



GUILDFORD
BOROUGH

James Whiteman
Managing Director

www.guildford.gov.uk

Dear Councillor

PLANNING COMMITTEE – WEDNESDAY 9 JUNE 2021

Please find attached the following:

Agenda No Item

- e) Late Sheets - Updates/Amendments/Corrections - Garlick's Arch - Planning Committee 9 June 21 (Pages 3 - 14)

Yours sincerely

Sophie Butcher, Democratic Services Officer

Encs

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee

9 June 2021

Update/Amendment/Correction/List

19/P/02223 – (Page 15 - 186) – Land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common, Portsmouth Road, Send

1. Key information (page 17)

- 1.4 The proposed site *is part of an allocation* for 550 new homes (C3), including some self-build and custom house building plots and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots under site allocation policy A41 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: strategy and sites (LPSS) 2019. The proposal would deliver a mixture of flats and houses with 40% affordable homes, accessible homes and custom build homes.

2. Executive Summary and Recommendation (page 18)

- 2.3 There would be an increase in the local population using local services, community facilities and the local environment. Therefore, financial contributions totalling £1.55m have been secured for the redevelopment of Ripley Village Hall, a new pavilion at Send Recreation Ground and environmental improvements in Send and West Clandon parishes. There would also be financial contributions to increase capacity at schools for early years, primary and secondary education, additional floorspace at the GP practice and policing in Surrey. The package of S106 and S278 highway improvement works including the bus subsidy would amount to approximately £12.6 million.

3. Formal Recommendation)

- 3.3 Full application phase 1:

Additional plans (page 21-23)

| | | | | | |
|----|--------------|---|----------------------------|-----|---|
| 2. | Drawing no.s | The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following list of approved plans: | | | |
| | | Date Issued | No. | Rev | Title |
| | | 24/02/21 | LN-LD-102 | G | Illustrative Landscape Masterplan |
| | | 24/02/21 | 102773-MLM-ZZ-00-DR-YA-016 | C02 | Phase 1 – 175m Buffer from the A3 |
| | | 24/02/21 | 102773-MLM-ZZ-00-DR-YA-001 | C03 | Façade Sound Reduction Requirements |
| | | 24/02/21 | 102773-MLM-ZZ-00-DR-YA-002 | C03 | Overheating Noise Mitigation Requirements |
| | | 15/03/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0100 | C | Earthworks Proposed Levels Phase 1 |
| | | 15/03/21 | GARL-ARP- | C | Earthworks Proposed Levels Phase 1 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|-------------------------------------|---|--|-------------|--|--|----------|----------------------|---|------------------------------------|----------|----------------------|---|------------------------------------|----------|----------------------|---|------------------------------------|----------|----------------------|---|------------------------------------|----------|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------|----------------------|---|----------------------|----------|----------------------|---|--|----------|----------------------|---|--|----------|----------------------|---|---|----------|----------------------|---|---|----------|----------------------|---|--------------------|----------|----------------------|---|------------------|----------|----------------------|---|--|
| | | <table><tr><td></td><td>XX-CIV-0101</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>15/03/21</td><td>GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0102</td><td>C</td><td>Earthworks Proposed Levels Phase 1</td></tr><tr><td>15/03/21</td><td>GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0103</td><td>C</td><td>Earthworks Proposed Levels Phase 1</td></tr><tr><td>15/03/21</td><td>GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0110</td><td>C</td><td>Earthworks Proposed Levels Phase 1</td></tr><tr><td>15/03/21</td><td>GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0111</td><td>C</td><td>Earthworks Proposed Levels Phase 1</td></tr><tr><td>15/03/21</td><td>GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0115</td><td>A</td><td>Earthworks Cross Sections Phase 1</td></tr><tr><td>15/03/21</td><td>GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0130</td><td>C</td><td>Earthworks Cut & Fill Phase 1</td></tr><tr><td>23/02/21</td><td>GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0202</td><td>D</td><td>Drainage Flood Zones</td></tr><tr><td>23/02/21</td><td>GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0212</td><td>E</td><td>Drainage Proposed Drainage Strategy Sitewide Sheet 1</td></tr><tr><td>23/02/21</td><td>GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0213</td><td>E</td><td>Drainage Proposed Drainage Strategy Sitewide Sheet 2</td></tr><tr><td>23/02/21</td><td>GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0214</td><td>E</td><td>Drainage Proposed Drainage Strategy Phase 1 Sheet 1</td></tr><tr><td>23/02/21</td><td>GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0215</td><td>E</td><td>Drainage Proposed Drainage Strategy Phase 1 Sheet 2</td></tr><tr><td>23/02/21</td><td>GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0216</td><td>A</td><td>Drainage Schedules</td></tr><tr><td>23/02/21</td><td>GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0225</td><td>B</td><td>Drainage Details</td></tr><tr><td>23/02/21</td><td>GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0400</td><td>B</td><td>Proposed Utilities Spatial Allowance Phase 1</td></tr></table> | | XX-CIV-0101 | | | 15/03/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0102 | C | Earthworks Proposed Levels Phase 1 | 15/03/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0103 | C | Earthworks Proposed Levels Phase 1 | 15/03/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0110 | C | Earthworks Proposed Levels Phase 1 | 15/03/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0111 | C | Earthworks Proposed Levels Phase 1 | 15/03/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0115 | A | Earthworks Cross Sections Phase 1 | 15/03/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0130 | C | Earthworks Cut & Fill Phase 1 | 23/02/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0202 | D | Drainage Flood Zones | 23/02/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0212 | E | Drainage Proposed Drainage Strategy Sitewide Sheet 1 | 23/02/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0213 | E | Drainage Proposed Drainage Strategy Sitewide Sheet 2 | 23/02/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0214 | E | Drainage Proposed Drainage Strategy Phase 1 Sheet 1 | 23/02/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0215 | E | Drainage Proposed Drainage Strategy Phase 1 Sheet 2 | 23/02/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0216 | A | Drainage Schedules | 23/02/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0225 | B | Drainage Details | 23/02/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0400 | B | Proposed Utilities Spatial Allowance Phase 1 |
| | XX-CIV-0101 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15/03/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0102 | C | Earthworks Proposed Levels Phase 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15/03/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0103 | C | Earthworks Proposed Levels Phase 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15/03/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0110 | C | Earthworks Proposed Levels Phase 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15/03/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0111 | C | Earthworks Proposed Levels Phase 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15/03/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0115 | A | Earthworks Cross Sections Phase 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15/03/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0130 | C | Earthworks Cut & Fill Phase 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23/02/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0202 | D | Drainage Flood Zones | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23/02/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0212 | E | Drainage Proposed Drainage Strategy Sitewide Sheet 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23/02/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0213 | E | Drainage Proposed Drainage Strategy Sitewide Sheet 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23/02/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0214 | E | Drainage Proposed Drainage Strategy Phase 1 Sheet 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23/02/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0215 | E | Drainage Proposed Drainage Strategy Phase 1 Sheet 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23/02/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0216 | A | Drainage Schedules | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23/02/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0225 | B | Drainage Details | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23/02/21 | GARL-ARP-XX-CIV-0400 | B | Proposed Utilities Spatial Allowance Phase 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | <p><u>Reason:</u> To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approval and to ensure the quality of development indicated on the approved plans is achieved in practice.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35. | Installation of temp acoustic fence | <p>Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling within 175m of the A3 the temporary acoustic fence shall be provided in accordance with Appendix 7.8 of the Environmental Statement, <i>drawing no. 102773-MLM-ZZ-00-DR-YA-016 Rev C02 - Phase 1 – 175m Buffer from the A3</i> and thereafter maintained until the permanent bund and acoustic fence are provided.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> In order to safeguard occupiers from external noise sources.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

3.4 Outline application phases 2 and 3:

Page 39

| | | |
|-----|------------------|--|
| 55. | Reserved matters | <p>Details of the appearance, layout, scale and <i>landscape</i>, hereinafter called "the reserved matters" for each phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development begins on that phase and the development shall be carried out as approved.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To enable the Local Planning Authority to control development in detail and to comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990) as amended.</p> |
|-----|------------------|--|

7. **Proposal** (page 47-48) updated

7.1 In respect of the outline application, the matters for determination at this stage are access *only and all other matters are reserved. Landscape, scale, appearance and layout are reserved.*

7.3 Phases 2 and 3 for 21.62 hectares of the application are in outline with *only* the access details. *However, illustrative landscape details have been provided for the overall masterplan, and the landscape parameter plan provides key parameters.*

10. **Consultations**

10.33 Forestry Commission: (page 56)

- no trees would be removed from alongside Kiln Lane
[officer comment: no further trees, as some cutting back occurred in 2019]

13. **Planning considerations.**

Amendments and corrections.

Electricity pylons (page 70)

13.3.4 *The works would be carried out by UKPN who have not yet, committed to these works. However, phase 1 has been designed that it would be built without the pylons coming down and could be done in the later phases. A condition for programmes of these works as been requested at the earliest possible time, prior to the first occupation of phase 1. The applicant has did make a case that this condition should be triggered on submission of the phase 2 reserved matters, although they have accepted the recommended condition and this would give more certainty.*

Landscape bund (page 70)

13.3.5 Landscape has been *reserved* as part of the outline planning application including the bund and acoustic fencing *and this would be part of the reserved matters.*

13.3.6 *The specification of the details of the acoustic fence to be installed would be included in the reserved matters application for phase 2. The applicant has provided details of example acoustic fences.*

13.9 Housing mix and type (page 87)

13.9.7 Suggested condition 59 includes buffers for the housing mix rather than a strict adherence to the identified need in the SHMA as policy H1(1) is not intended to be applied in a prescriptive way. It is acknowledged that there is a need for smaller homes in the settlements and villages. However, this buffer, takes into account the phased nature of the development and that the different character areas would accommodate different house types to achieve an overall compliance with the SHMA, with some variation where it can be justified as part of the design and landscape approach and meeting local needs for market and affordable housing.

13.10 Travelling Showpeople plots (page 88-89)

13.10.5 The Council have received a response from the Norwich and Eastern Counties Section, as they have members who live in the Borough, as set out in their response dated 24.03.2021. As with many families it is not uncommon for them to originate from one area and maintain those affiliations even after they have moved. Their comments are valid in explaining that there are families who operate small rides and vehicles.

13.23 Viability assessment (page 121)

13.23.5 The proposed planning obligations amount to circa £12.6m.

13.23.6 The applicant formally withdrew the viability appraisal work (as clarified in the February 2021 Planning Statement Addendum). Whilst the viability review is no longer a material planning consideration for this application. As this work was conducted and referred to by the applicant it needs to be reported as this exercise did take place.

Questions from members

1. Acoustic fencing – Are there some examples of it and how effective it is.

See para. 10.8 comments from Environmental Health (page 54), para. 13.3.6 and 13.12.4-13.12.14

2. Impact on highway capacity – additional vehicle journeys, traffic through villages, whether a severe impact

See response from Surrey County Council as the County Highways Authority

3. Clustering of affordable housing – barrier to inclusive communities

See para. 10.11 comments from Housing (page 53), para. 13.9.10-13.9.12

4. Road would link the whole site

See para. 13.5.4-13.5.6, 13.11.12-13.11.15 and Design and Access Statement

5. Premature application prior to the burial of the pylons and overhead lines

See condition 39, para. 13.19.4 and Utilities Statement

6. Wastewater capacity

See para. 10.26 comments from Thames Water, para. 13.19.3 and Utilities Statement

7. Highway improvement works to mitigate the development

See condition 32, 33 and 36, para. 13.5.15-13.5.18 and Transport Assessment: Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement, Environmental Statement Addendum and Technical Notes prepared by Vectos

8. Fibre to the Premises (FTTP) Broadband

See condition 17, para. 13.19.7 and Utilities Statement

9. Impact of lack of school places at Send Primary School

See response from Surrey County Council as the Local Education Authority and County Highways Authority

10. Plots meeting the needs of Travelling Showpeople

See S106 requirement para. 3.1 and para. 13.10.1-13.10.11

11. Use of Kiln Lane by HGVs

See condition 36 and 38, para. 13.5.19-13.5.27 and Transport Assessment: Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement, Environmental Statement Addendum and Technical Notes prepared by Vectos

See response from Surrey County Council as the County Highways Authority

This page is intentionally left blank

**Application 19/P/02223 - Land at Garlick's Arch,
Send Marsh/Burnt Common, Portsmouth Road, Send**

A number of pupils attending Send CE Primary School live outside of the Send and Lovelace wards and a number of pupils living in the Send and Lovelace wards travel to schools in other wards. This is only to be expected as a result of as parents expressing their preferences for schools other than the local school.

The school places justification produced for this proposal looks at schools within a three-mile radius, thereby offering reasonable accessibility to other schools for the children yielded by the proposed development. Schools within a three-mile radius of the development have vacancies across all year groups at the time of writing, which will be able to admit the initial pupils yielded from the development.

The need for additional school places that will arise from the new homes, will be met by the provision of bulge class accommodation. Such a provision prevents an excess of additional permanent places that would lead to schools becoming unsustainable in the future given the current forecasts as regards to birth rates. Bulge provision is achievable at any of the local schools subject to appropriate agreements with the schools, including Send CE Primary School.

This page is intentionally left blank

Application 19/P/02223 - Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common, Portsmouth Road, Send

This document addresses the questions that were received on the 7th June 2021 from GBC, for completeness the questions are included at the end. Vectos provided additional information on the 19th May 2021 which covers many of the areas in question, however for clarity Surrey County Council (SCC) will provide an additional response.

SCC have carried out a thorough assessment of this site through the course of pre-application discussions and detailed scrutiny of the documents submitted by Vectos as part of the planning application. The planning application is supported by a suite of traffic impact assessments that have been undertaken in accordance with guidance published by the [Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government](#).

The content of the documents, including the methodology and approaches taken, was all agreed by SCC at the pre-application stage. These detailed discussions included agreeing the parameters for the trip rates, traffic counts, width of roads and levels of parking. These discussions continued throughout the planning application stage, involving internal teams at SCC for their expert views on various matters. The detail within the documents are reviewed and assessed by teams such as our Road Safety Team, Highways, Passenger Transport, Modelling and Rights of Way teams, this ensures that the documents are assessed with the upmost scrutiny and where required further work is undertaken by Vectos to overcome any concerns or queries that SCC have to ensure the site accords with policy.

The concern regarding traffic in relation to private vehicles associated with the site is valid, however this impact has been thoroughly assessed, modelled and audited by SCC. The predicted impact is likely to range from 1 to 2 additional vehicles a minute in the morning and evening peak hours, this increase is unlikely to materially affect the operation of the highway network, however a detailed capacity assessment of junctions was still undertaken by Vectos and audited by SCC.

The development traffic has been predicted by using data from the TRICS database, which is the accepted approach by SCC on all developments. The trips themselves have been sub-divided using National Travel Survey data that identifies the proportion of journey types that are undertaken (commuting, education, leisure). Travel behaviour statistics from the 2011 Census and the National Travel Survey are then used to establish the modes of transport used when completing journeys. These trips are then distributed across the highway network in accordance with journey to work statistics from the 2011 Census. Table 5.3 in the transport assessment provides a summary of the traffic increases within the study area at the various junctions modelled.

Data from traffic surveys undertaken in 2016 were validated by further traffic surveys undertaken in 2019, this data gives us the baseline traffic conditions at junctions in the vicinity of the site. The detailed junction modelling was done in accordance with best practice and in agreement with SCC. The traffic impact assessments were audited by SCC's modelling team and where necessary further work was submitted by Vectos, including a junction modelling sensitivity test. This additional test took into account destinations that specifically related to journey types, ie school and retail, and demonstrated that the trips distributed in this way would actually reduce the impact of the proposed development on Ripley High Street and Ockham Interchange but add traffic to the Send Roundabout and A247/A3 Slip, but that these would still operate within acceptable capacity thresholds. This document can be found on the GBC website, it was submitted by Vectos on 24th February 2021.

SCC requested that the traffic impact assessment didn't include adjustments to the travel patterns of future residents that could reflect the improved pedestrian, cycle and public transport infrastructure improvements that have been secured by SCC. In this regard, allowances have indeed been made in the assessments for people driving to schools as has been suggested. It should also be pointed out that the work submitted by Vectos is based on baseline traffic surveys that pre-dated the COVID-19 pandemic, which is likely to overinflate the traffic flows that have been assessed as it is expected that the travel behaviour patterns that have emerged over the last 15 months (i.e. increased working

Agenda item number: 4(5)

from home and on-line shopping will continue moving forward. SCC are content that the assessments provided are robust.

On the basis of the analysis presented by Vectos, which has included a range of sensitivity tests that take into account planned growth in the local area, it has been shown that the proposed development will not lead to the severe impact referred to in the NPPF as a legitimate reason to refuse permission on transport grounds. This is exemplified through reference to before and after queue lengths and delays at the junctions that are expected to experience the largest increases in demand as a result of the proposed development, including, but not limited to Ripley High Street and the B2215 junctions with the A247 and Send Marsh Road. The transport assessment demonstrates that the junctions modelled will generally operate with large amounts of residual capacity in the anticipated year of opening.

The conclusion of the Transport Assessment is that the site will not result in a severe impact on the local highway network, however SCC have still secured a comprehensive package of off-site improvements and recommended a number of planning conditions which should offset any impact that the development may have. The improvements are expected to reduce car dependency by enhancing travel choices for existing and future residents and are consistent with the policy requirements of this allocated site. The financial value of these are in excess of £2M.

I understand that there is some confusion about the delivery strategy for the Burnt Common Slip Roads. For the avoidance of doubt, it is important to clarify that the Garlick's Arch site is not required to deliver the Burnt Common Slip roads. This is an explicit requirement of the separate allocation at Wisely Airfield. Notwithstanding this, it should be noted that the analysis submitted by Vectos has included assessments that are predicated on the slip roads being both absent and in place. Under both scenarios, it has been satisfactory shown that the proposed development will not have a severe impact and does not warrant or justify any off-site highway works.

In terms of Kiln Lane and the Travelling Show People pitches, this was also subject to a detailed assessment by Vectos and a thorough assessment of this from SCC. It is understood that the requirements for the site are based on a group that the Applicant was introduced to by GBC. There is an operational management strategy that future users will have to abide by. The mitigation secured by SCC for this part of the scheme includes waiting restrictions, a weight limit with associated TRO and localised widening to allow two vehicles to pass one another in two locations as well as at the junction of Kiln Lane/Portsmouth road. SCC involved the Area Highways team in discussions for their views of the proposed mitigation for Kiln Lane, which they also accepted. There are physical measures which are supported by a weight restriction that will limit the maximum vehicle to 18 Tonnes, which is in the region of 10 metres long. By way of a comparison, GBC's refuse collection vehicle is 10.4 metres long, whilst the largest legal vehicle that can use UK roads are those that transport bulky goods to supermarkets is 16.5 metres. We are content that the mitigation measures secured for this element of the proposals are (i) commensurate with the level of vehicular activity associated with the types of activity that the group will undertake and (ii) ensure sufficient controls are in place to control the types of vehicles that can use and be stored on the site. From a public highway perspective, the County Council is content that the evidence presented by Vectos has shown this element of the proposed development will not have an unacceptable safety impact, which is the other key threshold identified by the NPPF.

I hope the above has satisfactorily answered the questions below.

Kirsty Wilkinson

Principal Transport Development Planning Officer

Questions Received 7th June 2021

1. Agenda page 53 – item 105 – County Highways Authority I fully understand and appreciate that GBC do not have authority over the highways – however,,,,,is it possible at all – anywhere to question the findings as they relate to a planning application?? It feels crazy to accept the finding that some 500 dwellings resulting in around 1000 cars and at least 1000 – 2000 journeys daily – ‘would not result in a severe impact on the local highway network’,,,,,will the A3 Clandon slip road definitely be built very soon??? A lot of traffic will use these. Without them – and on this application alone – much of the traffic will move through the small village of Ripley in order to access London direction routes. Car journeys towards either Clandon or Woking railway stations will result in traffic moving through the small villages of

Clandon and Send. How on earth can any of this be said to have no severe impact on local highways?? One passes a school. Please can we be advised what 'severe impact' would be? Please can councillors be advised what SCC actually DOES in its determination of these statements?? This issue is at the heart of many objections in this case and having an answer to this would greatly assist.

2. Agenda page 60 – item 10.39 – Primary school places – Surrey CC has indeed suggested that there are plenty of places within Surrey schools although they have not mentioned where exactly – therefore there is a strong case that families buying houses in this area will have to use their cars in order to take children to schools within the borough. Send primary school has a policy which has been compiled with existing needs in mind before this application came forward therefore would not immediately be able to accept new children. It is likely therefore that more car journeys will be required. Is it possible to make a statement that this application will result in more car journeys which – even if temporarily – until such time as the local school might be expanded by SCC – following the S106 contribution. I feel that the officers report on this application needs to be very clear about what will be the result of it overall. We need houses but we need to understand the cost in all areas too.
3. Agenda page 63 – item 10.50 and 10.51 – Showmans Guilds – please can the officers advise why they have accepted the views of the Norwich and Eastern Counties section of the Showmans Guild over and above that of its headquarters?? How often do showmen from the Norwich and Eastern Counties actually travel to Surrey and our local area and to where exactly?? Is there evidence of their need of storage and quartering?? This feels like a strange situation.....to accept a relatively small part of the guild and yet to dismiss the main objectors comments?? Do we have information on what constitutes a smaller vehicle or need as distinct from the HGVs which cannot travel down Kiln Lane. Exactly what would this site be used for?? Can members of the committee be more fully informed on this issue please??

This page is intentionally left blank