Respondent:** 11170689 / Anneka Dykes  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I refer to the land behind the Christmas Hill properties and Shalford Village Hall.

I see that you are proposing to move the green belt boundary to exclude these fields and extend the village boundary to include these fields, making it easier to develop.

I object to these changes because:

The elevation of this land is 32 ft above Christmas Hill and Kings Road. Any housing development would tower over the village community facilities and surrounding area including the ancient Shalford Common. Any development would be easily seen from Chinthurst Hill, from the Chantries and the Downs link national trail.

The land contributes to the open character of the village and provides an attractive setting for the village community facilities.

Access to this land is via Chinthurst Lane, an already heavily congested lane.

Over 700 residents signed a petition objecting to the proposed settlement boundary changes last year. The Parish Council also objects to the boundary changes. As you can imagine the issue has united the local community.

If Guildford Borough Council support the express views of the local residents to protect these fields from development, they should retain them within the current green belt boundary and keep them outside the village settlement boundary.

The boundary has been there for a very long time and should remain in place.

There is no justification for the proposed change.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/464  **Respondent:** 11173825 / David Bradley  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I refer to the land behind the Christmas Hill properties and Shalford Village Hall.

I see that you are proposing to move the green belt boundary to exclude these fields and extend the village boundary to include these fields, making it easier to develop.

I object to these changes because:

The elevation of this land is 32 ft above Christmas Hill and Kings Road. Any housing development would tower over the village community facilities and surrounding area including the ancient Shalford Common. Any development would be easily seen from Chinthurst Hill, from the Chantries and the Downs link national trail.

The land contributes to the open character of the village and provides an attractive setting for the village community facilities.

Access to this land is via Chinthurst Lane, an already heavily congested lane.

Over 700 residents signed a petition objecting to the proposed settlement boundary changes last year. The Parish Council also objects to the boundary changes. As you can imagine the issue has united the local community.

If Guildford Borough Council support the express views of the local residents to protect these fields from development, they should retain them within the current green belt boundary and keep them outside the village settlement boundary.

The boundary has been there for a very long time and should remain in place.

There is no justification for the proposed change.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I object to the new version of the Guildford Local Plan, specifically in regard to protection of the fields behind Shalford
Village Hall. GBC should support the expressed views of the local residents to protect the fields from development,
retaining them within the current green belt boundary and keeping them outside the village settlement boundary. The
boundaries have been there for a long time and there is no valid reason for change. The fields behind Shalford Village
Hall contributes to the open character of the village and provides an attractive setting for the village's community
facilities. Further the elevation of this land, which is 32 feet above Kings Road, is the highest in the local area and any
housing development built on it would tower over the village community facilities and surrounding area. Finally, with
access to this land being via Chinthurst Lane this would further add to an already heavily congested country lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/390  Respondent: 15188513 / Michael Brenner  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

[Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of
the Data Protection Act 1998] I am writing to object at the proposed changes to the Local Plan by Guildford Borough
Council (GBC) to the fields behind the Shalford village hall.

The fields you are planning to develop contribute to the open character of the Shalford village and provide a rural
backdrop - I believe that GBC should support the expressed views of over 700 local residents who signed the petition
objecting to this development and retain this land within the Green Belt and keep them outside the village settlement
boundary.

Due to their height, these fields contribute to the openness of the Green Belt and any development would tower over the
village community facilities and surrounding areas - with very large developments already planned both sides of the
village is it really worth spoiling the heart of Shalford by building on this virgin, totally undeveloped site?

I have already seen first hand in station road that previous developments haven't taken the impact of more cars on the
small road infrastructure in Shalford - both parking on pavements and making roads more busy and dangerous. As there
are so many families with young children in the area my main concern is that access to this land is via Chinthurst Lane,
which is already heavily congested, and is a key route for families to access walks in Chinthurst Hill and alone the old
railway line to Bramley, which will then become more dangerous in the future.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/365  Respondent: 15195937 / Lois Treacher  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I object to moving the green belt boundary to exclude the fields behind Shalford Village Hall. These fields should stay
protected as green belt and not for future development.
As a resident of Kings Road, the elevation of land by the village hall is the highest in the local area and any housing development built on it will tower over the village community and spoil the natural beauty of the area. It is well known that the vast majority of local residents are also against this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/376</th>
<th>Respondent: 15196289 / Graham Kite</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 proposed changes to move the Green Belt Boundary. The fields adjacent the village hall are an important feature of the village. Any development on those fields would have a negative impact, including increasing traffic flow on already over-stressed roads at peak hours.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/385</th>
<th>Respondent: 15197153 / D Woodhams</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

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/387</th>
<th>Respondent: 15197281 / Marion Tyrrell</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>

Objection to Shalford green/settlement boundary

I object to GBC's proposal

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPA16/703  Respondent: 15267713 / Roger Black  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I'm writing to object to the above proposal on many grounds but especially my concern for the safety of all local residents if chinthurst Lane is to become more dangerous due to increased traffic as it is treacherous already.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/725  Respondent: 15278401 / Elizabeth Wallis  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have studied the proposed changes to the Green Belt/Settlement Boundary for Shalford and I strongly object to these proposals. I am a property owner in Chinthurst Park.

These fields form an important part of the open and attractive character of Shalford Village and provide a rural backdrop. The fundamental aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and consequently the most important attribute of green belts is their openness.

These fields are currently within the Green Belt and AGLV and this level of protection should remain. The land has not changed so why should the level of protection? The fields significantly contribute to the openness of the Green Belt because of their height - they rise to almost 10 metres above the Kings Road and over 7.5 metres above the Village Hall. This means that any housing development built there would dominate the village landscape especially from the Village Green.

