



GUILDFORD  
B O R O U G H

[www.guildford.gov.uk](http://www.guildford.gov.uk)

**Tom Horwood**  
Joint Chief Executive of Guildford and  
Waverley Borough Councils

Dear Councillor

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - MONDAY 10 JULY 2023**

Please find attached the following:

**Agenda No    Item**

Late Sheets - Late Representations/Updates, Amendments and Corrections  
(Pages 1 - 18)

Yours sincerely

Sophie Butcher, Democratic Services Officer

Encs

This page is intentionally left blank

## Planning Committee

10 July 2023

### Late Representations

Since the last date for the submission of views on applications/matters before the Committee this evening, representations in respect of the under mentioned applications/ matters have been received. The letters, copies of which will be available for inspection by councillors at the meeting, are summarised below.

#### Item 5 – Planning Applications

#### 22/P/01175 – (Page 23) – Former Wisley Airfield, Hatch Lane, Ockham, GU23 6NU

##### **1. Additional Response from SCC as County Highway Authority: 30.06.2023**

1.1 Under the heading “Strategic Model Outputs”, at the end of paragraph 20.150, the Report states *“The County Highway Authority has confirmed that further consideration will be given to a package of improvements that may address its current concerns. In the absence of an identified package of works, the current objection must stand.”* At paragraph 20.153 the Report Summary is *“Given SCC’s concerns raised above it is suggested that the planning application should be refused for the highway reasons as set out in paragraph 20.142”*.

1.2 In this regard, on 29 June 2023, following further discussions between Taylor Wimpey (TW), the appellant, and SCC as County Highway Authority (CHA), an email from SCC to GBC advised *“please find attached an update on SCC’s position on transport/highway matters, further to our formal consultation response. I have provided this in table format for ease of reference, with matters now agreed in green and matters that are still not resolved to the CHA’s satisfaction in amber.”*

1.3 GBC officers sought confirmation from SCC that the table represented their updated comments on the scheme and therefore that

they should be uploaded to the GBC website, and forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate, (PINS). In response, officers received the following email on 4 July 2023: *“See attached an **updated** version. This was shared with TW on Friday. I am happy for this to be put on the portal and sent to PINS.”* This table, dated 30 June 2023, has therefore been uploaded to the GBC website, and was circulated to the Planning Inspectorate and the Rule 6 Parties on 5 July 2023, with the comment that it *“is still being considered by the Council, and we will need to discuss it with the County further to ensure we fully understand the position being taken.”* The table is annexed to these Late Sheets.

1.4 In the updated version, there remain the following 6 issues indicated in amber, in respect of which officers summarise SCC’s comments as follows:

- **7a – Traffic Impact (Strategic Model) Various roads** – *“increase in traffic onto parts of the Local Highway Network where currently no mitigation is proposed could have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, particularly for non-motorised users. SCC request that WSP undertake a detailed Personal Injury Accident (PIA) analysis ... of the data over the latest 5 year period; ... SCC consider a s.106 contribution to address these unforeseen impacts ... would be an appropriate mechanism to ensure that these impacts can be mitigated to an acceptable degree.”*
- **7b – Traffic Impact (Strategic Model) Potters Lane**- *SCC request WSP undertake a detailed PIA analysis ...of the data over the latest 5 year period ... SCC consider a s.106 contribution to address these unforeseen impacts ... would be an appropriate mechanism to ensure that these impacts can be mitigated to an acceptable degree.”*
- **7c – Traffic Impact (Strategic Model) B2215** -*SCC consider a further package of traffic management and walking/cycling safety improvements can be brought forward ... enhancing the scheme being delivered by National Highways ...SCC consider TW should provide a s.106 contribution to help support delivery of this additional package ...”*
- **10 – Bus Strategy** – *Discussions are on-going with regard to agreeing the Level of Service required in the off-peak period to the*

*railway stations and to agree the amount of resilience funding to support services in perpetuity. SCC will shortly be sending TW a request and justification for a s.106 contribution to deliver 'Access for All' improvements at Effingham Junction and Horsley railway stations."*