I see that access to the proposed development is via Chinthurst Lane. Chinthurst Lane is a narrow and windy country lane and it can barely cope with the current volume of traffic – it certainly could not sustain traffic from a development of this size. In addition the local infrastructure including the school and medical facilities just cope with the existing number of residents.

Finally AGLV has been a long standing policy designation in Surrey, identifying land of particularly high landscape value which lies immediately outside the AONB. The current GBC Local Plan has a specific policy in this regard. Policy RE6 states that development within the Area of Great Landscape Value should be consistent with the intention of protecting the distinctive landscape character of the area. The Guildford Landscape Character Assessment & Guidance published in 2007 by Guildford Borough Council and Landuse Consultants discussed as a key landscape characteristic the "panoramic views across the landscape from Chinthurst Hill". It notes among the key positive landscape attributes that contribute to the character of the area and that should be conserved and enhanced as being: Remote, peaceful and unsettled character - Mixed woodlands - Rural roads and sunken lanes. This landscape needs to be preserved and not destroyed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/754  Respondent: 15284321 / Adam Hodgson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)
I would like to register my objection to the proposed changes to the local plan affecting the green belt boundary within Shalford Village specifically the exclusion of the fields behind Shalford Village Hall, proposals that will lead to the increased threat of the development of the land which will have a significant negative effect on the village.

As a resident of Kings Road, we have had 2 serious accidents recently (within the last 3 months) outside my house and the fact that both did not result in serious injury is purely down to chance. The volume of traffic using Kings Road and most importantly travelling at serious excess speed is reason enough to demand that the threat of further increased volume of traffic be removed.

I would seriously ask you to look at drastic road traffic calming measures through the village and would suggest that time spent doing this would be time well spent rather than looking at ways of destroying the village by turning its green belt land into house developments. There are plenty of unused brown field and non-green field designated sites you could target within the Guildford Borough rather than just picking on soft targets like Shalford Village.

I object to your proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/772  Respondent: 15292065 / William Paul  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)

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 object to the latest proposal to move the green belt boundary and extend the village settlement boundary in Shalford. There are numerous reasons for my objection to this including:

- There is no valid reason to change the green belt boundaries which have been in place for a long time.

- Over 900 residents signed a petition objecting to the proposed settlement boundary change last year. If GBC supports the expressed views of the local residents to protect the fields from development, they should be retained within the current green belt boundary and be kept outside the village settlement boundary.

- The land contributes to the open character of the village and provides an attractive setting for the village’s community facilities

- The elevation of this land, which is 32 feet higher than King’s Road, is the highest in the local area. Any housing development built on it would tower over the village community facilities and the surrounding area, creating a real eyesore and damaging the local character.
- Most importantly, given the fact that access to the land is via Chinthurst Lane, the proposal it will create significant additional congestion on Chinthurst Lane, and significantly increase the level of safety concerns of residents on that lane. Chinthurst Lane is already heavily congested, bordered by significant levels of shrubbery and undergrowth, and with very limited pedestrian facilities beyond Poplar Road. The corner here is already blind because of overgrown shrubbery - any increase in traffic volumes on Chinthurst Lane will necessarily lead to an accident at that point. I live in a house with a dog and two small children and already feel that Chinthurst Lane is dangerous because of the volume of traffic, the speed at which it comes along the lane, the narrowness of the lane, and the limited pedestrian facilities. Building any further housing at the proposed location would significantly compromise the safety of local residents and children, putting them at risk of traffic incidents and significantly increase the likelihood of accidents on that road.

I trust that you will act with your best judgement and conclude that the proposed changes do not make sense and indeed could potentially be dangerous.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/1861  Respondent: 15458113 / Shalford Village Hall (A Cooper)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We are very concerned about the latest version of the proposed Local Plan issued on 6 June 2016 in relation to the fields behind Shalford Village Hall. The Plan removes the fields from the Green Belt and puts them in the Shalford Settlement Boundary. As this removes the current long established Green Belt protection it would encourage the developer who has an option on the land to submit housing development proposals with access to Chinthurst Lane.

It is noted that the Plan does reserve these fields for "Open Space" but we understand that as currently notated on the Shalford plan, it is not as strong as its current Green Belt status and will be open to challenge. We believe the Borough Council shares the expressed view of the local community that this land should be left undeveloped. Therefore this intention would be best met by retaining this land in the Green Belt with its additional AGLV protection.

Regarding the site, the fields rise up 32 feet from Kings Road and over 25 feet above the Village Hall. Any development would be clearly seen from the Village Common and could dominate the tennis courts and bowling green. Aerial maps used to draw up new settlement boundaries do not take into account high elevation of land or any protected status.

The gift by the late E. C. Wigan in 1962 of the land for the main Village Hall building was made for the inhabitants of Shalford "for use for meetings ...... and other forms of recreation and leisure time occupations ". The Village Hall site and the open space around it has been the vision of many residents for over 50 years. The facilities offered - including the 3 tennis courts and bowling green and open space - are a significant amenity value and are important in providing an attractive setting for the village. There is a real possibility that the recreational facilities could be expanded in the future: for example adding more tennis courts. We are very anxious to keep these options open and retain the site benefits for future generations.

In summary the proposed Green Belt boundary is in the wrong place by enclosing these fields on the edge of the village within the built up area of Shalford. Only a small adjustment to the 2003 boundary plan is necessary to reflect the 1999 development behind the Village Hall and thus keep its Green Belt status. We ask that full and sympathetic consideration be given to this objection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2058</th>
<th>Respondent: 15472897 / Nola Armstrong</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shalford (south)</td>
<td></td>
</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 MOST STRONGLY to any plan to move the current green belt boundary to exclude the fields behind Shalford Village Hall. These fields should be retained within the current green belt boundary and kept outside the village settlement boundary. The boundaries have been there for a long time so there is no valid reason for change. If housing was allowed on this land it would dominate the village because of its elevation. It would also take away the open breathing space which is so valuable to the village's character. Access to this site for vehicles is utterly unsuitable and dangerous. It would be via Chinthurst Lane. I have lived in the lane for almost forty years. It is extremely congested both with through traffic and parked ( non- residential ) cars. To consider more traffic is ludicrous and irresponsible. I repeat that I object vehemently. <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>
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Shere
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4189  Respondent: 8563233 / Shere Parish Council (Joy Millett)  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

General Comment – the term ‘Identified Boundary of the Village’ is misleading, as it fails to clarify the significance for infill development.

We note that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states:

“89. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

..... limited infilling in villages, ....”

We consider that the NPPF is referring only to villages where development could take place that can be described as infilling, and thus the existing level of development must be of relatively high density. We also consider that any local policies must stay within the limitations of the NPPF by only allowing new development in Green Belt villages (under this provision) that is limited infilling. Local policies cannot, under this provision in the NPPF, designate areas that are not inherently appropriate for infilling.

We consider that the boundaries drawn up for this local policy in the Draft Local plan include areas that are not appropriate for limited infilling, and that the designation of them as within a village settlement will open them up for development pressure beyond that which can reasonably be seen as limited infilling.

We consider that in designating land as being within villages when that land is not inherently appropriate for infilling, the Local Plan is going beyond that which is allowed by the NPPF and is therefore unsound.

We also feel that in defining the designated areas with the term “Identified Boundary for Village” the Local Plan is misleading as it appears simply to describe the limits of the villages whereas the requirement for designation is for those parts of the village that are inherently appropriate for infill development.

We also note that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states:

“89. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

..... and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; ....”

We consider that affordable housing that has been built under the NPPF and its predecessors on rural exception sites should not be considered as appropriate for infilling and thus not included within the “Identified Boundary for Village”. This inclusion also seems contrary to the intent of the NPPF and, as it risks generating distrust of the process of creating affordable housing, undermines the effective working of the NPPF. In this respect the Local Plan is again unsound.

In the light of this we have enumerated all the changes in boundaries compared to the Settlement Areas in the 2003 Local Plan and indicated which are inappropriate in terms of our objections defined above. Please see attached comments on specific proposed changes to the Settlement Areas within Shere Parish’s wards.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  
- Proposed changes to the Settlement Areas with comments (2).docx (28 KB)
- SPC response prop sub LP strat sites 16 (2).docx (28 KB)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong> PSLPA16/4190</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 8563233 / Shere Parish Council (Joy Millett)</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Shere</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 <strong>Sound</strong>? ( ), is <strong>Legally Compliant</strong>? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The term ‘Identified Boundary of the Village’ is misleading, as it fails to clarify the significance for infill development

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: Appendix H: Maps - The Orchard (Puttenham)

No representations received for this section.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/577   Respondent: 8597761 / Mrs Pippa Fleming   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon

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 West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4147   Respondent: 8717921 / Helen Jefferies   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon

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 West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3745   Respondent: 8769217 / Ann Dickinson   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to so much development in one area of the borough. While I accept the need for more housing it seems bad planning to create so much housing in one area because this will have a dramatic increase in traffic especially on The Street in West Clandon.

We live at [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] and everyday at around 6pm there is a slow moving traffic jam back from the traffic lights at the junction with the A246. The Street is too narrow and windy to take more traffic, every year there are accidents on this road. There was a car crash just last week on the 12 July and this year alone two cars have crashed through our fence and into our garden. More cars resulting from the housing you are proposing will increase the dangers of further collisions and to pedestrians.

I object to all erosion of the greenbelt. Unless we keep the greenbelt there is a danger villages such as West Clandon will lose their identity as has already happened to Merrow, which has become part of the Guildford urban sprawl.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am a resident of West Clandon and I have strong objections to parts of the proposed 2017 Plan. I fully support the very thorough arguments set out in detail by the Clandon Society which will also have been repeated by a great many local residents. The proposals will have an extremely serious impact on our village, putting unsustainable and dangerous pressure on the A247 main road and effectively embedding West Clandon in a corridor of urban extension/sprawl spreading from the A3/M25 interchange to the edge of Guildford.

You will be aware that there is a lot of serious concern amongst the residents of West Clandon about the proposals in the Plan for the reasons set out above. Our village will be overwhelmed with traffic, as will other parts of this area of the borough. The changes in the proposals for Garlick’s Arch and Burnt Common between this version of the Plan and the previous one, on top of the proposal for a 4-way junction, have only made the impact worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

As a West Clandon resident I suffer everyday at the volume and speed of traffic along the A247. The danger of fast, heavy and very large vehicles travelling the A247 is extremely dangerous and I have witnessed first hand pedestrians being frightened by vehicles mounting the pavement in order to avoid a collision with oncoming vehicles.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

The plans, particularly with regards to the proposed developments around West Clandon, are totally disproportionate to the existing communities and infrastructure and would hugely change the character of our villages, destroy the character that is cherished by so many;

The Street in West Clandon (A247) is not appropriate for increased traffic (which would inevitably result from the proposed developments at Garlick’s Arch and / or additional access to/from the A3 at Burnt Common. In particular the road is extremely narrow in several places, has numerous houses with driveways that need to use mirrors to see traffic coming down the road; has dangerous and poor visibility junctions at the station and at the Onslow Arms pub/restaurant and following the 2012 Olympic Games the A247 has seen a huge (and in my view very welcome) increase in road cyclists using the road to access the Surrey Hills from Woking and further afield. For all of these reasons any plans that
would increase traffic flow on this road would heighten danger both to road traffic and to residents of West Clandon who need to access and cross the road on a daily basis.