- **11 – Cycling Strategy**- *recommendations made in the Road Safety Audits[RSA] to improve the safety of the schemes proposed on each of the cycle routes can be dealt with at s.278 detailed design stage. Discussions are ongoing with TW on s.106 wording ...to secure delivery of these works ... SCC will provide details of the amount of contribution required ... SCC to provide a Road Safety Audit 'overseeing organisation' response"*
- **13 – Old Lane Traffic Management Scheme**- *recommendations made in the RSAs to improve the safety of the proposed works can be dealt with at the s.278 detailed design stage ... SCC to provide an RSA 'overseeing organisation' response."*

1.5 In respect of these issues, whilst SCC indicates that any remaining highway safety concerns can be addressed by appropriate mitigation funded by s.106 contributions or at s.278 detailed design stage, officers advise that since these measures rely on further analysis and design work, the results or impacts of which are not currently known, certainty to overcome all concerns cannot be guaranteed. This is equally relevant for compliance with the National Highways assessment recommending conditions, which is subject to a caveat set out at paragraph 10.4 of the Report, stating: *"the mitigation package must be in its final form and, where necessary, appropriately tested to quantify impacts on the Strategic Road Network to ensure that there is no unacceptable impact upon highway safety and no severe impact on congestion ..."*

1.6 Additionally, in respect of the bus service levels, the Access for All measures, and the other measures identified, since these are not known or costed, there is currently no certainty that they would be provided by TW via a s.106 or s.278 agreement as sought.

**1.7 On this basis, officers recommend that the existing Putative Reasons for Refusal (PRfR) 6, and 7 (where related to highways and transport mitigation), should stand.**

1.8 Officers reiterate that it is open to the appellant to continue discussions with SCC in the run-up to the public inquiry opening, with the aim of addressing the outstanding issues identified above by SCC, and they also have the option of requesting to the Inspector that additional material be accepted and circulated to all parties, in respect of which the Inspector would decide whether to agree to this. Officers note that the lpa needs to continue to be updated on and form part of the discussions with TW on the package of mitigation, as GBC may take a contrary view to SCC, either in terms of the mitigation itself or its deliverability, and thus whether the proposals satisfy the development plan policies.

1.9 In addition, officers advise that they are expected by the appeal procedures to negotiate if possible the wording of a s.106 agreement with TW prior to the public inquiry which could provide the certainty on delivery of mitigation found to be acceptable to SCC noted above, if also acceptable to GBC. Accordingly, notwithstanding what the Committee decides in respect of the recommended PRfR 6 and 7, the position could change prior to the opening of the public inquiry.

## **2. Additional Representations submitted to GBC**

### **2A: Letter from LRM Planning on behalf of Hallam Land Management 06 07 2023**

2.1 A letter from LRM Planning suggests that there are errors in the Report to which attention of Members should be drawn. In fact the points raised by LRM Planning are intended to provide support to their case for the current Hallam Land Management (HLM) application for 70 dwellings on land north of Ockham Lane, (Ref 23/P00417), which proposes the sole vehicular access to be from Ockham Lane, rather than through the TW site. That application does not form part of the application now at appeal for the Committee's consideration, but for the record, officers consider the points raised by LRM Planning to be incorrect or to represent an interpretation of policy which is not shared by officers. The points made by LRM Planning are as follows:

- *“Paragraph 20.110 [of the Committee Report] refers to the TW/WSP Highway Forecasting Report, (HFR), and purports to*

*summarise points from within it. The discussion of access to Ockham Lane does not appear to be derived from that HFR and it is unclear to us as to the origins of that paragraph from the contents of that Report.”*