The Street in West Clandon is also inappropriate for increased traffic due to the pedestrian use – the village is spread along the road so residents need to walk along the footpaths but these are also narrow in places (in particular near the school), they are only on one side of the road or the other in several places necessitating residents to cross the road frequently; and for example the church car park is across the road from the church itself – with corners creating poor visibility and a dangerous situation for elderly or less mobile residents attempting to cross the road. The number of places that crossing the road is an issue are too numerous for pedestrian crossings to be a realistic solution.

The scale and location of the proposed developments would result in the loss of treasured and unique green belt land for ever – ill thought through and unnecessary intrusion into the Green Belt will result in permanent loss for future generations;

With the decision now taken to exit the EU, the fundamental assumptions pertaining to the number of people coming to live in the borough must be reviewed. It’s clear that the government will be aiming to reduce significantly EU immigration and therefore the housing demand must be correspondingly reduced.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp173/186</th>
<th>Respondent: 9607905 / Anne Pascoe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am writing to protest regarding the proposed local plan which will affect West Clandon. I live on The Street (A.247) and this road is already full to capacity. If this proposed plan goes through we will have grid-lock as the A.247 cannot take any more traffic. The road is very narrow in places which necessitates trucks having to mount the pavement to pass each other. There is a school close by, which means a major accident is very likely, especially when parents are attempting to accompany their children to school. The infrastructure needs to be put in place before such a plan can be instigated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are proposing to build 2,100 houses at Garlick Arch and Gosden Hill as well as a further 2,000 at Wisley etc., etc. Each of those properties will have at least two cars, possibly more and therefore, the roads will become impassable. The A.3. is already at a standstill on a daily basis but is expected to take on even more traffic. You are proposing to build an Industrial site on the Burnt Common areas – this will mean yet more heavy duty vehicles using both the A.3. as well as the A.247.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fully appreciate more homes are required but these need to be built on brown field sites and to be affordable to the younger generation and not Executive type homes. This is an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and needs to be maintained as well as the Green Belt which appears to be slowly eroded by such plans. Infrastructure needs to be a priority before any of these proposed plans can be instigated and I implore you to give this priority consideration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: PSLPA16/3375</th>
<th>Respondent: 10682529 / Paul Edwards</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very concerned about the amount of housing increase proposed and the infringements onto the current green belt, which will result in a significant increase in traffic and pollution (air and noise) in the area and the road through West Clandon becoming even busier and resulting in traffic accidents, more injuries and deaths.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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: pslp173/319</th>
<th>Respondent: 10833537 / AC Vause</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a resident of the village of West Clandon and I wish to object to the following elements of the 2017 Local Plan policies having an impact on the A247 - my objections are-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following proposals will have an impact on the traffic on the A247, much of which will be lorries and vans:-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Gosden Hill Development and off and on slip roads to service the development.
2 The proposed 4 form entry secondary school etc.
3 Potential employees on the employment site to the north side of Gosden Hill Farm
4 Garlick’s Arch Development
5 Burnt Common on/off slip roads
6 Burnt Common industrial Site Development
7 Slyfield Development
8 Wisley Development
9 Smaller house developments in West Horsley, Send and Ripley
10 The SCC business plan for Newlands Corner

The A 247 although an A road:–
1 Is less than 2 vehicles wide in places, lorries have to mount the pavement to pass
2 Does not have continuous footpaths or street lights
3 Has several sharp bends
4 Has a humpback bridge with poor site lines
5 Has a primary school
6 Is already congested at times, more so when delays on the A3 are severe, commonly between 4 and 6.30pm
7 It cuts through the Conservation Area of West Clandon within which 19 listed buildings are located with road frontage

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/572</th>
<th>Respondent: 10882785 / Stephen Fleming</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon</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 insetting of West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/3845</th>
<th>Respondent: 10912513 / Sarah Green</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3842  Respondent: 10941057 / Tim Green  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon

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 West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3699  Respondent: 10987905 / Marika Chandler  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I live on the Street on West Clandon on the very dangerous bend opposite the church. When I exit onto the road it is completely blind in both directions and therefore extremely dangerous. The road is already an extremely busy rat run through to the A3 and any development that increases the number of cars on the road in the area will make it more dangerous. I also have to walk my children along this road to the recreation ground and in places the path is barely wide enough for us and I have seen trucks and buses mount the curb to pass in the narrower places. I moved to West Clandon from London 2 1/2 years ago. I made the choice to move here to raise my children in a rural environment, in a village and to get away from urbanisation. One of the reasons I chose West Clandon is because it is protected from development by the green belt and I felt that West Clandon and the other small villages around here, that will be adversely effected by the plan, would remain as small villages. I therefore feel that the proposed plan will degrade the nature and amenity of the villages that will be effected and I feel that the Council have a duty of care to me and my family to not go ahead with development that will increase traffic on the roads through my village and make it more dangerous to live here and degrade the environment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4034  Respondent: 11070113 / Alison Hague  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Re: Responses to Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016)

I OBJECT to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016).

I am particularly concerned that more weight should be given to the effect on the existing rural communities, including the local communities of West Clandon, Send and Ripley, with regard to:

1. the effect that increased motor traffic would have on these communities;
2. to the need that any development to existing rural communities should be proportionate to the size and nature of those existing rural communities and should preserve their rural character;
3. the need to maintain the Green Belt; and
4. the need to ensure that the Plan does not set into unstoppable motion an unsustainable programme which does not contain adequate checks and balances to safeguard our existing rural communities.

I am particularly concerned that insufficient weight has been given to the effect that Policy 43a (New A3 slip-roads at Send-Marsh/Burnt Common), Policy 43 (Garlick’s Arch) and Policy A25 (Gosden Hill Farm) will have on the rural communities of West Clandon, Send and Ripley, and particularly WEST CLANDON.

West Clandon is a linear village stretching for approximately 3km or 2 miles from the current A3 Burnt Common southbound entrance slip-road, south along the A247 to the traffic lights at the junction with the A25/A246, just south of West Clandon church. West Clandon has a historic centre with a church, two pubs, a branch of the Royal British Legion, an infant school, an old people's home (Ashley Park), a recreation ground and Clandon Park (a historic National Trust property currently under reconstruction after being damaged by fire). West Clandon has a railway crossed by a hump-backed bridge and a railway station. The southern half of the village is in a conservation area. The village comprises approximately 500 homes.

The A247 through West Clandon, known as “The Street” or at the north end of the village “Clandon Road”, runs right the way through the village. In places it is narrow and windy with significant bends. In parts there is a footpath only on one side and the road is so narrow that it is frequently mounted by lorries. There is a constant stream of broken wing-mirrors left behind as debris evidencing the narrowness of The Street at some sections. Within the last couple of years there has been at least one collision between a vehicle and a building (Summers Barn) at a narrow section. The A247 already has a disproportionate amount of traffic to cope with compared to neighbouring villages because it has a road crossing over (rather than under) the railway line.

Around 100 houses, businesses and amenities have an access directly onto The Street (or Clandon Road). Some of these have very limited visibility (lines of sight), or in some cases zero visibility, of oncoming traffic in either direction, except through the use of mirrors. My own property is situated on the inside of the crown of a narrow bend and we rely totally on mirrors for sight of traffic as we exit the property. We are by no means alone. The approach road to West Clandon railway station and the Onslow Arms pub are two more examples of entrances onto The Street with extremely limited visibility – in the case of the railway station because of the hump-backed bridge, and in the case of The Onslow Arms pub, because the pub building itself is situated on the road and obscures a clear view of traffic approaching from the north. Within the last two weeks there has been a road traffic accident outside The Onslow Arms with one of the vehicles ending up in the garden of Brownlow Cottage opposite the pub. Accidents and near-misses at the junction of Clandon station approach with The Street are extremely common and this is well-known as a dangerous junction with very limited visibility of traffic approaching from the north.

The danger of traffic in West Clandon not only affects vehicles but also pedestrians. The linear nature of the village, plus the fact that the road is only wide enough for a footpath on one side at various points, means that the frequency of passing vehicles can make it difficult for pedestrians to enter and exit some properties at busy times. The same limited visibility from some entrances of traffic on The Street that affects people leaving these properties by vehicle also affects pedestrians. I myself experience this every day as I leave my property on-foot, since my home is located on the inside of the crown of a bend and I rely on a mirror for my only view of the traffic. For an elderly person or a child this would be highly dangerous or impossible. If the volume of traffic increases, the situation will become worse and there is a risk that the difficulties of access would make some villagers in West Clandon virtual prisoners in their own homes.
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. Once a certain critical volume is exceeded this will become virtually impossible. For the elderly or infirm and for children it is already very difficult for them to cross from one half of the village to the other with the very limited visibility that exists in some areas. A pedestrian crossing cannot be provided from every house or every business or amenity and there is insufficient room to allow footpaths to be built on both sides of The Street.

Users of several public footpaths crossing The Street, including one on a severe bend near the church, will be put at greater risk. The same is true for pedestrians crossing from the graveyard, Ashley Park old people's home or the church car park, all of which are on the east side of The Street, to the church side of the A247 which has the only pavement at that point.

The number of cyclists that use the A247 as a route to access The North Downs has increased massively following the well publicised use of cycle routes in this area during the Olympics and in national cycle events. The A247 is now a corridor for cyclists accessing the Downs from Woking and beyond. The winding and narrow nature of the A247 makes it difficult for other vehicles to overtake these cyclists. If the volume of traffic increases then this will only make this problem worse and lead to a higher risk of accidents as more vehicles try to overtake cyclists on narrow winding roads.

Many of the above concerns are specific to West Clandon because it is a linear village divided by the A247 which is narrow, winding and in places bordered by a footpath on only one side. Because it winds through the historic centre of West Clandon there is no possibility of the A247 being widened or of additional footpaths being provided alongside the road, or of improvements to visibility for entrances on to or off The Street. For all of these reasons I consider any significant increase in the volume of traffic on the A247 through West Clandon could have a seriously damaging impact on the quality of life of residents of West Clandon including the approximately 100 homes with entrances directly off The Street/Clandon Road, and on users of West Clandon's railway station, pubs, infant school, church, old people's home, Royal British Legion club, recreation ground and public footpaths.

I am concerned that the provision of 400 homes plus industrial, storage and distribution units at Garlick's Arch just to the north east of West Clandon, an additional entrance and exit to the A3 at Burnt Common, and 2000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm, will produce a much greater volume of traffic on the A247 through West Clandon, particularly at busy times. I OBJECT because I do not believe there has been a proper assessment of the likely impact of these three proposals on the volume of traffic though West Clandon and the effect that this will have on that community, or that any assessment has been properly taken into account. I OBJECT because a key consideration should be the effect on existing neighbouring communities, taking into account the specific circumstances of those communities. A key consideration for Policy 43a (New A3 slip-roads at Send-Marsh/Burnt Common), Policy 43 (Garlick’s Arch) and Policy A25 (Gosden Hill Farm) should be the effect of the increased traffic that these policies and the Plan as a whole will have on the community of West Clandon and neighbouring communities of Ripley and Send.

Additionally the scale of the proposed developments in the vicinity of West Clandon are disproportionate to the size of the existing rural community.

Moreover the Plan as a whole is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary. I set out below additional objections to specific policies and matters within the Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPA16/3752  **Respondent:** 11098369 / Neil & Nicki Covington  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon

---
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

WE OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary.

From our personal perspective this plan is wholly unsustainable within the area. The area of West Clandon is already dangerously insufficient to support the local usage in place and adding more to this is a recipe for disaster. The roads are already dangerously over used by speeding vehicles and vehicles of excessive size. This itself needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency before there is a serious accident and any plans to increase usage disregarded completely.