- Officers’ response: Paragraph 20.110 states *“Both GBC and SCC wish there to be only a nominal number of units accessed directly via Ockham Lane, ie approximately 10 units although the SPD for Wisley Airfield does allow a limited number ie up to approximately 100 units off Ockham Lane”* In fact that is a **direct quote** from TW’s Transport Assessment (TA) paragraph 11.2.9 where it summarises the TFR, which is an appendix to the TA.
- **“Paragraph 23.68 of [the Committee Report]** refers to *connectivity across the three landownerhips ..and describes the Access and Movement [Parameter] Plan. Within this passage you refer to “vehicular connection zones” between the respective areas. As a matter of fact the connection at the boundary of the TW and HLM land is referred to on that plan as a “connection zone”. The annotation states ‘Exact location of routes and uses to be determined at the RMA’. ... It does not refer to vehicles.”*
- Officer response, officers advise that they requested TW to show these zones on the above plan to allow for vehicular connections, since there are already Public Rights of Way pedestrian connections between the landownerships that are being retained. In respect of the Harris land, the plan annotation does indeed state “Vehicular Connection Zone” as set out in para 23.68 of the Report, however, for the Hallam Land site, the annotation states “Connection Zone”. The wording is therefore by TW. Nevertheless, officers reiterate that for the consideration of the TW scheme, the relevant fact is that the TW Access and Movement Parameter Plan shows the “connection zone” to the HLM site, and the TW Drawing 1350-2-191 Rev J: *Illustrative Masterplan* layout shows two possible roads linking the eastern neighbourhood, from the Sustainable Transport Corridor, with the boundary to the HLM site. This would allow a vehicular link, the exact location of which would be determined at Reserved Matters application stage, when its ‘use’ could be confirmed. Officers interpret ‘use’ to refer to its purpose and therefore the type of vehicles that would use

the link. Thus, for the consideration of the TW scheme, officers confirm that it does allow for a vehicular connection to the HLM site. However, to avoid any doubt over the implications of the semantics of the above Parameter Plan's wording for the HLM application, (which are a matter for consideration at the determination of that application, not the TW scheme at appeal), officers advise that the Committee resolve that TW Drawing 1350-2-255 Rev P: *FWA Access & Movement Parameter Plan* could only be supported if the highlighted area adjoining the Hallam Land be annotated "Vehicular Connection Zone" rather than "Connection Zone".

- The LRM Planning letter also expresses a difference of view in interpretation of Policy A35 Transport Strategy (1) and (2), relying on a quote from the SPD, from which it omits the essential caveat "*to be agreed with SCC*". Again, this matter is relevant to consideration of the HLM application, not the TW scheme, and officers would advise that they stand by their comment in paragraph 23.68 of the Report which states the "*TW application does not preclude these links from being introduced in reserved matters applications for the relevant parts of the site.*"

## **2B: Representations from Other Parties**

2.2 Since publication of the officers' Report on 30 June 2023, 15 letters have been received from members of the public, of which 13 are objections and two in support. Also a letter has been received from the combined East and West Horsley Parish Councils, in objection. Villages Against Wisley New Town, (VAWNT) has provided a synopsis of the case against the scheme which highlights the reasons for the previous appeal being dismissed, and the unsustainability of the location as an allocated site. G-BUG has reiterated its previous reasons for objection in response to the second round of consultation. Additionally, Surrey Nature Partnership has endorsed a number of other objections made in respect of impact on wildlife.

2.3 The points raised in all these letters and representations have already been recorded in the Report in Section 11 - *Third Party Representations*,



and addressed in relevant sections of the Report. No additional points have been raised.

2.4A verbal update on any further representations will be made at the Committee meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Planning Committee

10 July 2023

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

#### 22/P/01175 – (Page 23) – Former Wisley Airfield, Hatch Lane, Ockham, GU23 6NU

#### 1. Corrections and Updates to Committee Report

1.1 **Page 28 Para 3.9: Recovered Appeals** – The Secretary of State has **not** at this point recovered the appeal decision.