As a regular footpath user both as a parent and a runner I am fully aware of how close I have already come to being struck by a vehicle when I am on a footpath and am of the opinion it is only a matter of time as to when this happens. Many of the proposals will only make matters worse.

Additionally as a country we need to protect the greenbelt and avoid our landscape becoming a single mass urban sprawl. The only way for this to happen is to respect the greenbelt instead of removing it. There are ample more appropriate sites for development including many brownfield sites that achieve this but are being ignored. Once the greenbelt is removed it is going to be almost impossible to reinstate it and rash decisions now are going to cause serious problems for generations to come.

Whilst these are a few of specific personal areas of objection we fully agree with the many areas also raised by others and include them below also.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3747  Respondent: 11150913 / Sarah Marshall  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary.

I set out below my objections to specific policies and matters within the Plan.

I have lived in the village of West Clandon for 17 years and during that time traffic congestion has got much worse, with increasing numbers of lorries travelling through a very narrow and restricted road causing risks to pedestrians and to the detriment of village life. Whenever there is a problem with the A3, traffic uses West Clandon as a cut through and it is often impossible and dangerous to try and exit from Oak Grange Road. The proposals in the local plan will only make these matters worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/548  Respondent: 15234849 / Alastair Fleming  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon
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 West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/562  Respondent: 15239297 / T Fleming  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon

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 West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/728  Respondent: 15278465 / Chris Wright  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objections to Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016)

I am writing to register the strongest possible objection to all of the element of the draft local plan 2016 which affect West Clandon.

As a long standing resident of the village of West Clandon, I object to the way in which successive administrations seem determined to destroy forever the nature of the village by pressing ahead with unnecessary and ill-advised development plans, much of which would be on protected green belt land.

I chose to settle in this quiet, semi-rural location rather than embrace city life closer to Guildford. This way of life is now clearly under threat. My son and I make regular use of the open spaces that surround the village. Once these are gone, we will have no choice but to add to road congestion by traveling in a car in order to seek out the next nearest open spaces.

The village has a documented history going back hundreds of years, and local residents are proud to uphold this heritage through a vibrant community which celebrates, and thrives because of, the separation of the village from surrounding conurbations. The developments proposed for West Clandon will therefore not only destroy forever the clean, open, rural green belt land which is extensively used for recreational purposes, but also the community feeling and spirit which will disappear once the process of subsuming Clandon within the wider urban sprawl commences.

This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary. Specifically, I object to the following elements of the Local Plan:

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1) Your Manifesto pledged to respect the green belt and it hasn't
2) All green belt sites meet the five purposes of the green belt
3) The housing target is unsustainable and unconstrained.
4) The fact that you plan to use brown field land for commercial purposes and using green belt land for housing
5) Proposed building on Gosden Hill Farm on the green belt which prevents West Clandon being absorbed in an urban development four times its size
6) I object to all other sites in the Local Plan: Blackwell Farm, 3 Farms meadows, Garlick's Arch, West Horsley and Hogs Back. All are out of proportion to teh local area.
7) Roads, schools, doctors etc will not be able to cope.
8) The consequent increase in traffic, which already is very heavy, with dangerous lorries driving over the speed limit.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I OBJECT to adding a station at West Clandon (shown on map at page 18, but made no mention of elsewhere in the document that I can find), which will add tremendous burden onto all local services, not least loading up train services by the time they reach Horsley (which at peak times are already full by the time they reach Oxshott).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I am a resident of West Clandon. I have lived on Meadowlands Estate since 1957 - nearly 60 years. West Clandon is a small village and will be squeezed in amongst the development plans detailed in the Local Plan. The road through the village is narrow in places, lorries frequently mount the pavements and there have been worrying incidents/accidents. Traffic does not adhere to the speed restrictions. It is dangerous to walk through our village, especially for my daughter
pushing me in my wheelchair. The traffic is particularly heavy due to the A3, where vehicles come off at Burnt Common and through West Clandon when traffic is queued on the A3. I append my objections to the Local Plan as follows:

I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary.

I set out below my objections to specific policies and matters within the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary.

I set out below my objection to specific policies and matters within the Plan.

My KEY OBJECTIONS are as follows:

- The plans, particularly with regards to the proposed developments around West Clandon, are **totally disproportionate to the existing communities and infrastructure** and would hugely change the character of our villages, destroy the character that is cherished by so many;

- **The Street in West Clandon (A247) is not appropriate for increased traffic (which would inevitably result from the proposed developments at Garlick’s Arch and/or additional access to/from the A3 at Burnt Common).** In particular the road is extremely narrow in several places, has numerous houses with driveways that need to use mirrors to see traffic coming down the road; has dangerous and poor visibility junctions at the station and at the Onslow Arms pub/restaurant and following the 2012 Olympic Games the A247 has seen a huge (and in my view very welcome) increase in road cyclists using the road to access the Surrey Hills from Woking and further afield. For all of these reasons any plans that would increase traffic flow on this road would heighten danger both to road traffic and to residents of West Clandon who need to access and cross the road on a daily basis.

- **The Street in West Clandon is also inappropriate for increased traffic due to the pedestrian use** – the village is spread along the road so residents need to walk along the footpaths but these are also narrow in places (in particular near the school), they are only on one side of the road or the other in several places necessitating residents to cross the road frequently; and for example the church car park is across the road from the church itself – with corners creating poor visibility and a dangerous situation for elderly or less mobile residents attempting to cross the road. The number of places that crossing the road is an issue are too numerous for pedestrian crossings to be a realistic solution.

- **The scale and location of the proposed developments would result in the loss of treasured and unique green belt land for ever** - ill thought through and unnecessary intrusion into the Green Belt will result in permanent loss for future generations;

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4217  Respondent: 15673185 / Simon Jefferies  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon

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 West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp173/620  Respondent: 17459713 / Alan & Cathy Barns  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Appendix H: Maps - West Clandon

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---
As residents of Burpham for well in excess of thirty years we have accepted new developments to the surrounding area as they have not largely affected our continued enjoyment as residents of Burpham. This enjoyment has been tested recently as a result of the entirely inappropriately placed Aldi store, with an associated lack of road improvement and too few parking spaces on the Green Man site. This development has, as widely predicted but apparently ignored by designers and planners, had a disproportionate and unacceptable impact on the traffic in the vicinity by creating gridlocks at the Green Man roundabout and exacerbating the already overcrowded Burpham roads at this pinch point in the centre of the village. The surrounding road infrastructure is clearly at breaking point and as a consequence this small suburb of Guildford has its own rush hour traffic jams as well as overcrowding through many other reasons especially when the A3 regularly evacuates through the village from either direction due to the ever-present traffic incidents on the A3 in either direction with resultant noise, inconvenience and pollution.

We live just off the London Road and regularly experience car queues before reaching our road or we have to join a queue when exiting the road. Also, if we are not faced with a queue, at other times of the day the quantity and number of speeding cars prevents us from easily and safely exiting onto the London Road often for five or ten minutes. We have not experienced such a heavy and rapid increase in traffic flow until recently and we believe this is a result of poor planning and anticipation of the impact traffic has in the Burpham area. Consequently, we have little confidence that any proposed road ‘improvements’ for the Gosden Hill housing scheme will improve anything at all and we expect the massive influx of cars this development as currently planned will impose will have an unacceptable affect on the current inadequate road infrastructure. We consider this development has the potential to accelerate Burpham to a vehicular standstill or crawl throughout much of the day.

We therefore object to the Local Plan as currently drafted until:
(i) the problems currently experienced with Burpham traffic flow have been addressed.
(ii) the impact of this proposed development and the associated improvements to infrastructure roadworks have been properly, realistically and sustainably thought through and planned.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
No representations recieved for this section.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Wood Street Village
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2372  Respondent: 8627393 / Worplesdon Parish Council (Gaynor White)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Wood Street Village
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The inset map for Wood Street Village is incorrect as it does not show the common land on Oak Hill.

<See attached map>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  Map - Wood Street Village (Inset) 2016.pdf (1.0 MB)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2236  Respondent: 8728865 / Neville Bryan  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Wood Street Village
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Object

The inset map for Wood Street Village is incorrect as it does not show the common land on Oak Hill.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4071  Respondent: 8728865 / Neville Bryan  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Wood Street Village
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Wood Street Village Association

Wood Street Village Association was established in 1990 to represent the Village of Wood Street, and represents the people of Wood Street Village, as defined by the Parish Boundaries, some 1612 people and 550 homes.

WSVA Summary View

WSVA remain deeply disappointed by the process and output on this local plan. Any project which works without targets (in this case housing numbers) for so long can be suspect. In this case since the housing number (693 per year) has only recently been produced, has not been scrutinised, is not open to examination, and is so much higher than the existing 322 per year, we believe this a significant flaw in the plan.

WSVA recognise the need for a Guildford Local Plan, beyond the legal requirements for one. This is seen as good practice and WSVA support that need.
WSVA also see a need for Social Housing, however we do not believe this plan takes proper account of all the evidence
to correctly enable this housing to be available in the right place. We see far too many houses built on Greenbelt (nearly
8000), and far too few in the town (2000) where available land appears to be allocated at too low density, and to allow a
retail expansion of close to 40%, which is against almost all market trend information.

We see much of our resident feedback from the regulation 18 consultation completely ignored., we therefore conclude,
that the regulation 18 consultation feedback has largely been given lip service only. Despite the major rewrite, many
policies are still loosely worded, and the greenbelt protection asked for and which was paramount in many responses, has
been completely ignored.

Over 1100 people said in the regulation 18 responses, no building on the greenbelt, against just 6 saying yes, “saving the
greenbelt” was a major election manifesto promise, yet the number of houses on the Greenbelt proposed is now even
higher than original local plan proposal consultation of 2014.

We remain deeply sceptical that the council planning office is representing its residents views in this local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: 20160716 Local Plan Consultation (Reg 19) response By WSVA Final.pdf (1.1 MB)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/3555  Respondent: 11023201 / Steve Johnson  Agent:

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 strongly oppose the revised Local Plan because rather than
addressing the many issues we have , it exacerbates them.

First and foremost the base infrastructure we have now is totally inappropriate , that's before we have potentially an
additional 1200 houses ( 2400 cars ? ) built local to the village. Every day between 7.45 am and 9 am there is a stationery
queue of traffic out the front of our house , heading towards Guildford, it is practically impossible to get out of the drive.
We are nearly 200 metres from Rydes Hill roundabout. The queue goes right back beyond Oak Hill. Each additional car /
lorry is a problem ... 2400 would be a disaster.

Each year we have to have tankers parked alongside Broad Street Common draining out / relieving the sewage system
which cannot cope whenever we have a prolonged spell of rainfall, we have had raw sewage on our back garden in the
past...... another 1200 houses to be fed into that system ??

I also believe it is totally wrong that we are not shown the methodology for determining the number of houses required to
be built each year , it is too important decision to just have to accept as "an act of faith". We must be shown, in an
informed way, how this number is arrived at.

Finally , I totally agree for the need to additional housing,particularly for the younger generations who cannot afford to
live in their home town ..outrageous. However ,at the same time we do not need a huge increase in retail /
commercial outlets. The planning objective in the town should be to give all those brownfield opportunities to dwellings
for people to live in. To assist in providing additional homes the University of Surrey should be made to fulfil its
commitment to develop campus accommodation, releasing current town centre and suburban properties, used for
students, for local purchase.