1.2 **Page 29 Para 3.13**: there are now **six Rule 6 Parties**, in view of some combinations, as follows:

Wisley Action Group (WAG). Ockham PC & RHS Wisley;

East Horsley PC and West Horsley PC;

Ripley PC and Send PC;

Villages Against Wisley New Town (VAWNT);

Hallam Land Management (represented by LRM Planning);

Trustees of the JR Harris Discretionary Settlement (represented by CBRE);

1.3 **Page 31: Putative Reason for Refusal (4) (PRfR 4)** is in fact erroneously included, because it was merged into Putative Reason for Refusal (1), but not then omitted. Members are therefore requested to treat PRfR 4 as **withdrawn**.

1.4 **Pages 137 – 161: Main Issue 23 – Urban Design Principles –**

**Placemaking: creation of a new settlement.** Paragraph 23.7 advises that LPSS Policy D1 – *Place Shaping* requires, inter alia, that a Masterplan will be required for A35, and that this will be subject to assessment by a **Design Review Panel**. Within this Main Issue, whilst there is no detail provided of the Design Review Panel process that was undertaken by TW, for avoidance of doubt, officers note that both the Urban Design Officer's comments and the endorsement of these comments, by officers, in the assessment within this Main Issue, were informed by the

Design Review Panel reports that were provided. In fact four stages of design review with the Design Southeast Strategic Review Panel were undertaken by TW, with GBC officers and Members in attendance. The DAS Section 5: *Masterplan Evolution* details the discussions and responses to the first three Design Review Panel meetings which took place prior to the submission of the application. This is set out from pages 106 to 111 of the DAS. The Savills covering letter dated 16 March 2023 which supported the submission of additional material confirms at page 11 that *“through [inter alia] four Design Review Panels the design has had input from a vast number of stakeholders, which has ultimately shaped the Application Proposal.”*

1.5 The fourth DRP meeting, which took place on 6 April 2022, in the lead-up to submission of the TW application, identified a number of concerns and in particular the need to consider the procedures to ensure that the Illustrative Masterplan could inform the later reserved matters applications. The Summary stated:

*There has been positive progress on elements of this proposal since the last review, and we remain supportive of the vision and ambition for this site. Our main concern though is that there are insufficient guarantees in place to ensure the delivery of that vision and high quality design and locally distinctive placemaking. Reflecting this, some of the comments in this report refer specifically to design as presented, and how issues identified by the panel can be addressed, whilst others focus on how design quality can be assured through the planning submission. Both types of comments need to be responded to if this proposal is to set a new high standard for large-scale development in Guildford and Surrey. We are pleased to have been able to see the scheme four times and we would welcome an opportunity to further discuss the issues raised in this report.*

1.6 This resulted in the request to TW from officers that further work be undertaken on the Illustrative Masterplan and the supporting Vignettes, and that a Design Principles Document be prepared, in consultation with the other two landowners, which in itself sets out the further steps for submission of a site-wide (strategic) Design Code and then Neighbourhood Design Codes to support each reserved matters application, as is set out in paragraph 23.12 of the Report. All this has been undertaken in the scheme now before the Committee, and

therefore the officers' comments on Main Issue 23 are confirmed to have taken account of the Design Review Panel comments and thus remain as set out in the Report.

## **2. Statements of Case by Rule 6 Parties**

2.1 As required by the Planning Inspector for the appeal, each of the Rule 6 Parties have submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, their respective "Statements of Case" (SoC), which set out the cases that each will be making in their Proofs of Evidence, due on 29 August 2023.

2.2 These SoCs reflect the submissions that these parties have made to GBC in respect of the TW scheme during the two rounds of consultation at application stage, but have been completed after publication of the officers' Report to this committee.

2.3 Given that the SoCs relate to the detailed cases that each Rule 6 Party intends to submit to the Planning Inspector in respect of the appeal and reflect issues previously raised and addressed in this report, officers do not consider that their content needs to be summarised in these Late Sheets for Members to be fully informed in arriving at their resolution on the recommendations in the report.

This page is intentionally left blank

Item ref	Subject	SCC Consultation Response Comments	Applicant response to SCC as at 07.06.2023	SCC Comments 30.06.2023
1	trip rates	The trip rates contained within the TA have been agreed to establish an acceptable trip generation.	Agreed	
2	Modal split	The TA assumptions are considered acceptable	Agreed	
3	trip distribution and assignment	The CHA is now satisfied that the trip distribution assessment in the Strategic SATURN Model is robust.	Agreed	
4	Strategic SATURN Model (Base year 2019)	The CHA has undertaken an audit of the base model, and consider it is satisfactory	Agreed	
5	Strategic SATURN Model (Future year 2038) including committed development growth	the CHA is satisfied that using TEMPro is a robust approach. It should be noted that since the model was produced, new NTEM datasets have been published which show lower growth assumptions, and as such the CHA considers the data utilised in the TA is robust and provides a 'worst case scenario'	Agreed	
6	Traffic Impact (TA Junction assessments)	The CHA is satisfied that the outputs from these junction assessments show that the residual cumulative impact would not be severe	Agreed	
7a	Traffic Impact (Strategic Model)	<p>CHA has identified the following potentially significant traffic impacts through relatively large increases in flow at links and junctions below:-</p> <p><b>Plough Lane</b> (AM: +160 / 225%; PM: +100 / 263%) on a key route that is being promoted for cycling between the site and Cobham. These trips are heading to Cobham with some dispersing onto the A307 towards Kingston and others using A245 towards Leatherhead. These trips are using this back route rather than routing via the Ockham roundabout and the A3.</p> <p><b>Old Lane (S)</b> (AM: +77 / 16%; PM: +130 / 24%).</p>	WSP responded to displacement of traffic in our note SCC comments response April 2023 V1. We await SCCs detailed comments before responding, particularly on the criteria used by SCC in determining a severe impact on congestion or unacceptable impact on road safety.	<p>-SCC have reviewed the note provided by WSP (4.04.23) in response to SCC's comments/queries on the Strategic Model Outputs.</p> <p>-SCC accept that the impact on these links and their associated junctions is not severe in capacity terms.</p> <p>-SCC consider the increase in traffic onto the parts of the LHN, where currently no mitigation is proposed, could have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, particularly for NMUs.</p>

Item ref	Subject	SCC Consultation Response Comments	Applicant response to SCC as at 07.06.2023	SCC Comments 30.06.2023
		<p><b>Ripley Lane</b> (West Horsley) (AM: +132 / 33%; PM: +100 / 42%)</p> <p><b>Ripley Road</b> (East Clandon) (AM: +70 / 26%; PM: +33 / 16%).</p> <p>The CHA's assessment has also identified that the proposed speed reduction measures displace trips onto adjacent routes in both the AM and PM peak periods, as follows:</p> <p><b>Old Lane</b> northbound from Effingham to the A3.</p> <p><b>Ripley Lane</b> in both directions.</p> <p><b>A247 Clandon Road</b> northbound</p> <p><b>Guileshill Lane</b> in both directions</p>		<p>-SCC request that WSP undertake a detailed PIA analysis of Ripley Lane, Ripley Road, A247, Guileshill Lane, looking at the data over the latest available 5-year period, so that any PIA trends/patterns can be identified.</p> <p>-SCC consider a S106 contribution to address these unforeseen impacts, resulting from the displacement of traffic, (in highway safety terms but also to support the resilience of the the infrastructure on these links), would be an appropriate mechanism to ensure that these impacts can be mitigated to an acceptable degree.</p>
7b	Traffic Impact (Strategic Model) Potters Lane	<p>Trips are also being displaced from the B2215 to Potters Lane, to then join the A3 (just over 50 PCUs).</p> <p>The CHA would question the attractiveness of this route for drivers in reality, as an alternative to routing via Ripley, given that during peak times it can take a considerable amount of time for a suitable gap in traffic flow on the A3 to occur, to enable a vehicle to safely egress from Potters Lane.</p>	<p>NH have confirmed in their formal consultation response that they have no highway safety or capacity objection to the proposed increase in vehicles joining the A3 from Potters Lane. No information on available gaps and delays has been provided by the CHA to support its alternative view. PIAs at the junction show most are single vehicle accidents indicating loss of control, not merging issues. The safety performance of the junction has significantly improved following improvements to the signage at the junction.</p>	<p>-SCC request that WSP undertake a detailed PIA analysis of Potters Lane, between its junctions with the A3 and the A247, looking at the data over the latest available 5-year period, so that any PIA trends/patterns can be identified.</p> <p>-SCC consider a S106 contribution to address these unforeseen impacts, resulting from the displacement of traffic, (in highway safety terms but also to support the resilience of the the infrastructure on these links), would be an appropriate mechanism to ensure</p>



Item ref	Subject	SCC Consultation Response Comments	Applicant response to SCC as at 07.06.2023	SCC Comments 30.06.2023
				that these impacts can be mitigated to an acceptable degree.
7c	Traffic Impact (Strategic Model) B2215	The CHA is concerned that the strategic model is over-estimating the displacement of traffic from the B2215 as a result of the proposed speed reduction measures and cycle route proposals for Ripley	This is not credible position for the CHA to take because it has confirmed that the base and forecast models are agreed. No supporting analysis has been provided by the CHA.	-SCC consider a further package of traffic management and walking/cycling safety improvements can be brought forward for the B2215, enhancing the scheme being delivered by the NH, and extending it further south-west to the B2215/A247 roundabout junction. -SCC consider TW should provide a S106 contribution to help support delivery of this additional package of works on the B2215, both in terms of highway safety and the amenity of the LHN through Ripley.
8	Site Accesses	The CHA has undertaken the necessary technical and safety review of the proposed access arrangements and is satisfied that they provide safe and suitable access to the site for all users	Agreed	
9	Accident Data	The CHA is satisfied that none of the six fatalities indicate any inherent safety problem on the local road network.  CHA is satisfied that the mitigation package will help to improve highway safety on:-  <b>Old Lane</b> <b>Ockham Lane</b> <b>Ockham Lane North</b> , between the junctions with Alms Heath and Long Reach	Whilst these specific findings are agreed, the CHA has also not brought to the LPA's attention any other concerns. It should be noted that speed reduction measures on Ockham Road North extend from Ockham Lane junction to the junction with Long Reach.	
10	Bus strategy	In principle, the CHA agrees and supports the strategy that is proposed in regard to the destinations identified and the	Agreement on the principles is welcomed.	-SCC have now reviewed the revised PT strategy and discussed

Item ref	Subject	SCC Consultation Response Comments	Applicant response to SCC as at 07.06.2023	SCC Comments 30.06.2023
		<p>level of service required to ensure that the bus offer for future residents of the development is attractive and convenient to use.</p> <p>The CHA does however have concerns regarding the absence of any reference in the Bus Strategy for improving bus/rail integration and interchange, and currently the proposals do not meet the CHA’s expectation and requirements for providing ‘door-to-door’ bus services between the proposed settlement and the ‘front-door’ of at least one of the nearest railway stations to the site.</p> <p>The CHA has also requested further information from the applicant on the modelling assumptions that have been used to develop the proposed frequency and extent of bus services that are being proposed. Discussions are continuing with the applicant regarding the exact funding mechanism that will be required to secure monies that will provide the bus services in perpetuity</p>	<p>WSP await feedback on the bus strategy submitted to the CHA on 23<sup>rd</sup> May, which contains clarification on:-</p> <p>the bus services proposed between the proposed settlement and the ‘front-door’ of at least one of the nearest railway stations to the site i.e. Horsley Station; and</p> <p>the modelling assumptions that have been used to develop the proposed frequency and extent of bus services that are being proposed.</p> <p>TW have no in principle objection to providing a proportionate CIL-compliant contribution to “Access for All” improvements at both Horsley and Effingham Junction Railway Stations</p>	<p>this further with TW and WSP at a Teams meeting on 29.06.23.</p> <p>-Discussions with TW are ongoing with regard to agreeing the LOS required in the off-peak period to the railway stations and to agree the amount of resilience funding to support the services in-perpetuity.</p> <p>-SCC will shortly be sending TW a request and justification for a S106 contribution to deliver ‘Access for All’ Improvements at Effingham junction and Horsley Railway Stations.</p>
11	Cycling Strategy	<p>The CHA considers the cycling strategy is a positive step-change from the proposals submitted as part of the previous planning application and appeal scheme</p> <p>The CHA is satisfied with the fundamental principles of the improvements proposed, including the speed limit reductions, the typology of interventions being utilised, and the destinations being served, and that the package of improvements accords with the cycling infrastructure requirements of Policy A35 of GBC’s Local Plan, to provide “improvements to a level that would be attractive and safe for the average cyclist”.</p>	<p>The Road safety audits have been carried out and these along with the revised detailed designs have been submitted on 12.05.2023 to the CHA for comment and agreement.</p>	<p>-SCC have reviewed the RSAs and considers that there are no fundamental safety problems that have been identified.</p> <p>Recommendations made in the RSAs to improve the safety of the schemes proposed on each of the cycle routes can be dealt with at the S278 detailed design stage.</p> <p>-Discussion are ongoing with TW on agreeing the wording of the S106</p>

Item ref	Subject	SCC Consultation Response Comments	Applicant response to SCC as at 07.06.2023	SCC Comments 30.06.2023
		<p>The CHA would advise however, that subject to the outstanding Road Safety Audits being completed and any safety problems identified satisfactorily addressed, the CHA would then be in a position to recommend a suitable worded condition/S106 obligation to secure their delivery.</p>		<p>obligation necessary to secure the delivery of these works.                      -The proposed cycle routes include the upgrading of Public Rights of Way. SCC advise that these works would be undertaken by SCC, fully funded by TW via a S106 contribution.                      -SCC will provide details of the amount of contribution required for these ROW improvement works as soon as possible.                      -SCC action to provide an RSA 'overseeing organisation' response as soon as possible.</p>
12	Impact on Public Rights of Way	<p>The CHA is satisfied that the Improvements proposed to the following PROW will provide a suitable route for cycling and can be accommodated within the definitive width of the ROW:-</p> <p><b>Bridleway No. 98 and Footpath No. 99</b> - These form part of the proposed cycle between the site and Horsley Station.  <b>Bridleway No. 566</b> - This forms part of the proposed cycle route between the site and Byfleet  <b>Footpath No. 67</b> - This forms part of the proposed cycle route between the site and Cobham</p> <p>The CHA has no objection in principle to the impact on the ROW network within the site, as shown on the indicative masterplan</p>	Agreed	

Item ref	Subject	SCC Consultation Response Comments	Applicant response to SCC as at 07.06.2023	SCC Comments 30.06.2023
13	Old Lane Traffic Management Scheme	Subject to the outstanding Road Safety Audits being completed and any safety problems identified being satisfactorily addressed, the CHA would then be in a position to recommend a suitable worded condition/S106 obligation to secure their delivery.	The Road safety audits have been carried out and these along with the revised detailed designs have been submitted on 12.05.2023 to the CHA for comment and agreement.	-SCC have reviewed the RSA and considers that there are no fundamental safety problems that have been identified. Recommendations made in the RSAs to improve the safety of the proposed works on Old Lane can be dealt with at the S278 detailed design stage. -SCC action to provide an RSA 'overseeing organisation' response as soon as possible.
14	Parking Strategy	The CHA supports the flexible approach that has been proposed within the strategy and considers it critical that a S106 obligation is secured as part of any consent granted, for a scheme for the monitoring of parking demand, linked to the demand and usage of the sustainable modes of transport proposed for the site	Agreed	
15	Travel Plan and Mobility Strategy	<p>The CHA considers the Travel Plan (TP) provides a comprehensive strategy for promoting sustainable travel between the site and the surrounding area.</p> <p>The proposed mobility hub strategy for the site is also supported by the CHA, and it is considered that the management/funding of these hubs and ultimately the successful operation of them will be a key function of the proposed Community Trust for the site.</p>	Agreed	