I am very happy for someone to come and view the traffic situation ( chronic queuing ) along Broad Street from our
house during normal term time ... as many days as you need.
The Green Belt Boundary

The inset boundary for Wood Street Village has been drawn very tightly (Map 3 - see end of document) to include only the east of the settlement: along Oak Hill east of Pound Lane and west of Pinks Hill; excluding Wood Street Green, the surrounding areas along White Hart Lane and the whole of Frog Grove Lane to the east and north. It is anomalous that the village conservation area, which helps to define the essential character of Wood Street Village, is outside the proposed settlement inset boundary.

The proposed inset boundary would allow for the development of some small sites in Wood Street Village including: land at 148 Broad Street, a site of 0.32 ha previously used for vehicle sales, maintenance and storage, which the Land Availability Assessment (LAA) of February 2016 identified as suitable for 12 dwellings (Site 115); a previously-developed site of 4.4ha with mixed uses at Oak Hill which the LAA identified as suitable for 22 dwellings (Site 35); and land at ‘Roundoak, White Hart Lane which the LAA identified as suitable for traveller accommodation (Site 2114). These sites enter into the LAA housing figures, although only sites for 23 or more dwellings are shown on the Proposal Map.

The approach to Green Belt insets needs to comply with paragraph 86 of the NPPF which states:

‘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. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt.’

Paragraph 85 of the NPPF sets out the proper approach to defining Green Belt boundaries in local plans, which includes ‘consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development.’ The Council’s Land Availability Assessment (February 2016) demonstrates that the Spatial Development Strategy of Policy S2, is unable to meet the objectively assessed need for housing throughout the plan period, largely because of constraints imposed by Green Belt Policy P2 and related proposals maps. Impacts on housing land supply are considered in more detail below.

The settlement boundary for Wood Street Green appears to have been drawn tightly to restrict development, rather than to allow for housing and other forms of development to take place within the settlement, to meet the changing social and economic needs of the village and the borough.

Not all the open parts of Wood Street Village are important for their contribution to the Green Belt. There are infill sites, such as those previously identified, where development could make a useful contribution to meeting housing needs, consistent with the size and character of Wood Street villages and its local facilities, and without compromising the essential roles of the Metropolitan Green Belt.

The Site of Nature Conservation Interest provides a natural boundary to the south of the village. To the north west of the village, it is reasonable to exclude Frog Grove Lane from the inset areas as it is essentially ribbon development extending for over a mile from Oak Hill/Wood Street Green northwards to join the Aldershot Road (A323). A flood risk
area and an area of registered common land are also constraints on development on Frog Grove Lane. However, the Green is clearly part of the core of the village and there are areas surrounding the Green that should also be included within the settlement boundary and Green Belt inset and should be allocated for appropriate development.

The inset boundary should therefore be extended westwards to include Wood Street Green, surrounding development and the sites previously identified as ‘Potential Development Areas’ (Map 2 - see end of document); to allow for appropriate development within the functional boundary of the settlement in accordance with accessibility to local facilities, existing residential development and natural boundaries that can be defined on the ground, including roads and vegetation that would provide long-term, defensible, natural boundaries for the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  BRS.5587_PLANNING_SUBMISSION_FINAL.pdf (4.4 MB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPA16/2843</th>
<th>Respondent: 15212129 / Amanda Susan Sturdee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Wood Street Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please register my objection to the GBC's proposed plans for housing to be developed on green belt land in the village of Wood Street. Why this is being considered in an area of outstanding natural beauty, thereby robbing us and future generations of enjoyment of this beautiful space, is quite unacceptable and frankly unbelievable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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>
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Appendix H: Maps - Worplesdon
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/2364  Respondent: 8627393 / Worpsdon Parish Council (Gaynor White)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Worpsdon

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The following existing employment land within Worpsdon parish should be protected:

- The Pines Industrial Estate, Broad Street
- Oak Hill, Wood Street Village
- Hunts Farm and Frosbury Farm, Gravetts Lane
- 148 Oak Hill, Wood Street Village
- Cheesman Bros, Broad Street
- Sandiacre Nurseries, Frog Grove Lane
- Frog Grove Farm, Frog Grove Lane
- Clasford Farm, Aldershot Road
- Sylvester’s Garage, Aldershot Road
- The Guildford Flooring Co. Aldershot Road
- Russell Place Farm, Frog Grove Lane
- Riverside Business Park, Clay Lane
- Woodlands Farm Nursery & Reclamation, Wood Street Village
- Fairlands Farm

Russell Place Farm – The inclusion of Russell Place Farm as a SANG in the Local Plan on page 296, in our opinion amounts to pre-determination of planning application no: 13/P/01453, which has not yet been decided by the Borough Council despite the application being submitted almost three years ago. A site visit was undertaken on 16 June 2016 after the s19 public consultation period has commenced.

With respect to all Traveller pitches we would expect DCLG Planning Policy for Traveller Sites August 2015 to apply.

The inset map for Wood Street Village is incorrect as it does not show the common land on Oak Hill. See attached map.

Conclusion:  Worpsdon Parish Council believes that the Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites is unsound.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: Map_Wood_Street_Village_Inset_2016 (4).pdf (1.0 MB)

Comment ID: PSLPA16/4435  Respondent: 8932193 / Maureen M. Chalmers  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Appendix H: Maps - Worpsdon

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Without major changes to our roads and plans to upgrade utilities and flooding defences, I object to any further building in Worpsdon Parish.

Today, the current infrastructure cannot cope with the existing population, particularly the road network. Roads around Worpsdon are often gridlocked and any additional housing would make matters worse causing further pollution as well
As more delays. Water and Sewage, likewise is a problem and again The Proposed Local Plan does not seem to deal with this?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: