



Contact Officer:

Carrie Anderson, Senior Democratic
Services Officer

14 December 2023

Dear Councillor,

Your attendance is requested at a meeting of the **EXECUTIVE** to be held in the Council Chamber, Millmead House, Millmead, Guildford, Surrey GU2 4BB on **THURSDAY, 4 JANUARY 2024** at 6.00 pm.

Yours faithfully

Tom Horwood
Joint Chief Executive
Guildford & Waverley
Borough Councils

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE

Chairman:

Councillor Julia McShane (Leader of the Council & Lead Councillor for
Housing)

Vice-Chairman:

Councillor Tom Hunt (Deputy Leader of the Council & Lead Councillor for
Regeneration)

Councillor Angela Goodwin, Lead Councillor for Engagement and Customer
Services

Councillor Catherine Houston, Lead Councillor for Commercial Services

Councillor Richard Lucas, Lead Councillor for Finance and Property

Councillor Carla Morson, Lead Councillor for Community and Organisational
Development

Councillor George Potter, Lead Councillor for Planning, Environment and
Climate Change

Councillor Merel Rehorst-Smith, Lead Councillor for Regulatory and
Democratic Services



WEBCASTING NOTICE

This meeting will be recorded for live and/or subsequent broadcast on the Council's website in accordance with the Council's capacity in performing a task in the public interest and in line with the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014. The whole of the meeting will be recorded, except where there are confidential or exempt items, and the footage will be on the website for six months.

If you have any queries regarding webcasting of meetings, please contact Committee Services.

QUORUM 3

THE COUNCIL'S STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK (2021- 2025)

Our Vision:

A green, thriving town and villages where people have the homes they need, access to quality employment, with strong and safe communities that come together to support those needing help.

Our Mission:

A trusted, efficient, innovative, and transparent Council that listens and responds quickly to the needs of our community.

Our Values:

- We will put the interests of our community first.
- We will listen to the views of residents and be open and accountable in our decision-making.
- We will deliver excellent customer service.
- We will spend money carefully and deliver good value for money services.
- We will put the environment at the heart of our actions and decisions to deliver on our commitment to the climate change emergency.
- We will support the most vulnerable members of our community as we believe that every person matters.
- We will support our local economy.
- We will work constructively with other councils, partners, businesses, and communities to achieve the best outcomes for all.
- We will ensure that our councillors and staff uphold the highest standards of conduct.

Our strategic priorities:

Homes and Jobs

- Revive Guildford town centre to unlock its full potential
- Provide and facilitate housing that people can afford
- Create employment opportunities through regeneration
- Support high quality development of strategic sites
- Support our business community and attract new inward investment
- Maximise opportunities for digital infrastructure improvements and smart places technology

Environment

- Provide leadership in our own operations by reducing carbon emissions, energy consumption and waste

- Engage with residents and businesses to encourage them to act in more environmentally sustainable ways through their waste, travel, and energy choices
- Work with partners to make travel more sustainable and reduce congestion
- Make every effort to protect and enhance our biodiversity and natural environment.

Community

- Tackling inequality in our communities
- Work with communities to support those in need
- Support the unemployed back into the workplace and facilitate opportunities for residents to enhance their skills
- Prevent homelessness and rough-sleeping in the borough

Agenda

**Item
No.**

1 Apologies for Absence

2 Local Code of Conduct - Disclosable Pecuniary Interest

In accordance with the local Code of Conduct, a councillor is required to disclose at the meeting any disclosable pecuniary interest (DPI) that they may have in respect of any matter for consideration on this agenda. Any councillor with a DPI must not participate in any discussion or vote regarding that matter and they must also withdraw from the meeting immediately before consideration of the matter.

If that DPI has not been registered, the councillor must notify the Monitoring Officer of the details of the DPI within 28 days of the date of the meeting.

Councillors are further invited to disclose any non-pecuniary interest which may be relevant to any matter on this agenda, in the interests of transparency, and to confirm that it will not affect their objectivity in relation to that matter.

3 Minutes (Pages 7 - 20)

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 23 November 2023.

4 Leader's Announcements

5 Send Hill Disused Sandpit (Pages 21 - 284) *

Key Decisions:

Any item on this agenda that is marked with an asterisk is a key decision. The Council's Constitution defines a key decision as an executive decision which is likely to result in expenditure or savings of at least £200,000 or

which is likely to have a significant impact on two or more wards within the Borough.

Under Regulation 9 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, whenever the Executive intends to take a key decision, a document setting out prescribed information about the key decision including:

- the date on which it is to be made,
- details of the decision makers,
- a list of the documents to be submitted to the Executive in relation to the matter,
- how copies of such documents may be obtained

must be available for inspection by the public at the Council offices and on the Council's website at least 28 clear days before the key decision is to be made. The relevant notice in respect of the key decisions to be taken at this meeting was published as part of the Forward Plan on 7 December 2023.

Executive

* Councillor Julia McShane (Chairperson)

* Councillor Tom Hunt (Vice-Chair)

* Councillor Angela Goodwin

* Councillor Carla Morson

* Councillor Catherine Houston

* Councillor George Potter

* Councillor Richard Lucas

* Councillor Merel Rehorst-Smith

*Present

Councillors James Jones, Richard Mills, Joanne Shaw, and Howard Smith were also in attendance.

Councillors Dawn Bennett, Ruth Brothwell, Stephen Hives, Vanessa King, James Walsh, Dominique Williams, Fiona White, and Catherine Young were in remote attendance

EX28 Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

EX29 Local Code of Conduct - Disclosable Pecuniary Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

EX30 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 October 2023 were confirmed as a correct record. The Chairman signed the minutes.

EX31 Leader's Announcements

New Exhibition at Guildford House

The Leader announced that a new exhibition would open at Guildford House Gallery this weekend from 25 November 2023 to 6 January 2024. The display featured a selection of artworks from the Guildford House Open Competition 2023. Promising a captivating experience for any contemporary art lover, this exhibition was for all ages.

Festive Family Fun Day

The Leader announced that the annual Festive Family Fun Day returned to the town centre last weekend, launching the start of Christmas in Guildford. A full programme of free entertainment ran throughout the day. It had been well-

attended and very positive comments were received on the day. The event had been funded by Experience Guildford and the UK Shared Prosperity Fund.

Christmas bin collections

The dates for Christmas bin collections were now on the Council's website: www.guildford.gov.uk/Christmasbincollectiontimes

Guildford Design Awards

The Guildford Design Awards were currently taking place and the Council had several buildings nominated for awards including The Guildhall, Walnut Bridge and Midleton Enterprise Park. The Leader wished everyone taking part good luck.

Tenant Drop-in Sessions

The Leader informed councillors that the first of our tenant drop-in sessions took place on Wednesday 22 November, and that if they knew of any tenants within their wards that would like to come and talk to us the next session would take place at The Hive on Park Barn Drive on Wednesday 29 November between 6.30pm and 8pm.

EX32 Review of Councillors' Allowances: Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel

The Council appointed an Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) – jointly with Waverley in October 2022 to review the existing scheme of councillors' allowances and make recommendations for a new scheme. On 2 November 2023, the IRP concluded its review and the Executive received its report and recommendations which were attached as Appendix 1.

The Leader highlighted the correction set out in the Supplementary Information Sheet. On page 20 of the agenda, the figure quoted as the Employers' National Insurance contribution in the table in paragraph 9.1 (Financial Implications) was incorrect. It should have read "£18,153".

The Chairman of the IRP, Dennis Frost, was in attendance along with Panel member Rodney Bates (in remote attendance) to speak to the report. Mr Frost set out his experience of working on other IRPs and the experience of the other panel members. He had been a member of the Guildford IRP which last reviewed the scheme in 2019. Mr Frost thanked officers for their support to the IRP.

During the course of its review, the IRP had received and considered twenty-five completed questionnaires from members and had interviewed fourteen members to arrive at the final recommendations which included a rise in the Public Service Discount (PSD) from 35% to 40% and a 2.5% increase to the Basic Allowance (BA). If adopted, this would be the highest BA of all of the Surrey

districts and boroughs. The IRP argued this was justified when taking in account the latest Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE) median hourly rate for Guildford and the average number of hours that Guildford members spent undertaking council business. It was noted that the hourly rate for Guildford had risen by over 12% in the past year.

There were recommended changes to some of the Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs) awarded to councillors undertaking additional roles such as the Leadership, portfolio holders, chairs and vice chairs of the various committees, notably an increase in the Leader's Allowance to 250% of the BA and a small reduction for portfolio holders. The IRP had taken a particular interest in how the role of the Mayor was supported through the Allowances Scheme and sought to spend more time looking in depth at this role with a view to reporting back in a year's time. The Panel recommended the Council adopt a scheme where a councillor could only receive one SRA, as this was described as fair and best practice.

Mr Frost observed the demographic of the membership had changed since 2019 and consequently there was a different recommendation for the Dependent Carers' Allowance (DCA) than in 2019. The Panel had recommended a new level which was an alternative lump sum of £500 be made available annually to parents of children under 12 years old and to registered carers rather than the submission of a series of claims and small expenses payments throughout the year. This was described as fair and equitable and less bureaucratic.

The Panel judged its recommendations to the council as an overall increase of 3.9% compared to the current budget, significantly less than the rate of inflation.

The Leader took questions for the IRP from non-Executive councillors. Councillor Brothwell, who was a chair of an Executive Advisory Board (EAB), noted that the SRA for this role would be reduced under the IRP's recommendations. The reason supporting the recommendation was that the EABs had rarely met during recent months. Councillor Brothwell argued that the EABs were scheduled to meet monthly and that cancellations were beyond the influence of the chairs and vice-chairs. The Panel members present replied that should the EAB meetings return to the previous frequency then the matter could be reviewed and that this was set out in the report.

Councillor Young suggested there might be a means by which the vice-chair of a committee might receive a proportion of the chair's remuneration when the chair was absent. Councillor Young was Chairman of the Licensing Committee and, having noted the recommended reduction in the one-off payments received by Licensing Sub-Committee Chairs, enquired should the one SRA rule be adopted

would this include the payments made to the Licensing Sub-Committee Chairs. The Panel members present responded to say that on the occasions when a deputy stepped up to take the Chair this would be a level of detail on which the Panel could not advise but might rather be a matter for the two individuals concerned to resolve between themselves. With regard to the one-off payments made to the Licensing Sub-Committee Chairs the Panel was of the view that the current amount was too generous and should be reduced to be in line with other Surrey councils, it was noted that some councils made no payment at all for this responsibility. It was reiterated that one SRA was fair and best practice.

The matter of the role of the IRP in stimulating diversity on the council was raised and the increase in flexible options for those with caring responsibilities was welcomed. The Chairman of the IRP considered the Panel's role in increasing a more diverse membership was limited and that the council itself should be leading in this regard. The proposed reductions for certain SRAs were questioned but was upheld by Mr Frost as evidenced through member interviews.

The Lead Councillor for Finance and Property thanked the Panel for its report which was described as clear, well-reasoned and much appreciated. Further appreciation was given to the Panel for taking into account the Council's current financial position by recommending an increase substantially below the rate of inflation. In addition, there was concern that there should be any increase at all at the current time.

Members of the Executive reflected that the BA was a crucial enabler for residents from diverse backgrounds to assume the role of councillor and consequently to provide representation for all communities. In addition, the report illustrated the elevated levels of public duty and commitment to voluntary service displayed by members of the Council via the recommended increase in the PSD to 40%.

Executive members welcomed the innovative approach to the DCA with the two different levels which sought to support and enable carers to participate in the democratic process and to represent their communities.

Overall, the report was well-received by the Executive, however in consideration of the Council's financial position, members of the Executive voiced concern about supporting any recommendations to increase the Councillors' Allowances Scheme at the current time. It was suggested a further review might be undertaken of Panel's recommendations in 12-months' time when the financial picture might be clearer. It was further proposed that the current indexation linking the Scheme to officer pay awards be suspended for the same 12-month period resulting in a freeze of allowances expenditure for 2024-25.

The Executive did have reservations concerning some of the recommendations of the IRP, notably the adoption of the One SRA Rule, but overall, it was the financial circumstances of the council that was at the forefront of the debate.

On 5 December 2023, Council was to consider the IRP's recommendations for a new scheme of allowances, together with any recommendations of the Executive, prior to determining a new scheme of councillors' allowances to come into effect on 1 April 2024. Consequently, the Executive agreed the following,

Recommendation to full Council (5 December 2023):

That the Council:

- (1) defers consideration of the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel on the review of councillors' allowances for a period of 12 months;
- (2) retains the current scheme of allowances without indexation, which effectively freezes councillors' allowances at their current level for the 2024-25 financial year; and
- (3) thanks the Independent Remuneration Panel for its work.

Reason:

In view of the current situation with regard to the Council's current financial position and the Council's determination to resolve those difficulties, now was not the right time to be increasing councillors' allowances.

EX33 Guildford & Waverley Transformation & Collaboration Programme

The Lead Councillor for Community and Organisational Development introduced the report.

Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils agreed to enter a collaboration in July 2021, starting with the appointment of a Joint Management Team (JMT) as a way of bringing forward further business cases for collaboration. The intention was to provide a robust partnership to provide better value for residents.

The report before the Executive set out the progress made so far and made recommendations in respect of future collaboration options, including options analyses, governance, and financial matters.

A transformation programme was proposed as the means for fostering future closer collaboration between the councils, whilst maintaining the independence and sovereignty of both authorities. Agreement of the report's recommendations

would empower officers to proceed with the programme and to realise the benefits of the collaboration.

The Programme would support the five principles set out in the vision, notably, to remain accountable to their own residents; to enhance and protect the continued delivery of priority services in the face of financial challenge; to seek to achieve more together than could be achieved separately in response to the climate emergency; to harmonise internal processes and external service delivery except where there is a good reason not to and to build a stable basis for any future collaboration proposals.

The Executive was content with the report and the recommendations set out therein and consequently,

RESOLVED:

- (1) To note and endorse the Guildford and Waverley Partnership Vision statement, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Executive.
- (2) To note the progress made to date with regard to the Guildford and Waverley collaboration initiative, as set out in Appendix 2 and section 7 of the report.
- (3) To adopt the proposed Transformation and Collaboration Programme, as set out in Appendix 3 to the report.
- (4) To approve a project to explore the potential benefits of co-locating Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council staff within shared premises or single HQ, resourced separately from this Transformation and Collaboration Programme, and to receive a report for consideration with an options appraisal and recommendations.
- (5) To approve a project to explore a single shared officer structure between Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council, resourced through the initial Transformation and Collaboration budget allocations, and to receive a report for consideration with an options appraisal and recommendations.
- (6) To agree the additional resources as set out in section 10 of the report (£100,000 of revenue and £100,000 of capital. For Guildford Borough Council this would be funded from flexible use of capital receipts and the Finance Recovery Reserve. For Waverley Borough Council this would be funded from the invest to save reserve) to support the initial start-up of this

programme and notes how the revenue funding will be spent to secure officer support as set out within Appendix 4.

- (7) To note that the initial benefits realisation work with the joint Executive Heads of Service had been carried out by the Organisational Development and Finance Teams, with a rough order of magnitude for savings through collaboration projects at £700,000 but that this figure was expected to increase over time as the detail of more plans is developed.
- (8) To note that the required level of funding to support the delivery of the programme in the longer term cannot be made available at this time, necessitating a phased and prioritised approach in the first instance (focusing more on staff terms and conditions and immediate savings opportunities and less on the broader and more complex questions of the operating model for both authorities).
- (9) To consider, in February 2024, how the broader programme can be fully funded and taken forward when the budgets of both Councils are agreed (and adopting a revised programme structure in line with that increased level of funding at that time).
- (10) To approve the principle of the Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council Executives working in partnership on matters relating to the Transformation and Collaboration Programme.
- (11) To approve the principle of Simultaneous Executive Meetings (SEMs) for the Executives of Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council to consider matters relating to the Transformation and Collaboration Programme.
- (12) To delegate authority to the Joint Executive Head of Legal and Democratic Services to schedule regular meetings, as required, simultaneously of the Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council Executives, in consultation with the Leaders of both Councils.
- (13) To invite Overview and Scrutiny Committees to scrutinise and comment upon the draft options appraisals, the recommendations and the costs and savings before these are finalised and brought back to the Executive for further consideration.

Reasons:

1. To articulate and set the framework and goals for the collaborative work between Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council and provide a direction of travel;
2. To enable collaborative work to continue with the resources available and allow officers to resubmit bids for funding to deliver the vision in future years;
3. To ensure Executive members of both Councils can jointly debate and decide matters coming to them relating to the Transformation and Collaboration programme, ensuring transparency and agile decision making across both authorities, whilst maintaining sovereignty of both councils;
4. To ensure decisions relating to sharing premises and staffing are subject to proper scrutiny; and
5. To support the plans of both councils to achieve financial sustainability, particularly for Guildford Borough Council in the light of the reset Budget 2023/24 report (Full Council 25 July 2023) and Financial Recovery Plan (Full Council 10 October 2023) and revised Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP).

EX34 Adoption of the Green Belt Supplementary Planning Document

The report was introduced by the Lead Councillor for Planning, Environment and Climate Change. The Planning Policy officer team were commended for their work in producing the draft documentation.

The report recommended the adoption of the Green Belt Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It was noted that the SPD did not create new policy but rather provided guidance for existing Green Belt policy as contained in Policy P2 of the Local Plan: strategy and sites 2015-2034. The SPD had taken around a year to produce and had been considered by the Council's cross-party internal Planning Policy Board (previously the Local Plan Panel). Appendix 2, paragraph 4.2 of the report set out how the SPD had been shaped following the comments made by that Board, including an additional insert to make a distinction for the use of buildings for agriculture and forestry uses.

If adopted, the SPD would be a material consideration in planning decisions. Adoption of the SPD would also help applicants and decision makers in the submission and determination of planning applications by providing additional clarity and ensuring better consistency.

The Executive,

RESOLVED:

That the Green Belt Supplementary Planning Document, as shown in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Executive, be adopted.

Reason:

Adopting the new SPD would provide detailed guidance for adopted Local Plan: Strategy and Sites policy P2. This would help ensure clarity and consistency in decision making.

EX35 Recycling Policy Review

The Lead Councillor for Planning, Environment and Climate Change introduced the report. Officers were commended for undertaking a review of the existing service and for the recommendations that had arisen as a result.

The Executive heard there were proposals to make changes to the Council's recycling policy in a number of areas. A review of the policy had been driven from a service challenge procedure and was focused on making the service more cost efficient for the taxpayer without substantial environmental or customer service impact.

The recommendations covered five areas relating to the operation of recycling 'bring' sites; the provision of refuse and recycling sacks to properties without space for wheeled bins; the provision of indoor use food waste caddies; the provision of kerbside food waste caddies and the provision of recycling bins.

'Bring' sites predated kerbside collections and were now said to make twice as much work for collection teams since the recycled materials were identical. The sites were costly to maintain and also attracted fly-tipping. The proposal was to retain two 'bring' sites and to convert them to recycling points for adjacent flats which currently had no space to recycle. Arrangements would be made to close the sites in late January 2024. There would be communications with residents to give notice and advise them of the change.

The proposal to withdraw the provision of black bin sacks to those households without space to accommodate the usual large, wheeled bins would provide a saving as such bin sacks were widely available at a relatively low cost. The Council would continue to provide recycling sacks as these needed to be transparent for collection purposes and as such were not so widely available. Similarly, the small household caddies were widely available commercially and at less cost than if the Council were to charge residents for them. Once again, there would be a strong communications plan to advise residents.

It was noted that the recommendations had been considered by the Community Executive Advisory Board on 7 September 2023 with the feedback from that meeting being in agreement.

The Executive was in agreement with the proposals and consequently,

RESOLVED:

1. To approve the closure of the recycling 'bring' sites across the borough, converting two – Station Parade in East Horsley and Portsmouth Road in Guildford – to flats recycling collection points.
2. To cease the supply of refuse sacks to the 1,917 properties that currently received them but to continue the supply of recycling sacks.
3. To cease supplying 7L internal food waste caddies for use in residents' kitchens.
4. To continue to supply 23L external kerbside food waste caddies.
5. To continue the supply of recycling bins.

Reason(s):

Acceptance of the proposals to close the 'bring' sites, cease the supply of refuse sacks and cease the supply of 7L internal food waste caddies allows a reduction in costs to the taxpayer with relatively little operational or customer service impact. Continuing the supply of 23L external kerbside food waste caddies and recycling bins allows the current service provision to continue uninterrupted while we wait for the impending recycling service regulatory update.

EX36 Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) and Financial Recovery Plan - November Update Report

The Lead Councillor for Finance and Property introduced the report and advised that progress continued to be made to address the Council's financial deficit. A key element to the progress was the outcome of the review of the Capital Programme. If approved by Budget Council in February this would remove £96.6m from the Approved and Provisional programmes which would reduce the Council's projected borrowing needs. Additionally, a further workstream within the Financial Recovery Plan was looking at the potential for asset disposals. A target sum of £50m of capital receipts was being sought which would help to further reduce the long-term borrowing needs of the Council. These disposal plans would be developed over the next few months, prior to the Council's budget being set in February 2024. This would also have an additional knock-on

effect of reducing the revenue costs for the running and maintenance of the Council's assets.

In addition to reducing the borrowing needs there would be a review of fees and charges to seek to improve the current income levels to the Council. It was reported that the work to date on the Financial Recovery Plan had reduced the July MTFP gap of £18.3m by £11m to £7.3m. Work would continue to address the deficit by means of further operational economies and asset disposals.

The Executive thanked officers and councillors for the hard work that had been undertaken to reach the current position but acknowledged that although excellent progress had been made, significant further work was still required to produce a balanced budget for 2024-25.

The Executive,

RESOLVED:

To note the updated MTFP position and the further work ongoing to produce a balanced budget for 2024-25.

Recommendation (to Council: 5 December 2023)

That the proposed changes to the Approved and Provisional Capital Programmes, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, be approved.

Reasons:

To enable the Council to protect the current level of reserves and to set a balanced budget and a robust Medium-Term Financial Plan.

EX37 Capital and Investment Outturn Report 2022-23

The outturn report included capital expenditure, non-treasury investments and treasury management performance for the 2022/23 financial year.

The Lead Councillor for Finance and Property commended the report to the Executive.

It was noted that the council's portfolio was performing well and with a balanced portfolio that included light industrial. Consequently, the council was not so exposed to the fluctuations in office space and retail as other councils.

The Executive,

RESOLVED:

To recommend to Council: 5 December 2023

1. That the capital and investment outturn report be noted.
2. That the actual prudential indicators reported for 2022/23, as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report, be approved.

Reasons:

1. To comply with the Council's treasury management policy statement, the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Code of Practice on treasury management and the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities.
2. As per the treasury management code although the scrutiny of treasury management (and indeed all finance) has been delegated to the Corporate Governance & Standards Committee, ultimate responsibility remains with full Council, this report therefore fulfils that need.

EX38 Housing Revenue Account - Revenue Outturn Report 2022-23

The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) was a separate ringfenced account that recorded all the income and expenditure associated with the provision and management of Council-owned residential dwellings and other properties in the Borough. The requirement to maintain a Housing Revenue Account was set out in the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 and the requirements to publish final accounts was set out in the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2003.

The Leader and Lead Councillor for Housing introduced the report.

The Executive heard that the outturn report set out a surplus for the year of £7.76m. This was £3.12m less than the budgeted surplus of £10.89m. The reconciliation was set out in paragraph 7.4. The variance was made up of three parts: Higher total expenditure net of revaluation movements resulted in £3.5m overspent predominantly in repairs and maintenance; rental income was lower by £1m due to voids and increasing interest rates.

The surplus had been transferred to two reserves. A contribution of £2.5m to the reserve for future capital and a contribution of £5.26m to the New Build reserve. The HRA working balance at year-end remained at £2.5 million.

HRA capital expenditure totalled £26.3m against an original budget of £53.9m. Of this expenditure, major repairs totalled £20.3m against a budget of £24.5m.

Provision of new housing was £6m expenditure against a budget of £27.5m due to delays of progression of schemes in the programme.

The Executive,

RESOLVED:

To note the final outturn position and to endorse the decision, taken under delegated authority, to transfer £2.5 million to the reserve for future capital, and £5.26 million to the new build reserve from the revenue surplus of £7.76 million in 2022-23.

Reason:

To allow the Statutory Statement of Accounts to be finalised and subject to external audit prior to approval by the Council.

EX39 General Fund Revenue Outturn Report 2022-23

The report gave the final position on the General Fund revenue account and Collection Fund for the 2022-23 financial year and explained the major variances from the General Fund revised estimate and the adjustments made in the accounts as a result of the balance sheet review.

The Lead Councillor for Finance and Property commended the report to the Executive.

The Executive,

RESOLVED:

To note the final outturn position and to endorse the decisions taken under delegated authority to transfer the amounts set out in the report from the Medium-Term Financial Plan reserve.

Reasons:

1. To note the final outturn position and delegated decisions taken by the Chief Financial Officer which will be included in the statutory accounts.
2. To facilitate the ongoing financial management of the Council.

EX40 Timetable of Council and Committee Meetings 2024-25

The Executive considered the report that set out a draft timetable of Council and committee meetings for the next municipal year, for recommendation to Full Council.

The Executive,

RESOLVED

Recommendation (to Council: 5 December 2023)

- (1) That the timetable of Council and Committee meetings for the 2024-25 municipal year, attached as Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Executive, be approved.
- (2) That the Executive Head of Legal & Democratic Services be authorised, in consultation with political group leaders, to approve the Timetable of Council and Committee Meetings in future years.

Reason:

To assist with the preparation of individual committee work programmes.

The meeting finished at 7.34 pm

Signed

Date

Chairman

Guildford Borough Council

Report to: Executive

Date: 04/01/2024

Ward(s) affected: Send and Lovelace

Report of Director: Place

Author: Damien Cannell – Asset and Property Manager

Tel: 01483 444553

Email: Your email damien.cannell@guildford.gov.uk

Lead Councillor responsible: Richard Lucas

Tel: 07834 020422

Email: Richard.lucas@guildford.gov.uk

Report Status: Part Exempt

Send Hill Disused Sandpit

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1. Land West of Winds Ridge, Send Hill, known as Send Hill Disused Sandpit, is an old landfill site that is surplus amenity land which is used for the purposes of public recreation. It is identified in the Local Plan as development land for housing.
- 1.2. The site is heavily contaminated due to being used for landfill and if it were to be developed, a large amount of remediation work would need to be undertaken.
- 1.3. This site is not considered appropriate for development by the HRA due to remediation costs and resource implications. Officers are seeking consent for a disposal of the land to facilitate development, subject to the necessary planning consents. If the Council does not dispose of the site, future development options would be severely impacted due to site access constraints.
- 1.4. An independent external valuation has been undertaken and the current proposed transaction represents best consideration (as detailed in the “Not for Publication” Appendix 6).

- 1.5. This report seeks consent from the Executive to proceed with the recommendations detailed below.

2. Recommendation to Executive

That, in line with the Land and Property Disposal Policy, the Executive authorises The Joint Executive Head, Assets and Property to negotiate terms for a disposal at best consideration and to subsequently enter into all relevant legal documentation required to complete the transaction of the Council owned land comprising Land West of Winds Ridge, Send Hill in return for a capital receipt.

3. Reason(s) for Recommendation:

- 3.1. To facilitate the building of new homes in compliance with the local plan designation.
- 3.2. To generate Income (a capital receipt) and reduce revenue costs.

4. Exemption from publication

Yes, part of the report (Appendices 2 and 6)

The content is to be treated as exempt from the Access to Information publication rules because it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any person and information which is subject to legal professional privilege and is therefore exempt by virtue of paragraphs 3 and 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 as follows:

“3. Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)”.

“5. Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.”

(b) The content is restricted to all councillors.

(c) The exempt information is not expected to be made public

(d) The decision to maintain the exemption may be challenged by any person at the point at which the Executive is invited to pass a resolution to exclude the public from the meeting to consider the exempt information.

5. Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Executive to authorise the Joint Executive Head, Assets and Property to negotiate terms for a disposal at best consideration and to subsequently enter into all relevant legal documentation required to complete the sale of Council owned land comprising Land West of Winds Ridge, Send Hill in return for a capital receipt.

6. Strategic Priorities

In agreeing a disposal, new homes can be built which support the corporate priority to, “provide and facilitate housing that people can afford” under the corporate theme of Homes and Jobs – Residents having access to the homes and jobs they need.

7. Background

- 7.1. The land sits to the west of Send Hill opposite Winds Ridge. The site was used for sand extraction between the 1940s to late 1970s and was subsequently used as a landfill site until 1985. The freehold interest was transferred to the Council on 17 April 1985. It is held as surplus amenity land.
- 7.2. The site, along with the land immediately to the southwest of the site, is earmarked in the Local Plan for development under ‘Policy A43’. The site is allocated for approximately 40 homes (Town & Country Planning Act Uses Class C3) and 2 Traveller Pitches (Sui Generis) (see Appendix 1)
- 7.3. All concerns regarding development of the site were addressed before the site was allocated and the adoption of the Local Plan in 2019. The planning inspector’s comments were as follows:

“Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send, Policy A43 Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send and Policy A45 Land at the rear of the Talbot, High Street, Ripley are modest-sized housing allocations (with 2 traveller pitches in the case of A43) on the edges of these villages. A42 is on the site of the Clockbarn Nursery; A44 and A45 are adjacent to existing development and are enclosed by vegetation. They are well-located and proportionate in relation to the

villages; their allocation would have limited impact on the openness of the Green Belt and in each instance, it would be possible to create good defensible boundaries. Their size is modest enough to have only a very limited effect on vehicle movements. There are therefore exceptional circumstances to alter Green Belt boundaries to provide for the allocations.”

- 7.4. The Council commissioned a stage 2 invasive contamination survey (Appendix 2) following a decision by the Executive on 05/01/2023. This concluded a moderate risk to future site users, flora and building occupants as well as Moderate/Low risks to potable water pipes and groundwater quality associated with contamination detailed in the section above. Construction phase issues have been identified relating to waste disposal, asbestos, foundation design and drainage that required further consideration. Acceptably low risks are anticipated with respect to buried concrete and risk from vapours. Remediation works would be required before any development which heavily impacts the value of the land.
- 7.5. The Land is surplus amenity land which is used for the purposes of public recreation. It has had recent incursions which resulted in a large wildfire, fly tipping and fly grazing of animals. Garden waste is also fly tipped on the land.
- 7.6. The Council’s Housing department were approached with a proposal to enter a joint venture to develop the land including the Council owned portion. The Council maintained a neutral position in respect of any proposed planning application. This land was identified for disposal and as a result has not been progressed for development by the Council. However, it was agreed that the Council could look at a disposal of the land to generate a capital receipt. Such a development would be required to meet the Council’s planning policy on affordable housing and there may be an opportunity for the HRA to be able to deliver those units. Any development of the site for housing would be subject to being 40% affordable.
- 7.7. The Council advised that it was not looking to work with anyone on a joint development. A further request was subsequently received to purchase the freehold interest.

- 7.8. The Council's Land and Property Disposal Policy recommends a private sale should only be entered into after a period of extensive marketing including advertising (through an agent or directly) and, where appropriate, negotiating bids. There are exceptions to this, including the following:

"If land is to be sold by private sale without being marketed, then the reasons justifying a private sale must be recorded in writing. In some circumstances the Council may seek an independent valuation to verify that 'best consideration' is being obtained or if considering the disposal of land and buildings (including leases) for less than best consideration, follow the Council's procedure. A private sale without the land being marketed may be justified where: ...

...the nature of the Council's land ownership and that of the surrounding land ownership is such that the land must be sold to adjoining or surrounding landowners if best consideration is to be obtained. ..."

- 7.9. The site allocation is for the site as a whole. Policy D4 (10) of the Local Plan Development Management Policies 2023 requires: 'Master plans and Design Codes will also be required for any site that will be developed in more than one phase or by more than one developer. Failure to agree a Design Code approach is likely to result in the refusal of any planning application'. Senior Council Planning officers have advised that the Local Plan site allocation is for the whole site and that the site needs to be developed comprehensively as a whole and not subdivided.
- 7.10. The access point onto Send Hill from the Council's land title is only circa three meters wide (see appendix 3). If the land were to be retained this would not be sufficient for future development purposes and also restricts the value of the land.
- 7.11. The Council currently maintains the land and carries out regular ground maintenance works, and weekly security patrols are being carried out to ensure there are no more incursions onto the land.

8. Consultations

- 8.1. Ward Councillors were consulted. Cllr Jason Fenwick noted the difficult decision the Executive need to make between disposal for a capital receipt and risks associated with continuing ownership on the land. Cllr Fenwick also had concerns over continuing public use and the Council's liability under the Occupiers' Liability Act 1957
- 8.2. Lead Councillor for Assets and Property, Cllr Richard Lucas, was consulted and supports the officer recommendations laid out in this report.
- 8.3. Parks and Countryside Leader, Hendryk Jurk, was consulted and had no objections to the recommendations.
- 8.4. The public were consulted via a notice being placed in the Surrey Advertiser Newspaper for fourteen days inviting any objections. (See paragraph 11.4 and 11.5)

9. Key Risks

- 9.1. The Council has carried out an invasive assessment of the site which has identified hazardous waste (fibrous asbestos) close to the surface. There is a risk of contaminants escaping the bounds of the site into neighbouring land and possible claims against the Council. Remediation as part of any development would mitigate this risk.
- 9.2. If the land is not disposed and the Council wishes to develop its own portion of the site in future, development would be unlikely as the access onto Send Hill, that the Council owns, is only circa three metres wide. Access for development would require purchasing land from the adjoining property, 'Homestead' or the neighbouring landowner, which would be a ransom situation. (see Appendix 3).
- 9.3. There are a number of houses that back onto the site and residents are against any development of the land. Development will be subject to planning consents and therefore they will have an opportunity to comment on any future planning application.

- 9.4. The Council is and will indefinitely remain responsible for securely retaining the waste transfer records and fulfilling any requests for information on the waste by the Environment Agency.

10. Financial Implications

- 10.1 If the land is not disposed of and contaminants impact users or neighbours of the land in future, there could be large remediation costs for the Council. The Council is now aware of the risks identified by an invasive stage 2 contamination survey.
- 10.2 There would be revenue savings of £3,500 for grounds maintenance and £975 for security costs annually.
- 10.3 There could be future costs associated with unauthorised encampments, fly grazing and fly tipping.
- 10.4 The Council has undertaken its own independent valuation of the site which considered the levels of contamination and remediation required for any future development (as detailed in the “Not for Publication” Appendix 6). This valuation, coupled with noted costs for remediation, represents best consideration. Any capital receipt is not currently included in the capital programme budget and would provide a financial benefit to reduce the Council’s underlying need to borrow for the capital programme and in turn reduce the Council’s General Fund borrowing cost (MRP and debt interest).
- 10.5 The party interested in purchasing the land is considered a ‘special purchaser’ given their relationship to the land. If the property were to go on the open market the value would likely be significantly reduced as our portion of the site would have to be developed in isolation and given the planning officers comments laid out in paragraph 7.9, would be unlikely to gain planning consent. This would also lead to the access issues previously referred to in paragraph 7.10.
- 10.6 A sale has not yet been negotiated and therefore any final purchase price will be subject to negotiations and contract.

11. Legal Implications

- 11.1. The Council acquired the Land pursuant to the Town and Country Planning Act 1971. There is a restriction on the title which states that “no disposition of the land is to be registered unless made in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1971 or some other Act or authority”. The 1971 Act was replaced by the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 11.2. The Land was acquired for planning purposes and, pursuant to s233(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the Council is authorised to dispose of the Land.
- 11.3. The Land is surplus amenity land which is used for the purposes of public recreation. Whilst the Land is not formally designated as open space, it is considered open space because it falls within the definition of open space under s336 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 being “any land laid out as a public garden or used for the purposes of public recreation, or land which is a disused burial ground”. It should be noted that this is not a constraint to any future development and the ownership of a site does not change a site’s planning status.
- 11.4. Section 233(4) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that before disposing of any land which consists of or forms part of an open space, a local authority shall:
 - (a) shall publish a notice of their intention to do so for at least two consecutive weeks in a newspaper circulating in their area; and
 - (b) shall consider any objections to the proposed disposal which may be made to them.
- 11.5. Section 123 (2A) of the Local Government Act 1972 mirrors this requirement and thus a notice was published to satisfy the statutory requirements prior to disposal of open space. Sub-section 123 (2) permits the Council to dispose of its land providing the consideration is the best that can be reasonably obtained.

- 11.6. A notice, as per paragraph 11.4, was published in the Surrey Advertiser for fourteen days and closed on the 25th February 2022. There were 93 objections to the sale of the land. The majority of the objections related to possible future development of the site for housing. The objections are listed in appendix 4.
- 11.7. There is a formally designated footpath crossing the eastern edge of the site (Footpath No. 58). This right of way would remain should the land be disposed of.
- 11.8. In response to the public consultation notice, a local resident has submitted a nomination for the land to be an Asset of Community Value which was rejected as the land did not meet the criteria set out in the Assets of Community Value Regulations 2012.

12. Human Resource Implications

There are no human resource implications and the matter would be finalised with existing resources.

13. Equality and Diversity Implications

- 13.1. The Local Plan site allocation includes the provision of two traveller pitches.
- 13.2. An impact assessment has been carried out. See appendix 5.

14. Climate Change/Sustainability Implications

- 14.1. The site, whilst mainly grass/scrubland, can contribute to the mitigation of CO2 emissions locally.
- 14.2. Any future planning consents for development will reflect current policies in this regard and dictate the outcomes.

15. Summary of Options

The options available to the Council are:

- 15.1 Do nothing – We can retain the land, keep it as amenity land and protect the biodiversity of the site. The Council will continue to have revenue costs associated with maintenance and security. There is a

risk of possible future claims if the made ground is disturbed. In addition, the Council would have to comply with the Occupiers Liability Act 1984 for members of the public using the land.

- 15.2 Pursue a joint development – This option has already been reviewed by senior officers and rejected due to a lack of in-house resources available and costs that the Council would need to bear for remediation. The site is also not considered suitable for development by the HRA. The Council’s future development options will be extremely limited due to access issues.
- 15.3 Disposal – A disposal to a special purchaser would allow for development of the land in line with the Local Plan, subject to the necessary planning consents, support corporate priorities, remediate the land to mitigate risks from contamination and would generate a capital receipt in difficult financial circumstances. Given the access issues and Local Plan site allocation constraints, this is the recommended option.

16. Conclusion

- 16.1 As the land is surplus, it is not supporting the delivery of the Council’s corporate priorities laid out in the current Corporate Plan. The land has social value as surplus amenity land, but this is limited due to the size and nature of the site which is mainly scrubland. The local residents mainly use it to cross over to get to the public footpath at the rear of the site where the boundary fence has been knocked down. Garden Waste is being fly tipped on the land. The land is contaminated.
- 16.2 The access point onto Send Hill that the Council owns is circa three meters wide. Whilst the owner of the neighbouring property, Homestead, has allowed unencumbered access over his land historically, this would not continue. It is unlikely that the three metre width would be sufficient for development purposes or access to and from the narrow lane that is Send Hill, if the Council wish to develop the site in future.

- 16.3 Since the Local Plan was adopted in 2019, planning applications approved for new homes in Send, already surpass the total allocation for the village for the full life of the development plan to 2034. If there were not access restrictions to the site, then a development for affordable social housing would be the preferred option. However, given the issues already detailed in this report it is unlikely to be an option in future. The planning status of the site under the local plan will not change.
- 16.4 The Council has an opportunity to realise a significant one-off financial receipt by making the best use of its land holdings to generate an income. A disposal would mean a contaminated site would be regenerated and deliver corporate priorities in providing and facilitating housing that people can afford, subject to the necessary planning consents. Officers can explore working with any developer to procure any section 106 units as part of the sale transaction.

17. Background Papers

None.

18. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Local Plan, Policy A43

Appendix 2 – Stage 2 Invasive Contamination Survey (Exempt – Not for publication).

Appendix 3 – Site access plan

Appendix 4 – List of objections

Appendix 5 – Equality Impact Assessment

Appendix 6 – Independent External Valuation (Exempt - Not for publication).

This page is intentionally left blank

POLICY A43: Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send	
Allocation	The site is allocated for approximately 40 homes (C3), and 2 Traveller pitches (sui generis)
Requirements	<p><u>Design</u></p> <p>(1) Sensitive design at site boundaries that has significant regard to the transition from village to greenfield</p> <p><u>Traveller pitches</u></p> <p>(2) The Traveller pitches will be provided on the part of this site that is owned by Guildford Borough Council, as well as housing (C3), to help meet the affordable housing needs of all members of the community</p> <p>(3) The pitches will be public (tenure) forming part of the affordable housing contribution (1 pitch equates to 1 affordable home)</p> <p>(4) The Local Authority (Guildford Borough Council) will allocate the occupancy of pitches and be responsible for their future management</p> <p>(5) Traveller pitches should reflect modern Traveller lifestyles. They should be serviced pitches, providing hard standing, garden and connections for drainage, electricity and water. Service meters should be provided. Utility blocks are not required</p> <p>(6) Traveller pitches should not be isolated, and should be reasonably integrated with other residential development, with services and facilities accessible, helping to create sustainable, mixed and inclusive communities for all</p> <p>(7) The pitches should not be enclosed with hard landscaping, high walls or fences, to an extent that suggests deliberate isolation from the community</p> <p>(8) Within the area to provide Traveller pitches, bricks and mortar housing, or any buildings capable of being converted to bricks and mortar housing, are not appropriate and will be resisted</p> <p>(9) Ancillary buildings must be proportionate in size to the mobile homes and caravans and should be no more than one storey in height</p> <p>(10) Improved visibility to be provided at the junction of Send Hill with Potters Lane</p>
Opportunities	(1) Green corridors and linkages to habitats outside of the site

Description

Location	Village
Ward	Send
Ownership	Private and Guildford Borough Council
Area (size)	1.9 ha
Existing use	Used for informal recreation (with former quarry workings evident)
LAA reference	Site 2081
Key considerations	<p>(1) Location of Traveller pitches within the site</p> <p>(2) Boundary treatment</p> <p>(3) Contamination</p>

Appendix 1 Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 5
Appendix 2

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



DRAWING NOTES

COPYRIGHT ©
This drawing and the details herein are the copyright of MBH Design Studio Ltd. and must not be reproduced, altered or passed to any third party without prior written consent.

Do not scale from this drawing.

Any errors or omissions are to be reported to the Architect immediately.

All drawings are to be read in conjunction with the Structural Engineer's drawings and all related Architect's and other Consultant's information.

KEY

- General Boundary Title Trace SY388661 (Applicant's boundary)
- General Boundary Title Trace SY546556 (GBC boundary)
- - - General Boundary Title Trace SY533116 (Neighbor's boundary)

FOR
INFORMATION

mbh



MBH Design Studio Ltd.
Rosemount House, Rosemount Avenue, West Byfleet, Surrey, KT14 6LB
www.mbhstd.com t: 01932 352 727 f: 01932 351 545

PROJECT
**LAND WEST OF WINDS RIDGE
AND SEND HILL,
SEND
GU23 7HW**

DRAWING TITLE
EXISTING SITE BOUNDARY

DRAWN BY	DATE	SCALE	PAPER SIZE
AP	12.07.2021	1:200	A0
CHECKED BY	DRAWING NUMBER	REV.	
AS	13055-SK04		

This page is intentionally left blank

Points raised

Dear Sir,

I wish you to log my objection to the sale of the land known as 'Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send' also known as 'Send Hill Disused Sandpit'. Presumably the council is intending to sell this land to a property developer for housing as in the (rather dubiously passed) local plan.

It is currently, and should remain, public open space. There is little enough of this left now in the parish given the planning that has been passed recently and building that continues ad infinitum. It is a valuable piece of woodland and open grassland and has many flora and fauna species that are being squeezed out now in Surrey. It is enjoyed regularly by both local residents and others who come from farther afield (parking at the cemetery) to walk. It needs to be protected. I also understand that several of the broad-leafed trees have protection orders on them, however I assume that is just another 'challenge' to developers to have that removed and it will be waived through in due course.

I'm not sure from the newspaper 'advert' whether you are interested in the eventual use of this parcel of land, should the sale complete, however I would like it noted that the housing proposed is inappropriate due to the density and lack /shortage of facilities (shops/footpaths/streetlights/school places/medical facilities) in the location.

The site of the proposed travellers' pitches is in direct contravention of the council's own policy on the subject, with the same lack of facilities, along with the community they need being cited.

As the site is former landfill of unknown contents, I believe that it is not suitable for residential buildings.

I have no doubt that this is just another tick box exercise for you, but I would like to believe that, for once, you could redeem yourselves by listening to the residents, and others who have bothered to respond, by keeping this land as free open space.

I would be grateful if you could acknowledge this email.

With kind regards

Part 1:

Dear Sir/Madam

With regards to the sale of the land at Send Hill. Could you please advise when the land will be advertised for sale and where, how to apply to purchase and the cost.

Part 2:

With reference to the sale of this land for development can you please tell me what the consultation process is for?

Would I be correct in assuming that it is a complete waste of time but ticks your relevant box and therefore regardless of the wishes of the residents who will be affected by this proposal GBC will sell the land for housing development.

I am writing to object to the proposed construction of 40 houses and 2 traveller sites on the disused sandpit at the top of Send Hill. The reason for my objection is as follows:

- following the somewhat dubious decision to take Send out of the greenbelt there has been an explosion of developments in the village including 2 and shortly to be 3 developments in Send Hill and at least 1 in Potters Lane. These were not foreseen when the plan was adopted and should contribute to the overall new housing target for the village. If the village continues to grow at the current pace the existing infrastructure will be overwhelmed and the character of the village will significantly change. Send will cease to be semi-rural and become more like a dormitory settlement, which is not why most of us moved to the area
- the disused sandpit is a well-used community facility, especially for dog walkers and given the number of additional people already moving to the village existing open spaces need to be preserved
- the bottom of Send Hill is a narrow lane, which is charming and important to the character of the area. However, it is unsuitable for large numbers of additional cars
- it is unclear what is proposed in relation to the traveller sites but whatever is being considered would be out of character with this particular area. The proposed development in Wisley also has traveller sites and in my opinion this development should be given permission for sufficient sites to meet the demand. I am sure that the traveller community would prefer to live together rather than to be separated and having a concentration of traveller sites would make it easier and more cost effective for any necessary targeted support to be provided.

To whom it may concern.

I write to object in the strongest of motions to the planned sale of the land opposite Winds Ridge, Send Hill. The council should absolutely not be considering the sale of this land for development.

Whereby I accept the council have an aspiration to meet new housing quota's, public accessible green spaces and the protection thereof are also the responsibility of you, the council. The area in question is widely and frequently used by country walkers, dog walkers and families alike and can often be observed enjoying this diverse nature filled space. This site is currently the only openly wild space freely available to the public in this vicinity. All others are privately owned fields to which access is clearly limited.

I appreciate this is simply a consultation questioning whether the council should sell this land or not to which any responses would be limited.

However, in 2016 32,000 objections were heard and recorded against GBC's local plan again along with many more in the 2017 revised plan. These voices were ignored. I understand the revised plan showed an even higher number of proposed dwellings meaning the consultation previously held was wholly meaningless.

26 individual objections were recorded on policy A44 in July 2017 to this particular area and accepted regarding this space. All of these many voices were clearly ignored. As such I question what is the threshold required that the council to deem worthy and to the point it can / will influence any decision? If this has not been established prior, what is the validity of such a consultation and motion? Will the council fail yet again in its duty to hear the voices of those affected?

Did the council ever consider a public consultation for this land to be protected as green space?

If not why not? Am I to be left thinking this is once again another failure of you, the council and just another monetary commercial decision.

Green space is precious and it's about time this was respected with the council stepping up and not ignoring the plight of both nature and the future of this planet. To date the council have not shown or exhibited any interest of such preservation. Why?

Failure to not act for the protection of this green space at each juncture of decision making is currently a systemic and direct failure of Guildford Borough Council.

What are the benefits to the council for releasing this land. Profits? Council tax?

Once lost, these pockets of green space can never be regained.

As such I implore you to re think it's use of this land and look to protect such a limited example of green open space left in this area, whilst respecting the local community's right to freely access local green spaces along with, aiding wider ecological issues and preservation of nature.

Do not sell this land, Protect it for "ALL" concerned both now and for future generations to come.

Thank you for hearing my opinion and hope that my voice is duly noted this time.

With kind regards

Dear Sir,Ref: Send Hill Disused SandpitI am writing to express a complaint regarding the proposition of the sale of land west of winds ridge, I am local resident. I am deeply saddened by the possibility of the council once again selling some of the few open spaces remaining in this area. Please see my comments and questions below and please inform when I will be receiving a response. - Please inform me of the person handling this complaint and a timescale for response?- Why is the council proposing to sell this land?- What is valuation of this land?- Can the local community place a bid to purchase this land?- My research suggests that GBC is exceeding it's delivery on housing so why is this land being considered for unnecessary and inappropriate development?Comments supporting this complaint:- This land is one of the only open public spaces remaining in Send, a village which is becoming increasingly congested and over developed. Some of the trees are protected by a tree preservation order and an important landmark for this area. - It is home to much natural wildlife and is used frequently by the local community.- The road on Send Hill is narrow with no footpath, I walk 3 young children to school every day and this journey is becoming increasingly hazardous, further traffic will only add to this.- Please can the council consider retaining green space or selling this for unique and climate conscious purposes only such as; a community orchard or rewilding.Please listen to the many voices of those who are deeply concerned at what is happening to this small community. Do not sell this land. I look forward to hearing your response to the questions and comments outlined above. Many thanks,

I understand the above site is being sold by GBC, please could you let me know why they are disposing of the land which currently is held as a public

open space and is used by many.
Many thanks

To whom it may concern;

I am writing to express a complaint regarding the proposition of the sale of land west of Winds Ridge, Send Hill. I am local resident at Send Hill. I am deeply saddened by the possibility of the council once again selling one of the few open spaces remaining in this area. This one of the only green, open spaces with public access in the local area and would be a huge loss to the local community who regularly use it.

I would be grateful if you could in the first instance confirm receipt of this email, then carefully consider the points raised below and then let me know a timescale for your response to this email.

Why is the Council proposing to sell this land and why now in particular?

What is the Council's valuation of this land and do the local community / residents have the option to bid for the land?

If the answer to question 2 is 'no', please advise why this is the case.

As is commonly known, the Council is currently not under any pressure to secure more housing development, having already exceeding its targets in this respect?

As you will be aware, 90% of Send Hill currently has no pavement for pedestrians. It is already dangerous having to walk along the road with small children, even with current traffic levels. If this new development were to proceed, with the significant levels of traffic this would bring, a pavement the length of Send Hill would be absolutely essential for public safety. Please can the council consider retaining green space or selling this for unique and climate conscious purposes only, such as; a community orchard or rewilding?

I understand that this proposed development is to provide affordable housing for people wishing to settle in Send. Please could you therefore provide a guide price that the Council anticipates these houses being priced at?

Complaint relating to the proposed disposal of land west of Winds Ridge – Send Hill – Send currently held as a public open space.

We need some open spaces left natural so that our children and grandkids can explore and see wildlife. We back onto this piece of land and see many people either out with their dogs or just going for a walk. We see many birds including woodpeckers and bats.

We already have a lot of new developments around Send i.e Tannery Lane, Garlicks Arch and of course the large site at Wisley.

If the council would not get a good price for the land due to its previous use as a landfill site – why take away what little recreational land we have in Send now.

If sold to a developer and houses were built on this land there could possibly be a lot of extra cars down a narrow road with no footpaths.

Could our little school cope with the additional children.

Could the doctors surgery manage many more patients.

Subject - Complaint :- This is a complaint relating to the proposed disposal of land west of Winds Ridge , Send Hill which is currently held as a public open space.

This land is a previous landfill site and possible contamination issues would impact negatively on its market value.

Send Hill is a narrow road with no pavement.

Open spaces are needed, left natural so that existing residents and their children can explore and see local wildlife. Many bird species including woodpeckers have been seen. The area is also a favourite location for dog walkers.

There are already many new developments in the area i.e.Tannery Lane, Garlicks Arch

and the large site at Wisley.

Any significant development would overwhelm local resources such as schools and medical centres.

In conclusion I believe that this land, being a previous landfill site is best left alone, serving as a local amenity.

Dear sirs,

I write in response to your newspaper notice regarding the proposed sale of Send Hill Disused Sandpit.

Prior to the highly unpopular local plan of 2019, this land was in the greenbelt. It is in constant use as an open space by walkers, and its sale for housing will be a loss of amenity to the community.

The Send and Burnt Common areas have a number of housing projects currently in build or scheduled, particularly Garlick's Arch. Surely this is sufficient to meet local housing needs.

Yours faithfully,

To Whom It May Concern:I write in respect to the above and in respect to the local Plan allocation is for 40 houses and 2 traveller pitches.I believe the area should remain as an open space and undeveloped. Along with many other local residents, I use this regularly for walking my dogs. The fact I can walk from my home around the village makes this is a very valuable and valued resource, with benefit for my physical and mental health and

meaning I do not get in my car as much as I might otherwise. There is now a robust 7.3 year confirmation of housing in Send – this is something recognised and used as a recent rejection of a number of recent housing developments in the locality. Given this and the disproportionate development already underway and completed in Send, I would urge that the site remain as it is.

Re: LP POLICY A43 - LAND OFF WINDS RIDGE AND SEND HILL

Dear Sir,

I wish to protest about the proposal to sacrifice Green Belt Public Open Space, well used by locals for short walks, for yet more housing development.

Please do not allow this to take place.

Dear Sirs

I object to the sale of the green space, GBC naming the space 'Send Hill Disused Sandpit', I would like GBC to answer my points below in consideration of GBC proposed sale of the land:

Wildlife - the space is occupied by badgers, woodpeckers and other rare wildlife, please provide evidence of how GBC propose to impose protection of the rare wildlife occupants when the land is sold on.

Recreational use - the said land has been used, for many generations, by the residents of Send, for dog walking, children playing and general green space, particularly by the elderly, it has been vital for the mental health of local residents during the pandemic. The land is an established community facility, how will GBC ensure the land will continue to be available as an open space and for recreational use by the residents of Send?

Protected trees - there are many trees, housing wildlife, many of the trees have Tree Preservation Orders, how will GBC ensure trees on the land will be protected after the land has been sold?

Footpaths and right of way - please provide evidence of how GBC will continue to protect ancient right of way footpaths surrounding the land.

Public Green Space Asset - please provide GBC evidence of their consideration of the whole of Send's open green space and its depletion, does the selling off of the said open space, cause irreversible damage to the community's use of open green space?

I look forward to your reply to my questions raised above.

This is a complaint relating to the proposed disposal of land West of Winds Ridge, Send Hill, which is currently held as a public open space. We wish to put this complaint through your complaint's procedure. Please provide details of the complaints procedure and who will be handling this complaint?

We became aware in July 2020 that the Council had changed the status of the land back in 2017 - POLICY A44: Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send and the Council accepted 26 individual complaints and the 2016 consultation saw 545 comments/complaints. This was brought to our attention by the estate agent, as we were considering buying Send Hill property.

In August 2021 we were told by (Guildford Borough Council - aka GBC) that GBC would not sell the land to us or anyone and if any development was to be considered (and no decision had been made to date), it would be managed by GBC and not a private developer. So, we went ahead with Broomfields purchase with the comfort that if GBC were to develop the site, it would be in their control and 'Boundary treatment' would be 'in-keeping' considering boundaries are on greenbelt and in-keeping with surrounding properties and in consideration of their views over this green land usage and protection. Furthermore, we thought if due process was to be followed by the Council, as a neighbouring property owner, we would have the chance to purchase the land ourselves.

We asked the GBC in August 2021 if we could purchase the land and were rejected, with GBC saying the land was not for sale and wouldn't ever be for sale. Did GBC know they would be putting the land sale up for consultation in Feb 2022 at that point?

In Feb 2022, GBC published an advert notifying readers that it was considering selling the land. It would now start the statutory process of consultation needed before the final decision could be made. It seems the Council has started the sale process, but not yet made a final decision. As a resident now of Broomfields, Send Hill (which backs directly onto the land in question), we were not informed directly by GBC, we heard about this advert through a neighbour.

We request GBC provide us a copy of its policy for the disposal of this surplus land.

If GBC land has no strategic or operational purpose GBC should assess the market value of the land and offer it for sale to the adjoining landowner(s). It would be reasonable to consider factors such as future maintenance liability when assessing the price for the land which should result in a disposal at a

nominal consideration. Has GBC obtained independent valuations of this land in question and if so, how many valuations have been received?
There are significant worries that any further developments in this area will overwhelm the existing transport infrastructure, services and amenities. In particular, these concerns surround Send Hill road, the lack of road width without any pathways, the narrow blind junction to Potters Lane and the potential impact on local medical and education services with any additional residents and/or traffic. As detailed in the 'Send Neighbourhood Development Plan', there is a lack of designated local green space sites in this specific area, so removing this public green space will have a negative impact on people's wellbeing and recreational activities. Notwithstanding the impact to existing wildlife (e.g Owls, Woodpeckers, Butterflies, Bats, Stag Beetles etc. which all live on this site and should be protected.)
The proposed site, and potential developments will add additional impact upon the residents of Send Hill who, like us, understandably will continue to raise objections about the proposals for further new housing on this site. A growing large group of us are now in regular (WhatsApp and face to face) contact about this matter.

So in summary, please can you...

Provide details of the complaints procedure.

Confirm who will be handling this complaint?

Provide us a copy of GBC policy for the disposal of this surplus land.

Confirm that GBC did not know in August 2021 that they would be proposing to dispose of the land 6 months later.

If GBC did know this then, why were we not informed?

As an owner of a property bordering this land, why were we not informed directly, rather than finding out via a neighbour?

Confirm if we, or our neighbours, would have the chance to purchase the land ourselves.

Confirm if GBC has obtained any independent valuations of this land in question and if so how many valuations have been received?

Finally, why do GBC want to dispose of this land?

Thank you in advance, we look forward to your response.

Dear Sir/Madam

Would you please tell me why the council are considering the sale of their land on Send Hill west of Winds Ridge

Dear Sirs,I would wish to object most strongly to the proposal to sell off this land for building purposes. A large part of this land is an established open recreational space used by local walkers, with or without dogs, and has been regularly used for many years. Send Hill has recently had approved several development sites, the consequences of which are congestion on Send Hill and dangers to pedestrians due to the absence of suitable footpaths. As for the suggestion that the junction of Send Hill with Potters Lane be improved, this would not be able to cope with extra traffic as Send Hill is single lane from the cemetery to Potters Lane. Please rethink the idea of more development on Send Hill.

Dear Sirs,

I wish to object in the most strongest terms to the proposal to sell off the above land for building purposes.

A large part of this land is an established open recreational space used on a regular basis by local people for dog walking and for enjoying as an a open countryside space and should therefore be retained for community purposes.

Send Hill has recently had several development sites approved which have caused congestion with extra traffic causing danger to pedestrians, including many children walking to the local schools and to catch school coaches as well as the more elderly. There is NO pavement along the majority of the road.

The junction of Send Hill and Potters Lane is quite dangerous with an almost blind bend that would be difficult to improve due to the recent development on adjacent land. The section of Send Hill leading from the Cemetery to the junction is a steep, single track road with sharp bends, totally unsuitable to take extra traffic from more building.

I therefore request that this land is not sold for yet more development on this semi-rural road/lane.

To whom it may concern.

I write to object in the strongest of motions to the planned sale of the land opposite Winds Ridge, Send Hill. The council should absolutely not be considering the sale of this land for development.

Whereby I accept the council have an aspiration to meet new housing quota's, public accessible green spaces and the protection thereof are also the responsibility of you, the council. The area in question is widely and frequently used by country walkers, dog walkers and families alike and can often be observed enjoying this diverse nature filled space. This site is currently the only openly wild space freely available to the public in this vicinity. All others are privately owned fields to which access is clearly limited.

I appreciate this is simply a consultation questioning whether the council should sell this land or not to which any responses would be limited.

However, in 2016 32,000 objections were heard and recorded against GBC's local plan again along with many more in the 2017 revised plan. These voices were ignored. I understand the revised plan showed an even higher number of proposed dwellings meaning the consultation previously held was wholly meaningless.

26 individual objections were recorded on policy A44 in July 2017 to this particular area and accepted regarding this space. All of these many voices were clearly ignored. As such I question what is the threshold required that the council to deem worthy and to the point it can / will influence any decision? If this has not been established prior, what is the validity of such a consultation and motion? Will the council fail yet again in its duty to hear the voices of those affected?

Did the council ever consider a public consultation for this land to be protected as green space?

If not why not? Am I to be left thinking this is once again another failure of you, the council and just another monetary commercial decision.

Green space is precious and it's about time this was respected with the council stepping up and not ignoring the plight of both nature and the future of this planet. To date the council have not shown or exhibited any interest of such preservation. Why?

Failure to not act for the protection of this green space at each juncture of decision making is currently a systemic and direct failure of Guildford Borough Council.

What are the benefits to the council for releasing this land. Profits? Council tax?

Once lost, these pockets of green space can never be regained.

As such I implore you to re think it's use of this land and look to protect such a limited example of green open space left in this area, whilst respecting the local community's right to freely access local green spaces along with, aiding wider ecological issues and preservation of nature.

Do not sell this land, Protect it for "ALL" concerned both now and for future generations to come.

Thank you for hearing my opinion and hope that my voice is duly noted this time.

To whom it may concern.

I write to object in the strongest of motions to the planned sale of the land opposite Winds Ridge, Send Hill. The council should absolutely not be considering the sale of this land for development.

Whereby I accept the council have an aspiration to meet new housing quota's, public accessible green spaces and the protection thereof are also the responsibility of you, the council. The area in question is widely and frequently used by country walkers, dog walkers and families alike and can often be observed enjoying this diverse nature filled space. This site is currently the only openly wild space freely available to the public in this vicinity. All others are privately owned fields to which access is clearly limited.

I appreciate this is simply a consultation questioning whether the council should sell this land or not to which any responses would be limited.

However, in 2016 32,000 objections were heard and recorded against GBC's local plan again along with many more in the 2017 revised plan. These voices were ignored. I understand the revised plan showed an even higher number of proposed dwellings meaning the consultation previously held was wholly meaningless.

26 individual objections were recorded on policy A44 in July 2017 to this particular area and accepted regarding this space. All of these many voices were clearly ignored. As such I question what is the threshold required that the council to deem worthy and to the point it can / will influence any decision? If this has not been established prior, what is the validity of such a consultation and motion? Will the council fail yet again in its duty to hear the voices of those affected?

Did the council ever consider a public consultation for this land to be protected as green space?

If not why not? Am I to be left thinking this is once again another failure of you, the council and just another monetary commercial decision.
Green space is precious and its about time this was respected with the council stepping up and not ignoring the plight of both nature and the future of this planet. To date the council have not shown or exhibited any interest of such preservation. Why?
Failure to not act for the protection of this green space at each juncture of decision making is currently a systemic and direct failure of Guildford Borough Council.
What are the benefits to the council for releasing this land. Profits? Council tax?
Once lost, these pockets of green space can never be regained.
As such I implore you to re think it's use of this land and look to protect such a limited example of green open space left in this area, whilst respecting the local community's right to freely access local green spaces along with, aiding wider ecological issues and preservation of nature.
Do not sell this land, Protect it for "ALL" concerned both now and for future generations to come.
Thank you for hearing my opinion and hope that my voice is duly noted this time.

We are writing to express our opposition to any proposal to sell GBC's interest in the above site. Although there are many footpaths in this part of Send, there is no public amenity open space. We therefore feel very strongly that this land should be retained and managed as a public open space for the benefit of the whole community. Any sale would only be to a developer who would purchase it for development purposes, which would be inimical to the public interest. We therefore request that any proposal to sell the land should be abandoned forthwith.

Dear Sirs

I object to the sale of the green space, GBC naming the space 'Send Hill Disused Sandpit', I would like GBC to answer my points below in consideration of GBC proposed sale of the land:

Wildlife - the space is occupied by badgers, woodpeckers and other rare wildlife, please provide evidence of how GBC propose to impose protection of the rare wildlife occupants when the land is sold on.

Recreational use - the said land has been used, for many generations, by the residents of Send, for dog walking, children playing and general green space, particularly by the elderly, it has been vital for the mental health of local residents during the pandemic. The land is an established community

facility, how will GBC ensure the land will continue to be available as an open space and for recreational use by the residents of Send?

Protected trees - there are many trees, housing wildlife, many of the trees have Tree Preservation Orders, how will GBC ensure trees on the land will be protected after the land has been sold?

Purchase of the land by Send residents - I will send a separate application letter for the purchase of the land from GBC to be purchased by the residents of Send.

I look forward to your reply to my questions raised above.

Dear Sirs,I spotted a GBC notice dated 11th February stating that the above open space land was to be disposed of starting late this month and any comment to be sent before the 25th. I live on the corner of Send Hill and Winds Ridge and have done for many years. We look out on to this lovely rural view with mature oak and other trees around the perimeter and within. It is rife with wildlife and amongst others we regularly see a good selection of birds along with owls at night calling to each other and the odd pheasant at all hours. We notice a number of bats that appear from across the lane before dusk that circle our back garden and lovely to watch. It is a regular haunt for deer hiding in the undergrowth along with foxes and occasional badger movements.The Send development plan has these two plots of land earmarked for housing and traveller site which is wholly inappropriate on one of the few public open spaces locally.Send has been unfairly highlighted for development with a number of areas currently being built on and others nearing completion adding further strain on all services and additional traffic with added pollution to boot. We bought our bungalow to enjoy our remaining years in a nice area and paid a price for the surroundings in a village environment having been assured this land would not be developed. As a former sandpit and subsequent landfill site with little control at the time of what was dumped including asbestos, old televisions/mercury, chemical and oil waste amongst others that I spotted on my walks in years gone by ,I would not want any of this area disturbed and would prefer GBC to retain ownership of the land and leave it as open space for the local community and the wildlife to enjoy and thrive for many years to come. I hope common sense prevails and we can end our sleepless nights over this situation for the foreseeable future.

To Whom It May Concern,

Ref: Send Hill Disused Sand Pit

Please accept this email as my formal, strong complaint against your proposal to dispose of the Land West of Winds Ridge, Send (Send Hill Disused Sand Pit).

Myself and my family live on Send Hill so are very close to the site which is being proposed to be disposed of. The land here has been used for many years as public, green open space by many within the community, including myself and my family. My concern is that if this land is disposed of, it will become private and the public will no longer be able to access it. In our area there are many footpaths but this site is the only open, wild space freely available to the public across which to walk or play. This particular area satisfies local green space criteria – it is in close proximity to the community, it demonstrates special value to the local community, specifically through recreational value, tranquillity and richness of wildlife and it has clearly defined boundaries and is not an extensive tract of land. It has not been designated as a local green space, but it is one of the only areas within the vicinity that is that in all but name. There are other designated local green spaces in Send, but none in the south of the village. So, this is a valuable and precious area to the local community.

There is a lot of open land / open space but in the main this is private or farm land and not accessible to the community. We currently use the space to walk our dog and our children play here. It is a pleasure to have this open space available for the children to play safely away from the road. We also look across the space so see how many people actually use this area on a daily basis. If the land is sold, there is a high probability that the area will be fenced off and become unusable to anyone. With the recent pandemic it has become even more important to have access to public, open spaces where we can safely enjoy recreational activities whilst being socially distanced – this is not so easy on small, narrow footpaths. Given the issues with obesity over recent years, space for children, dogs and the rest of us to play freely is increasingly important. I object to the sale of this land as this would result in private ownership and the loss of access to this important piece of open green land to the public.

I also object to the land being disposed of as I am concerned what any new owners would do with the land. If planning permission was sought and approved for new housing this would have an extremely detrimental effect on the village and the area.

If additional housing were built here, there would be an increase in traffic. We nearly always drive home to Send Hill via the road from Potters Lane.

This is an extremely narrow road and it is impossible to pass other cars. This means reversing down the hill in order to pass others. With additional housing and more vehicles this would become even more dangerous. The turning out from Send Hill onto Potters Lane is also very dangerous with limited visibility. With more traffic there is even higher chance of an accident occurring here. There is also no footpath along Send Hill, so my children, who will soon be walking along this road to catch the bus to school, will have to contend with even more traffic on a road without a footpath. This is dangerous for our children. I believe additional housing would give rise to concern around highway safety with additional movements generated by any development not being able to be safely accommodated on the public highway.

There is also an abundance of wildlife in this open, green area. We hear owls and woodpeckers and see bats and this is just in the limited time we have lived in the area. I also understand there are stag beetles in the area too. The area should be rewilded and the wildlife be left to thrive, rather than covering the area in concrete and losing all these natural habitats. There are also a number of large trees on this land which are covered by a Tree Preservation Order. The land these trees are on should be kept safe and in the hands of people or organisations who will preserve the trees as the TPO intends. There are fewer and fewer open, green spaces left for the wildlife to live – please keep this land public so it can remain this way.

I understand that this land is above what used to be a landfill site. If any developers started digging in this area, I would be extremely concerned about the health impact this would have on myself, my family and other local residents. Do we know exactly what has been disposed of here? Is it safe to start moving landfill? I understand this was a landfill site for builders refuse so could contain a number of harmful materials or gases which could cause issues if disturbed. If the land is sold, I would have strong concerns that any new owner would manage land correctly and deal with any remediation works correctly to ensure no health impacts to local residents.

I also understand that there is no identified need for additional housing in Send. Send has already hit its housing target. Since the local plan has been drawn up, it has been recognised that the housing need was substantially over estimated. The council has delivered 90% of delivery of housing as set out in the published HDT in 2020 and 144% in 2021. I do not believe it is in the public interest to dispose of a communally enjoyed asset and habitat for wildlife to potentially provide for a housing need that no longer applies.

We are also quite disappointed in the way in which GBC have approached this consultation to dispose of the land. Those immediately impacted, such

as us who directly border the land, should have been informed directly. It is disappointing that we had to hear about the notice from neighbours. It is also disappointing that prior to buying our current property, we contacted GBC to ask what the plans were for this particular piece of land. We were told, categorically, in August 2021, that the land would not be considered for sale anytime soon. I find it hard to believe that GBC plans have changed that quickly. Please could you explain why we were told in August 2021 that the land would not be sold, yet only 6 months later the sale is being considered? Please also note that as part of the purchase of our property, we own the section of footpath 58 which passes the back of our property. Please could you confirm this is not being included in any proposed sale.

I would appreciate if you could provide me with a copy of Guildford Borough Council's policy for the disposal of this land. I would also like to understand what the strategic objectives are for selling this land please. What are the reasons for considering the sale? If there is no need for more housing in the area, why would you consider this? If the housing demand has been met, this area should be left as a green, open space, accessible to the public and wildlife. The council has a responsibility to us, the public, to meet housing demand, which it has now done, but also has a responsibility to protect accessible, green open, useable space.

I implore you please, do not sell this valuable, precious land. It should remain as public, open, accessible land for us all.

Dear Sirs, I feel I must write adding my concerns over GBC notifying in the local paper that they intend to sell this land and asking for feedback before 5pm on the 25th of February 2022. I have walked across this open space on the long established footpaths and around the perimeter for over 20years enjoying the grassland and trees along with the wildflowers during the summer. I have sketched and painted over there on several occasions in one of the few open spaces. The land is respected by the neighbourhood and enjoyed by many throughout the seasons. Please do not sell it and let me continue to enjoy one of the few local open spaces in this area.

Yours Sincerely

Re: Send Hill Disused Sandpit / Contaminated Land Fill - Land West of Winds Ridge, Send Hill.

Dear Councillors,

In my 25 years on this planet, born and raised in Send, I have been bombarded in the last few years with social media vilifying your generation for having no respect for our planet's future. David Attenborough among many others made us gasp at the effects of global warming and how everything we do now, however small, would have a positive effect on our future.

Just recently COP26 gave us hope that at last people in power were going to use such power to bring about positive action to save our planet and no longer destroy it. Your generation has in no uncertain terms been made aware how fragile and precious the survival of our planet is. Farmers are now planting green meadows and all of us encouraged to plant millions of trees to boost the very life's blood of our planet.

However the people in power we are supposed to trust and have faith in to bring about these changes i.e., GBC, obviously have no conscience regarding global warming. This open space is abundant with all that is precious to our environment yet it's being put up for sale to be potentially turned into another landscape of housing, destroying yet another natural habitat. It's quite unbelievable and very disturbing.

This piece of land is one of the few natural green spaces we have left in our village which I used to enjoy as a child, so you must act now and stand up for what is right for my generation, and for those who will follow. Please keep ownership of the land and stop any future plans for its use other than common land for the families of Send to enjoy.

Our planet is in crisis so prove to my generation you actually care about our futures over greed and profit.

P.S. I do hope that what I have heard today at a local council meeting is untrue. I have been informed that you have already decided this land will be sold, and to the highest bidder to be flattened for housing. If this is true, what happened to democracy, and those we voted in to protect our rights? I would be very angry and totally disillusioned if you were wasting all of our time, to cover your back sides in law.!!

To whom it may concern, Re: GBC Local Plan Policy A43 – Send Hill Disused Sandpit - Land (west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill) – GBC consideration to sell the land We wish to object to the sale of the GBC owned land, known as the Send Hill disused sandpit positioned west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This piece of land is in constant use by local residents for recreation and dog walking and over the years has become a pivotal open space, especially during recent lockdowns, when people could safely meet outside, at a safe distance and have continued to do so. With more and more houses being built in Send and the surrounding area, we strongly believe, it is the responsibility of GBC to supply more outdoor spaces for recreation purposes to accommodate the increasing population of Send. The trend to build large family houses with very small gardens (2 developments in Send Hill with such houses plus more in the pipeline), means more and more children and adults will need an open space to play freely and meet friends or for dog owners to walk. Most of the land in Send is privately owned by hopeful developers and the public pathways are badly managed and so narrow, it is hard to pass people walking the other way. The paths are not appropriate for children's games and play. The prospect of more houses being built means the local semi-rural status will change quickly to an urban jungle. Send residents will be forced to get in their cars to drive to open spaces and this is not environmentally friendly, definitely not 'green' and our local roads are already busy, so any more reasons for us to use our cars, will only add to the congestion. For everyone's wellbeing and mental health, having a nearby open green space for people to meet and relax, is important. During lockdown it has become more and more evident that walking and green spaces are crucial for general wellbeing. Elderly residents from Orchard Way, Winds Ridge and Send Hill are often seen walking in and around the disused Sandpit, off Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This land is important to all age groups in the local vicinity. Over the years the land has been maintained by nearby residents and this shows how committed we are to keeping it as an open space for all to use. The open space also offers a place for the local wildlife to thrive. Deer are often spotted on this land as well as foxes. We also understand rare butterflies have also been spotted there. We believe the sale of this land for development would be a great error by GBC and would emphasis to the local people that GBC has no interest or commitment to act according to their mission statement 'A trusted, efficient, innovative and transparent Council that listens and responds quickly to the needs of our community' Or their vision:- A green, thriving town and villages where people have the homes they need, access to quality employment, with strong and safe communities that come together to support those needing

help. Please can you confirm receipt of this email. We look forward to any comments you may wish to convey in reply to my objection.

We understand that the piece of land (disused sandpit) in Send Hill, Send is about to be approved for sale.

We're not sure if there is a specific process to comment at this stage but we would like to register our deep concern and objection at the prospect of this land being acquired by a property developer or similar. We have lived in Send Hill for more than 25 years and along with numerous nearby residents have challenged the prospect of housing / travellers on this site in the Local Plan.

We have already seen the building of around 11 additional new houses taking place on two sites in Send Hill recently which is more than enough and arguably too many.

Without repeating the multitude of actual planning objections that would arise should a developer get their hands on it, it would be much better to leave this natural area as an open space for the environment and nature (preferably protected - especially after the travesty of the removal of greenbelt status locally) so that it can be part of the wellbeing for Send residents for the foreseeable future.

We understand from GBC website that a document is to be submitted for the Executive Meeting on 22 February 2022 regarding this matter and would be grateful if you would send us through a copy of this Report, preferably before the meeting.

I find it hard to imagine that Guildford Borough Council would consider selling this site for what I assume will be building houses. As it was previously used for landfill and all sorts of waste, including Blue Asbestos and other chemicals, were known to have been disposed of and I hate to think what would happen if they were to be disturbed. It would be criminal to allow the building of houses on top of this hazardous waste.

You would also be destroying woodland and natural habitat which we are all being encouraged to keep preventing climate change. I also believe that the land includes trees which have TPOs on them. These fields are used by so many residents in the area for walking their dogs or just exercise and pleasure.

Send Hill is a very narrow lane with no pavements and in particular where the land is to be sold pedestrians have to walk on the road. In the morning a large number of children walk down the road to catch buses to school. Also being opposite a cemetery means that on occasions the area gets very congested with cars due to the lack of parking. We already have 14 houses being build on Send Hill with another 6 in for planning application. If the land was sold to a developer then I expect approximately 40 houses would be built with an average of 2 cars per house meaning up to additional 80 cars during peak hours. No allowance would be made for the additional requirement put on Send Surgery and local schools which are already oversubscribed.

21st February 2022

Land West of Winds Ridge, Send Hill

Send Hill Disused Sandpit

Asset Management - To whom it may concern

I would like to raise my objection to Guildford Borough Council disposing of this piece of land.

Guildford Borough Council has recently let residents of Send Hill down by destroying the view and open space of the community by granting permission to build cramped square properties in back gardens, and in one of the two open spaces we had. Now GBC are proposing to dispose of this piece of land which is currently held as a public open space, this I wholeheartedly object to.

Do you need to be reminded that over the past two years our open green public spaces have proved more vital than ever, as was highlighted by the Covid outbreak and our need to have access to outside recreational spaces that social distancing could be adhered to was imperative.

I believe that GBC could consider selling the land for a peppercorn amount to those that care about the community and surrounding area, or better still, donate the land using the money they have obtained from the S106 charges received from all the new developments in Send. This will compensate us from losing so many of our green spaces. This is the one time GBC could redeem themselves.

There is no reason for GBC to consider selling this land other than greed by selling it to a builder/developer.

Dear Sir,

I find it quite unbelievable that you would even consider this site for building. When it was used for landfill there were no rules about what waste could be put in there. So you have no idea what ghastly things could be disturbed during construction. Also you would be destroying woodland and natural habitat which we are all being exhorted to keep to prevent climate change. Also there are two oak trees that the council planted for us as we had a dangerous oak removed by your tree department.

Has anyone considered the number of cars that would come with forty homes? Most homes have two cars at least so that is eighty cars going down the hill at rush hour times to get people to work and children to school. Add to this the Garlick arch development and you have permanent grid lock in Send and Ripley and then of course there is the Wisley airfield development to add to the crush. The A3 is already full and backing up. Our roads are lanes not highways and unless you knock down the main streets in the villages there is no way to enlarge them. The schools and the surgery are already full so people are going to have to drive further afield to get these facilities.

These fields are used by so many residents in the area for walking their dogs or just exercise and pleasure. Where are they supposed to go, walking in the fumes and the cyclists will be joining the jams. We are continually being told that exercise is the best thing to keep us healthy yet you want to concrete over our open spaces and destroy our green spaces so there will be nothing left for the younger generation to enjoy, no birds no hedgehogs no wild flowers or trees. But plenty of flooding as the rain has no natural soak away.

The Bible has something to say about building on sand and combine that with chemical waste sound very dangerous, the only people rubbing their hands with glee will be the solicitors ready for the long legal battles ahead.

I am writing regarding my opposition with Guildford council proposal regarding the Send Hill disused sandpit. Firstly it's quite apparent that this rears its head every three or four years. It's annoying to think that the council think that residents do not care about where they live and surroundings when they buy their properties. The green belt is being chipped away with any empty spaces or bigger areas to be filled and squeezed in as many houses as possible to create concrete jungles. The message we are given by Government, councils and environmental establishments is to be a cleaner and more eco friendly of which most residents in this area try and do. The next generation will suffer too as your regard or disregard to the environment will be affect them. The area where you have indicated is to cram in 40 houses plus two traveller units. That's 84 plus cars more to travel in and out of Send Hill alone. Surely this will not help Guildford area already renowned for its high pollution. With the extra 10 houses being built in send Hill at present plus the extra one slightly further up in the road. Surely this road has done its bit. Not just this but the poor wildlife, environment and trees which will be destroyed by developers who have no regard for any form of environmental issues raised. There is a public footpath which leads to potters Lane. I expect that will go too. Walkers and cyclists use this to get to Send village shops. It's apparent that everything here, as everything else, is for financial gain by the council, developers and other interested parties. The residents only suffer with inconvenience and lose their environmental green space. Further more is there any respect for the cemetery and resting places for those there now. From being a quite lane to busy traffic road using it a through road having to access to the potential homes. Not only that but the quite surroundings, wildlife and environment lost forever in the area. I am asking for this proposal to be reconsidered and to leave at least this part of the green belt alone.

My concerns regarding this proposed development is the density of housing being proposed. 40 houses is way too many for this site. Especially considering most houses will have at least two cars and the limited access on to what is a single track road.

So each property needs enough parking and reasonable size gardens both front and rear to maintain the rural feeling of the area and for the support of local wildlife meaning

20 to 25 houses seems much more reasonable and if they were also eco friendly much more acceptable. Also given the existing properties on Send Hill that would back onto this development are bungalows the proposed properties roof tops should be no higher than these existing properties. Mains Water pressure at the top of Send Hill is already not the best so with

another 40 households will be even worse, even with another 20 houses some intervention to maintain/increase pressure will be needed, so this should be a condition of any development.

Good Evening

I am requesting the details of the proposed sale of land West of Winds Ridge in Send.

I would also like the proposed sale details relating to the public right of way along the same woodlands.

you can send them to

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing this email to oppose in the strongest possible terms of the proposed building of 40 houses and 2 traveller sites on the disused sandpit on Send Hill.

Here are some of my reasons for opposing the building work..

1, I live in Winds Ridge and moved here two and a half years ago. A couple of the main reasons for me moving to this area was for the peace and tranquillity this area offers. The few open spaces/public land that is available to walk on, including public footpaths.

The abundance of beautiful wildlife.

I have seen deer, badgers, foxes and a variety of birds, including birds of prey.

People who generally move to this area, especially Winds Ridge, are older people of nearing retirement age. We look at it as our forever home and we pay a fairly high price to live in the area.

Bearing this in mind, I think it's totally unfair to then develop a new housing estate within metres from our homes.

This will have a huge negative impact on the properties directly opposite the proposed site.

The residents currently look out on to trees and open land. A reason why these residents decided to buy a house in that particular location in the first place. If the building work were to go ahead, the residents would be looking out onto buildings and parked cars.

2, Climate change and protecting our wildlife are two issues that are currently a world wide priority for this planet.

On the part of land in question, the disused sand pit, there are lots of

pollinating plants which the Bees need and thrive on. These will go if the development goes ahead.

Building a new housing estate, taking away yet more green space and cutting down established trees will have a negative impact on our wildlife and have an adverse effect on protected habitats sites.

3, 9 houses at the bottom of send hill are still in the process of being built. With 5 more in the pipeline.

Just by building those houses, it has become a nightmare to drive past during the Monday to Friday working hours.

The workers vehicles are parked along send hill, some park on the grass verges and are killing off the grass and other delicate plants. Not to mention the large delivery vehicles that block the road whilst they are dropping off building materials.

Can you not see that us residents are putting up with a lot at the moment with those 9 houses being built.

Then there are the new developments in Tannery lane and Wharf lane. More houses where green open spaces once were but are no more.

Surely Send has done its bit for making way for extra houses.

4, 40 more houses will add at least 80 more vehicles to the area. More pollution, more vehicles parked on the already narrow Send Hill.

As it is there is no footpath on Send Hill, so if people are walking up or down it, you have to step on to the grass verges (that are owned by the adjoining houses) if a car approaches.

With all the extra cars that 40 new houses will bring, I fear that somebody will end up being hit by a vehicle or worse.

5, as mentioned in point 1, lots of us who move to this area do so because of the open spaces and walking options.

When I'm walking in the area, I often see and chat to elderly people walking and enjoying the outdoor space. These people live very close by, the disused sand pit and the footpath alongside it, is ideal for older people or those with disabilities to use, as it's on their doorstep.

Several new houses have already been built on Potters lane.

Why is it that GBC feel the need to build on every bit of green space?

Financial gain?

Our green spaces are rapidly being destroyed and once they're gone, they're gone. There will be no turning back.

The future generations will not know green open spaces, they will just know buildings upon buildings - a concrete jungle, just like London. And of course, more pollution.

6, at a time when people are suffering with mental health issues, I do not

feel that taking away our open spaces will help with mental health problems, in fact I fear it will have a devastating effect on peoples mental health.

I personally feel that walking helps with my mental health.

Also to take into consideration is the health benefits of walking.

I walk for up to 10 miles most days. I love the fact that I can walk from my doorstep (not using the car, so reducing my carbon footprint) but as I have already stated, I've paid a fairly high price to live in such an area. That was my choice and it's why I chose to live here.

7, having spoken to several other local residents, it would seem that if GBC get their way and build the 40 houses and 2 traveller sites, many would move out of the area. Those that could afford to move. The rest of us would just have to stay here and be unhappy. Neither which I think is fair or acceptable.

8, the infrastructure. I am struggling to see how a small village like Send will be able to cope with more pollution, more children needing schools, more people needing doctors, not to mention more traffic on the roads.

And with the proposed building of hundreds more houses at Wisley on the old airfields.

When will it stop?

9, Send is a semi rural village and by building more houses, it will not fit in with the nature of the neighbourhood.

Not to mention harm to the setting of the corridor of the River Wey Conservation Area and all it's wildlife.

I feel that the proposed development would not preserve or enhance the character of the area.

I thank you for taking the time to read this letter.

I hope you can see things from the residents points of view and urge you to reverse the proposal to build yet more houses in our precious open spaces.

Thank you,
Yours sincerely

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

I am writing to you to STRONGLY OBJECT to the proposal to sell off the land and to build 40 houses and 2 traveller sites on the disused sandpit near the top of Send Hill. As I am sure you the council are aware Send already has a 7.3 year housing supply without this land. The land in question is full of established trees, natural flora and fauna with many wild animals living on the land including a wonderful wood pecker who I had the joy to observe the other day. Part of the land is open and this is used by local residents for many activities including children playing, dog walking etc. I am a regular pedestrian down Send Hill and the ill thought through recent planning approvals have made walking along this road dangerous. Over the last few months I have seen many near misses as the road, that has no pavement provision, has become a car park reducing the road to a single lane with NO pavement provision for pedestrians. Mothers have reported feeling like they are putting their children's lives at risk when walking down Send Hill to take their children to school. I attribute this to the poorly thought through approach of the council. These recent developments are near the bottom of the hill close to where the pavements do start yet the plot of land of the disused sandpit is at the top of the hill nowhere near any pavement provision. On a number of occasions I have contacted the council asking for something to be done, putting in pavements for foot traffic and traffic calming measures on this 30 mph stretch of road but instead of acting on this you propose the insanity of introducing not only more houses but traveller pitches where I assume access would be needed for large caravans and vehicles. At the Potters lane end of Send Hill I cannot see how you can significantly improve vision of oncoming traffic along this single lane piece of road that becomes a death trap when icy. This steep, visually obscured single track piece of road is the main route between the church and the graveyard regularly used by pedestrians. Rather than proposing to make this highly dangerous single lane piece of road safer you are proposing to yet further endanger the lives of users. I urge you to evaluate the impact of the already ill thought through developments that are in progress on Send Hill (especially at times when children are heading to school) and ask you to consider what is really the best approach for this piece of land which would further add to the problems on Send Hill. Please don't let it take a series of accidents when it is too late for these matters to be considered. If anyone reading this can help with the installation of pavements along Send Hill for pedestrians from the junction with Potters lane to meet up with the current pavement that ends by the development of the new Antlers home I beg you to do what you can to make this a reality. In conclusion I do not think this land, widely used by the community and wildlife, should be sold off. In fact I

think it should be protected by GBC and that any consideration of building in such an unsuitable position is dismissed.

The majority of the site in question was infilled with rubbish, how the land would ever be suitable for building houses on I do not know ,subsidence ,methane, all sorts of problems. The ground was then grassed over and was deemed only suitable for animal grazing.

The traffic the proposed houses would create on a rural country lane with only 2 very old fashioned street lamps the entire length , one by upper Sandfields and one by Orchard Way, I have lived on Send Hill 64 years only ever been the same two lamps. No pavement for pedestrians , an accident waiting to happen. My dog was killed by a car while being walked by the side of this road how long before a child going to school.

How our overcrowded school and Surgery are supposed to cope with yet another 40 houses I do not know.

Historically this site was owned and used by the local traveller families together with the last bungalow in the road. These families were lovely adding to the amenities, providing logs for our fires which we all had back then. Hopefully, we would have families as good as they were on the proposed sites.

If we must have more houses It would be nice to see some affordable housing for the village not the half a million plus homes that are presently under construction in our road.

Which brings me to the state of the road being caused by the building works going on at present, the amount of lorries are ruining the road I do hope it will be returned to some sort of decent surface when they have finished building.

To whom it may concern,

I object to any housing in the area above.

This should be left to be wild and for walkers. Guildford borough has ruined most of the area and this clearly isn't helping the current climate crisis.

Your local plan took my business away. To line the pockets of the rich. It's criminal. Don't ruin other people's lives by bidding on this one too.

Proposed Traveller's Site

With reference to the new proposals for two Traveller's sites in Send Hill, I would like to raise the following objections:

1. Having lived alongside Travellers in Berkshire, I witnessed their lifestyle and culture first hand and therefore believe that Traveller's lifestyle is particularly culturally diverse to that of existing Send Hill residents. When considering culture, ethnicity and diversity, it is important to not only consider the rights of minority groups such as Travellers but also the rights of existing residents, in regard to their chosen way of life and culture.
2. The road already has very poor infrastructure and is single file traffic alongside the proposed site. The only way the Local Authority could resolve this issue would be to widen the road and lose the charm that this area of the road affords. I have also noticed that drivers regularly travel too fast in the road and it is only when cars approach from the opposite direction, that traffic is caused to naturally slow as the road narrows. This will also be a concern: if too many additional homes are planned for the road. The infrastructure of the single-track road is already exacerbated at times during the rush hour.
3. With school traffic and other vehicles using the road, plus many other daily users who enjoy the walks around this area, it is important for any planning decision to take into account the safety and wellbeing of road users in Send Hill and give consideration to the size of vehicles typically used on a Traveller's Site.
4. Many residents of Send Hill are older and live quietly. They are entitled to retain the peace and security currently enjoyed.
5. Travellers that settle are no longer travellers technically and therefore should not be automatically be entitled to Traveller status. Unless the Local Authority intend for many travellers to use and move on and off the site regularly, which would raise another set of concerns.
6. Send Hill is currently an area of beauty, where many walkers come to

enjoy the pleasant outlook around the area under consideration as a Traveller Site. I believe we have a legacy to retain these views and landscapes in places appreciated for their beauty, so that future generations can also enjoy this.

Dear Sir/Madam I am writing to you opposing the building of houses and travellers pitches for the following reasons. Concerns about removal of contaminated waste and possible asbestos gases etc. Site unsuitable for housing/traveller pitches due to the following-Single lane road No street lights No footpaths Increase in traffic Not in keeping with Send Hill properties Why are there two travellers pitches when seventy properties have been built in Tannery Lane With no travellers pitches included. The schools and doctors surgery are already overloaded, yet this is not considered when granting permission for so many extra houses to be erected in Send.

I am writing to object to the disposal of the above land.
Why do you want to dispose of it? It is a small piece of open space used regularly by the public for walking, myself included. It is the only public green space in the area.
It is not suitable for housing as:
Send Hill has no pavements making dangerous conditions for pedestrians worse if extra vehicles are on the road.
The road narrows at this point up to Potters Lane making it single track with bends and no passing places.
Send has had far too many new builds since it was removed from the Greenbelt. Just because it is a small open space doesn't mean that it has to be built on.
As this was previously land fill, the land is best left undisturbed. It would be best made into a community asset.

My final question is what would be the asking price for this land? and would it be sold with planning permission?

I think you shouldn't sell this land think of the wild life we're ear on telly about global warning you keep taking all the land and building houses let's try and save land make it into a wonderland for kids so they can have picnics and the parents can take them and they can play safely thank you Mrs Higgs

I wish to object to the proposed sale of this parcel of land. My objection is on two grounds.

First is the removal of a valuable and ever declining public open space that can be used and enjoyed by the local community.

Secondly, whoever purchases the land will wish to make a profit from it, which will inevitably lead to the land being used for housing. This will create an ever increasing strain on the local road network, services and utilities.

With parts of the land covered in dense foliage, any development would also remove a haven for wildlife.

To whom it may concern.

I would like to voice my disapproval and concern for the proposed sale of the above

piece of land!!! Presumably for future development??

In my opinion it would blight the properties of Send Hill and increase traffic on a very narrow stretch of road , or would it be planned to be widened to take out the roadside verge!!!!

Also at present it is a very nice common area for walking and enjoyed by dog walkers.

As long time residents of Send Hill, we object to the sale of this land . We remember this land being purchased by Guildford Council when we were told that the purchase was to prevent further development . Has this now changed and are we now to expect the loss of this public open space? It has become a valued local amenity and has been used beneficially for the landing of the emergency helicopter. We also recollect the filling of the sandpit with quantities of noxious materials which has required methane monitoring for many years. The monitoring has now ceased, but is it wise to risk disturbing this site?

To whom it may concern. I write to object in the strongest of motions to the planned sale of the Land West of Winds Ridge, Send Hill. The council should absolutely not be considering the sale of this land for development. I appreciate that the council have an obligation to try and meet the new housing quota, I do not believe that selling off publicly accessible green space is the right answer. Protecting our very limited public green space should be a key objection and the responsibility of the council. Green space is becoming even more precious and it's about time this was respected with the council stepping up and not ignoring the plight of both nature and the future of this planet. Protecting Green Space was part of your manifesto, yet you are failing to deliver on this. Why? This area is also protected by a Tree Preservation Order. What is the point of putting TPOs in place if you just completely ignore them. Failure to not act for the protection of this green space at each juncture of decision making is currently a systemic and direct failure of Guildford Borough Council. I also understand that housing objective in 2021 for this area was exceeded with 144% of our obligation being delivered. Therefore, to sell this land to a developer to build an excessive number of houses on that space is not necessary, not to mention it changing the landscape of the area and increasing risk to the public with more vehicles in a very small area. The area in question is currently the only public open space freely available for the public in this vicinity. All the surrounding fields are privately owned. By selling off this space to a developer you will be removing one of the last publicly available spaces for us to use. This has been hugely important over the past couple of years with Covid and having space that we can walk to and exercise in safely and help with people's mental health. The Land West of Winds Ridge is also used constantly by walkers, dog walkers, families, and children and you can clearly see that it offers a very diverse space for nature, with a variety of wildlife including bats. It has also been used in the past for emergency helicopter paramedic teams who have landed on the field to attend to emergencies in the neighbouring roads. Removing this as an option will add risk to life. It also remains as a landfill site which of course is still very much a contaminated piece of land. Whilst I know that this is simply a consultation questioning whether the council should sell this land or not, it is clear that previous responses by local residents and users of that space objecting to the development of this land have been completely ignored. I understand that in 2016 32,000 objections were heard and recorded against GBC's local plan again along with many more in the 2017 revised plan. However, following this the revised plans showed an even higher number of proposed dwellings. There were also 26 individual objections recorded on policy A44 in July 2017

to this particular area and accepted regarding this space. These were also ignored. Please can you confirm that our responses will be heard and taken into full consideration in the matter of the sale of this land. This strikes me as a purely commercial decision for the council. Please confirm what the benefits to the council for releasing this land are. Profits? Council tax? I believe that this space should be kept as a community space. If you insist on selling the land then local residents, particularly adjoining residents should be given the option to buy this land. Please confirm that this will be an option. I implore you to seriously rethink your proposal to sell the land. Instead please protect our limited public green space, protect our wildlife including bats and maintain an important piece of green space that is used constantly by the public as a safe space. Please deliver on the manifesto that you promised. Do not sell this land. Please protect it on behalf of everyone concerned so that we can continue to enjoy this space now and for future generations. Thank you for taking the time to read my objection and I hope that my voice is duly noted this time. With kind regards Amanda Edwards22 Orchard WaySend WokingSurreyGU23 7HS07968 445540

I strongly object to the sale of the land west of Winds Ridge, Send Hill for the following reasons:

- Residents have long enjoyed this land as a public open, green space and use it for all manner of health-related activities such as walking, exercising dogs and socialising. The physical and mental health benefits derived to locals from this space, especially for those living on their own, was made even more evident during the recent Covid lockdown when the land provided a much needed safe space for them to walk on and chat to others whilst enabling them to still maintain the required safe distance from each other.
- Ambulance helicopters have historically used this public space as a landing field in times of emergency for residents in neighbouring roads (Send Hill, Orchard Way, Winds Ridge etc.) Should this land be sold and subsequently fenced off, it would cease to be a public asset and would no longer be available for use by ambulance helicopters to assist with any cases requiring urgent medical need.
- Should this land be sold, I have major concerns about the potential loss of

wildlife habitat from any development on the land which may arise from the sale.

- Finally, with regard to the proposed sale of this land, I am extremely dismayed at the lack of public notification Guildford Council has given to residents who would be impacted by the proposed sale. I only heard about it a couple of days ago through word of mouth from a neighbour. For others, like me, who don't use social media or buy newspapers surely a leaflet through doors in Send Hill, Orchard Way and Winds Ridge would have been a surer way to ensure people were made aware of the Council's intention to sell this land?

With reference to the above and the planned disposal of the land, I would like to oppose this sale due to the following, 1 - This land is currently designated as green space. 2 - Prior to 2019 it was green belt. 3 - GBC state "no green belt will be disposed off". 4 - GBC stated last year that this land would never be sold. 5 - The land is in constant use by ramblers, dog walkers and local children for play. 6 - The land is a toxic site due to it being used as a refuse dump years ago. What toxic waste lies underneath, waiting to be disturbed and contaminate the surrounding areas. 7 - All conifers and broad leaf trees on the land have preservation orders. 8 - The land has been used in the past for emergency helicopter ambulance landings, coming to the aid of local residents in need of life saving help. Will this be available in the future? Please do not sell this land. We all know that if you do, it will be purchased by a developer and before you know it, it will be built upon. We have around 16-17 houses being built in the Send Hill area on land that was once gardens, we don't need any more. We need to keep our green space not for the present but for the future, so our children, their children etc can all enjoy. If you do sell this land, the residents of Send and in particular Send Hill, Winds Ridge and Orchard Way will again have been let down by GBC. Again, please do not sell this land.

Guildford Borough Council has a strong 7.3 housing supply. Our wish would be that this area of countryside remained an open space, which has been enjoyed on walks over decades.

However, if this could not be achieved, we really need more genuine affordable housing, to give the next generation (our grown children included in this), the opportunity to remain in Send

Dear Sir/Madam

We refer to your 'NOTICE PURSUANT TO Section 123 (1) and 2(A) Local Government ACT 1972' advising readers that Guildford Borough Council proposes to dispose of an area of land to the West of Winds Ridge.

There is a recognised footpath running all the way along the left side of the proposed area of sale – including the plot below the G.B.C. site which would also appear to be 'up for sale'.

This land to the left of the proposed sale is farming land, home to cows and sheep.

To the North West of the G.B.C. site, the footpath links with another footpath which leads from Potters Lane to Farm Lane and also to Send Hill. This particular footpath runs adjacent to a larger field, which is home to cows. These footpaths and the common land between Send Hill and Potters Lane are very popular amongst local residents, dog walkers and visiting ramblers. We frequently use the paths as they form a very good 'circuit' for walking. The footpaths and open land are a safe, healthy environment, away from traffic and exhaust fumes.

We would therefore urge the Council NOT to sell the land.

To whom it may concern

I am writing to oppose the planned disposal of the land to the west of Winds Ridge, Send Hill. This land is currently designated green space which until the 2019 Local Plan was green belt and as such should remain so. We have lived in Send for nearly 35 years and have used that open space since we arrived, together with our children.

This Land is in constant daily use by the locals - most open space in this vicinity is privately owned and therefore inaccessible. Open green space is being lost in huge numbers and is having such an adverse effect on our wild life and the planet. There is a tree preservation order on the land which could be overturned if the land is built on again depleting natural habitat.

If you propose to dispose of the land it can only mean the council is in need of funds. After this consultation, if the decision is to sell, it will obviously go to the highest bidder i.e. a developer.

I understand that new housing has to be considered under the Government plan. However, I also understand this has been over estimated.

Notwithstanding that, Send seems to be inundated with windfall housing and non-allocated sites approved for development since 2019. Within the past few months Send Hill has 12 houses already in course of construction and another 5 with planning permission. What with the 75 already built under the Local plan, retaining some open space is vital. Once lost can never be

regained.

I hope you will reconsider your position.

Dear Sir/Madam,I would like to state my strongest objection to the proposed sale of land west of Winds Ridge, Send Hill.This area of land should remain as an amenity accessible for use by the public. Pockets of land such as this should be protected by GBC and retained as open spaces which have a public value for wildlife (deer, foxes, etc) and the preservation of biodiversity. Access to green environmental spaces is known to increase well being and mental health. It is unfair that GBC should profit from a sale which is detrimental to the interests of residents who live here.Yours faithfully,This area of land should remain as an amenity for use by the public.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to object to the proposed sale of land west of Winds Ridge, Send Hill. This area of land should remain an amenity accessible for use by the public. Pockets of land such as this should be protected by GBC and retained as open spaces.

The land is an established area used by local residents which also supports wildlife (deer, foxes, etc) and the preservation of biodiversity. Access to green environmental spaces is known to increase well being and mental health.

GBC should not profit from a sale which is detrimental to the interests of local resident

We object to the sale of the above land for the following reasons:

- 1) The site is continually used as a community facility...exercise, dog walking, etc.
- 2) The site should be offered to the parish council/or the residents of Send Hill for development as a community facility.
- 3) The road in Send hill around the proposed site is a single track. and NOT fit for the heavy vehicles that would be needed for the building of dwellings and the road would not be fit for the amount of traffic that would be coming from the proposed site.
- 4) As the site has been removed from the Guildford local plan, there is NO

necessity to build even more dwellings in Send Hill. particularly with the existing plans for Garlic arch Tannery Lane and the site in Send Marsh.

5) The consultation period should be extended to allow Send residents to express their views. The way the Council has published this in not widely read newspapers and lack of information from the local council has meant many of us not knowing much about this proposal, only a handful of us have found out at the last minute. This is hardly a fair and open consultation period. Those residents that would be most affected should have been informed by their Council representatives, especially as there were many strong objections in the Guildford plan consultation.

6) As many residents own half the road (as shown in their deeds) there would be strong objections to the use of the roads as access to the site and potential parking of heavy-duty vehicles.

7) To put this site on the open market will only mean bids from "Big Boys". ie property developers to buy the site and vastly increase the number of houses they will squeeze in. This would mean the worst possible scenario for the beautiful country lane. It would turn Send Hill into a RAT RUN up to Woking. The residents deserve better than this --decimating-- our country lane and environment.

To whom it may concern,
I object to the proposed sale of the land 'send hill disused sandpit'. This site is an open space used by many members of the local community and it would be a shame for us to lose it.

Dear Sir/Madam
I object strongly to the proposed sale of the land 'Send Hill Disused Sandpit'. This land has been a public open space for many years and is greatly used.

Dear GBC
I am apposed to the proposed sale of the disused sandpit by GBC for the following reasons:

1. This land serves as a recreation space for us and many other local residents. Such areas are of significant importance during these times when we need space for mental wellbeing.
2. It is an area of importance for local wildlife.

Taking this space away from public use will have a significant impact on us as local residents.

Reference: Send Hill Disused Sandpit
I should like to object most strongly to the sale of the Land West of Winds Ridge on Send Hill.
I have lived on Send Hill for 50 years and have always walked this public open

space with my family. It would be a great lose if this area became inaccessible to the residents of Send. It is a haven for wildlife at a time when so much land in the vicinity is being built on.

To whom it may concern:

I am lodging a strong objection to the proposed disposal of the Land to the West of Winds Ridge, Send Hill. It is currently one of the few remaining public open spaces and should remain so. As it was previously a council rubbish dump surely it is unsuitable for any other use? I have lived in the village of Send since 1977 and have used this open space on countless occasions and still used it on virtually a daily basis.

Many species of plants and animals have established themselves here since the tip was covered. Surely if we are serious about the environment and air quality we should allow such green spaces to remain intact.

Please could you tell me why the council is proposing to sell this land at this current time?

Please could you also tell me why this Notice was not displayed along the footpaths crossing this land so it could be seen by those of us who use this public space?

Dear Sirs,I am writing to object to the council's proposal to sell the above land. The grounds for this objection are:

- The land in question is currently used for informal recreation and is one of the few remaining wild areas in Send village freely available to the public. As such, it is enjoyed by families, dog walkers and countryside walkers. All other fields are privately owned and therefore not available to the public. At a time when climate change and the pandemic have focussed humanity on the importance of the earth and our attitudes to it, I believe this land must be retained as a public open space where all can freely access our diverse natural world. The impact of the approved housing on Send Hill in additional people and traffic congestion only adds weight to the need for remaining public open space to be retained.
- The council's aim, I believe, is that the land would then be developed as part of housing provision, although I understand that the area now has robust 7.34 year housing supply and a number of developments are currently taking place. There seems there is no need to sell what is already a designated open space. Under the circumstances the council should not be considering the sale of this land for development. Once lost to us, our children and grandchildren, these pockets of open green space are never regained.

Good morning

I am writing to register strong objections regarding the recent proposal to sell off the above plot, with as yet no real reason given as to why this is now being considered as a potential option. Perhaps, like many others areas in Send, this has been designated for another lot of greedy Developers to build yet more houses in what is already and overcrowded country village.

This site was formerly a sand excavation site and then became landfill and has for some considerable time been enjoyed by residents as an open access public green space for a great many people and animals to enjoy.

Good morning

I am writing to register strong objections regarding the recent proposal to sell off the above plot, with as yet no real reason given as to why this is now being considered as a potential option. Perhaps, like many others areas in Send, this has been designated for another lot of greedy Developers to build yet more houses in what is already and overcrowded country village.

This site was formerly a sand excavation site and then became landfill and has for some considerable time been enjoyed by residents as an open access public green space for a great many people and animals to enjoy.

I am writing to object please to the sale of this land by the council. This is a much used public open space enjoyed by local residents. In particular, it is a safe wide haven for children to play safely. It also gave locals, particularly those with no gardens, the much needed open space needed for walks during the pandemic vital to their mental well-being. The village of Send has recently undergone a lot of housing development and so this open green public space is more vital than ever. It is also a haven for wildlife which we all enjoy.

Dear Sir/madam

I object to the proposed sale of the land in send hill, the disused sand pit, to be sold. This land has been used as public space for years and is greatly used.

Send Parish Council objects to the sale of this land by Guildford Borough Council.

The Council believes that this land should remain an area of recreational value and supports the application for it to become an Asset of Community Value.

The area is regularly used by residents and is the only open space available in the vicinity. It is also a wildlife haven offering a green corridor for bats, rabbits, deer and foxes.

Send Parish Council

Dear Guildford Borough Council

SEND HILL DISUSED SANDPIT

I object to the proposed sale of land west of Winds Ridge in Send Hill because of the loss of public access to a green space for walking – recreationally, with dogs and for exercise to maintain good physical health.

I object to the proposed sale of land west of Winds Ridge in Send Hill because access to outside recreational open space provides a necessary and proven aid to creating and maintaining good mental health.

I object to the proposed sale of land west of Winds Ridge in Send Hill because that open space provides a valuable and much needed habitat for wild life – both animals and birds.

I object to the proposed sale of land west of Winds Ridge in Send Hill because that particular open space hosts a wide diversity of plants and flowers which give sustenance to birds, reptiles, mammals and particularly insects.

I object to the proposed sale of land west of Winds ridge in Send Hill because there are plants which grow on this land which are rarely seen anywhere else in this area, especially the wild orchids

I trust Guildford Borough Councillors will consider all the above, very real concerns about this locally much-loved and well-used piece of land.

I have to say the way Guildford Borough Council look after the land – particularly cutting back and mowing the grass in the autumn – is very much appreciated.

Dear Guildford Borough Council SEND HILL DISUSED SANDPIT I object to the proposed sale of land west of Winds Ridge in Send Hill because of the loss of public access to a green space for walking – recreationally, with dogs and for exercise to maintain good physical health. I object to the proposed sale of land west of Winds Ridge in Send Hill because access to outside recreational open space provides a necessary and proven aid to creating and maintaining good mental health. I object to the proposed sale of land west of Winds Ridge in Send Hill because that open space provides a valuable and much needed habitat for wild life – both animals and birds. I object to the proposed sale of land west of Winds Ridge in Send Hill because that particular open space hosts a wide diversity of plants and flowers which give sustenance to birds, reptiles, mammals and particularly insects. I object to the proposed sale of land west of Winds ridge in Send Hill because there are plants which grow on this land which are rarely seen anywhere else in this area, especially the wild orchids I trust Guildford Borough Councillors will consider all the above, very real concerns about this locally much-loved and well-used piece of land. I have to say the way Guildford Borough Council look

after the land – particularly cutting back and mowing the grass in the autumn – is very much appreciated. Thank you

I am writing to object to the sale of the above piece of public land located on Send Hill.

The land currently represents the only remaining green space accessible by the public on Send Hill and is well used by local residents for dog walking, recreational hiking - a safe space for friends to meet.

There is also a wide diversity of wildlife that live and use the land.

Whilst we cannot predict who will purchase the land, given the current amount of redevelopment and new buildings in Send Hill it would be likely that the new owner will want to build more properties on it.

To that effect I would urge the council to reconsider its decision and not to sell and to retain a green space for all to use.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to the councils proposal to sale of the land on Send Hill, Send on the site of the disused Sandpit.

I strongly believe that the council have not circulated enough information regarding the proposed land sale to the local population. There are many residents that remain unaware of the councils intention to sell off public land. Our local community do not have a free paper that is circulated within the community anymore. Therefore local residents would have to pay for a paper to see any notifications in the press. This seem rather unfair, and a way of hiding the information from the people that this decision will effect most.

I object to this plot of public land being sold as it is used by many villagers for recreation. It is one of the only remaining open green spaces for everyone to enjoy. I feel that this is particularly important for the physical and mental

wellbeing for the residents of the village. If the land is sold there is a potential threat and loss of habitat to local wildlife. I often see bats flitting around the site when I walk my dog at dusk.

Sends main road is becoming increasingly busy with vehicles. Currently the footpath that crosses the sandpit site links to others which provide safe and traffic free access for local children to travel to the village recreation ground and local shops

It is one of the last pieces of public land in the area as many have been sold off into private ownership and then developed. It appears as if the council are hiding the sale of this land with the intention of it being sold to private ownership rather than it remaining for the communities benefit. It is the first step to yet another example of the rural land grabbing that is making our village become a suburb of Woking and Guildford.

For the reasons above I strongly object to the land at this site being sold.

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I am writing to object to the councils proposal to sell off the land on Send Hill, Send on the site of the disused Sandpit.

I do not think that the council have released enough information regarding the sale of this land as many residents remain unaware of the councils intention to sell off public land.

I object to this plot of public land being sold as it is used by many villagers for recreation. It is one of the only remaining open green spaces for everyone to enjoy. I feel that this is particularly important for the physical and mental wellbeing for the residents of the village. If the land is sold there is a potential threat of development which will result in loss of habitat to local wildlife. I often see bats flying around the site.

The site is one of the last pieces of public land in the area and should be retained for the benefit of the local community.

For the reasons above I strongly object to the proposal to sell the land at this site.

Dear Sir, I object to the disposal of the land called "Send Hill Disused Sandpit" by Guildford Borough Council. The piece of land is very much a rural setting with evidence of badger sets and much other wild life. In selling the piece of land there would be a huge potential loss of wildlife habitat. The land is used extensively by the local residents of Send for exercise and it would be loss to the mental health and well being of the residents. The development that is currently happening within Send is excessive and the selling of this plot of land could potentially lead to the development of the land for the 40 houses and 2 traveller pitches which was suggested in the local plan. The local infrastructure of the doctors surgery, the school and the road networks

cannot cope with the current capacity and more development in this area should be prevented.

Dear Sir

I object to the disposal of the land called "Send Hill Disused Sandpit" by Guildford Borough Council.

The piece of land is very much a rural setting with evidence of badger sets and much other wild life. In selling the piece of land there would be a huge potential loss of wildlife habitat.

The land is used extensively by the local residents of Send for exercise and it would be loss to the mental health and well being of the residents.

The development that is currently happening within Send is excessive and the selling of this plot of land could potentially lead to the development of the land for the 40 houses and 2 traveller pitches which was suggested in the local plan. The local infrastructure of the doctors surgery, the school and the road networks cannot cope with the current capacity and more development in this area should be prevented

To whom it may concern.

I was very surprised to see that a notice of sale had not been put up on the area for sale, it was only brought to my attention by a neighbour who had spotted it in a paper.

Given that houses and travellers pitches were to be built there I wonder why this area is now being sold?

During lock down these walking areas were invaluable. There are many houses in the area and many people have dogs.

So much land has/is being developed in our area finding somewhere to walk with the dogs and grandchildren is getting harder and harder.

Given the proximity of this land to so many houses, people DON'T have to get in their cars to go out for a walk, thus reducing cars on the already very congested local roads.

The trees are capturing carbon dioxide.

The benefit to mental health of having somewhere to walk is immeasurable.

This area of land is contaminated, as it was a rubbish dump for a number of years, keeping it wild will prevent the toxins from coming out.

In an age when the benefit for outside time for children has been realised, why reduce the natural tree/wildlife locally etc for them?

There is Send school very close by and lots of children in the village.

Whilst Send Rec has football, tennis and children's equipment, this area has a wild natural landscape.

It has a large asset of community value.

In conclusion;

This area is close to a great number of people with children and pets, no need to go in the car for a walk, reducing traffic on the roads.

Carbon capture.

Children can explore a local, wild, natural habitat.

Walking in the countryside improves mental health for all.

Breaking up the continuity of houses and roads.

Natural habitat for wild animals lost.

Dog walking, giving a sense of community.

The worry someone will buy up all that stretch and put houses up. Roads are so busy in Send anyway and the some roads very narrow.

Why not gift it, or sell at cost price to the local community who will look after and improve it.

Yours, faithfully,





Send

Dear Sir/Madam Ref: Send Hill disused sandpit I am hereby writing to very strongly object to the sale of the council owned land west of Winds Ridge, which was previously a sand excavation pit and subsequently became and remains, a landfill site. Having lived directly opposite the land for over 50 years I can testify to the fact that it has been enjoyed as an open access green space amenity by a vast number of people, not least locals, spanning several decades. This plot of land provides an area for recreation in terms of walking, dog walking, ball games etc, and as such has been shown to be a vital asset for mental wellbeing. This was particularly highlighted in the recent Covid outbreak, when we needed to have access to outside recreational space to exercise at a safe distance apart. Whilst I recognise that we do have a good network of footpaths in the area, those are inherently of restricted width in this respect, and during those months particularly our village did have a large increase in walkers, both locals and those from outside the area who were actively seeking wider open spaced areas. In addition, the nature of this site; ie its openness together with the sense of security of houses being very nearby, provides a safe area on which to exercise for anyone feeling vulnerable walking alone etc. There have also been several occasions over the decades when a helicopter paramedic team have landed on this very field, to attend to emergencies in the neighbouring roads, as I myself have witnessed and can provide photographic evidence thereof. I personally feel this is a very powerful argument for keeping these pockets of open access public land within populated areas (which are already very limited) available. If this land is sold into private hands it could potentially be developed for housing which will not only result in a substantial loss of wildlife habitat, but would also have serious health and safety implications to the nearby residents, regarding the consolidation and disturbance of the landfill contents. I feel very strongly that the sale proposal has not been publicised adequately or widely enough, nor with enough notice for us to respond effectively. We should not be expected to have to buy a publication to learn of this. At the very least a public notice should have been prominently posted on the land itself. No mention has been made in any publicity as to WHY this sale is being considered, and when I requested an answer to this, through this same email channel, it was not forthcoming. As part of due process to a public consultation, we must be given this information so that we have the opportunity to robustly not only make our objections to the sale of the land, but also to the council's rationale if applicable. May I remind the council that as council owned land, this site actually belongs to all of us who use it and you the council are merely its custodians. I await a prompt and fully detailed response from you

I would like lodge an objection to the proposed sale of the disused sandpit on Send Hill, Send GU23.

My objection is based on the fact that there is a Potential loss of wildlife habitat, Loss of public access to a green space for Walking, Dog walking, Recreational, Mental well-being, Getting children interested in nature and Meeting neighbours in a safe space.

Our open green public spaces are proving to be more vital than ever these days.

As was highlighted by the COVID outbreak and our need thereby to have access to outside recreational exercise at a safe distance apart. Whilst there are plenty of footpaths available to us in our area, these are inherently of restricted width with heavy traffic.

According to some neighbours who have lived in Dend for a long time there have also been several occasions over the decades when a *helicopter paramedic* team have landed on the field to attend to emergencies in the neighbouring roads.

I personally feel this is a strong argument to keeping pockets of open access public land such as this, within populated areas, available.

To whom it may concern. I write to object in the strongest of motions to the planned sale of the land opposite Winds Ridge, Send Hill. The council should absolutely not be considering the sale of this land for development. Whereby I accept the council have an aspiration to meet new housing quota's, public accessible green spaces and the protection thereof are also the responsibility of you, the council. The area in question is widely and frequently used by country walkers, dog walkers and families alike and can often be observed enjoying this diverse nature filled space. This site is currently the only openly wild space freely available to the public in this vicinity. All others are privately owned fields to which access is clearly limited. I appreciate this is simply a consultation questioning whether the council should sell this land or not to which any responses would be limited. However, in 2016 32,000 objections were heard and recorded against GBC's local plan again along with many more in the 2017 revised plan. These voices were ignored. I understand the revised plan showed an even higher number of proposed dwellings meaning the consultation previously held was wholly meaningless. 26 individual objections were recorded on policy A44 in July 2017 to this particular area and accepted regarding this space. All of these many voices were clearly ignored. As such I question what is the threshold required that the council to deem worthy and to the point it can / will influence any decision? If this has not been established prior, what is the validity of such a consultation and motion? Will the council fail yet again in it's duty to hear the voices of those affected? Did the council ever consider a public consultation for this land to be protected as green space? If not why not? Am I to be left thinking this is once again another failure of you, the council and just another monetary commercial decision. Green space is precious and its about time this was respected with the council stepping up and not ignoring the plight of both nature and the future of this planet. To date the council have not shown or exhibited any interest of such preservation. Why? Failure to not act for the protection of this green space at each juncture of decision making is currently a systemic and direct failure of Guildford Borough Council. What are the benefits to the council for releasing this land. Profits? Council tax? Once lost, these pockets of green space can never be regained. As such I implore you to re think it's use of this land and look to protect such a limited example of green open space left in this area, whilst respecting the local community's right to freely access local green spaces along with, aiding wider ecological issues and preservation of nature. Do not sell this land, Protect it for "ALL" concerned both now and for future generations to come. Thank you for hearing my opinion and hope that my voice is duly noted this time. With kind regards [REDACTED]

Dear Sir / Madam,

OBJECTION - DISPOSAL OF SEND HILL SANDPIT

I object to the disposal of the land called "Send Hill Disused Sandpit" by Guildford Borough Council.

The piece of land is very much a rural setting with evidence of badger sets, bats and lapwing birds and much other wildlife. In selling the piece of land there would be a massive loss of wildlife habitat. There is a priority species including lapwing as surveyed by British Trust for Ornithology (BTO). This should be taken into account with regard to Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) Section 41 habitats of principal importance due to their priority status. Such acts as Lapwing Act in 1926 have tried to protect the severe decline of the species . This type of land is the only suitable habitat for the lapwing as stated by the RSBP.

The land is used extensively by the local residents of Send for exercise and it would be loss to the mental health and well being of the residents.

A development will have an adverse impact on the area. As stated within the NPPF paragraph 3 Non-strategic Policies Paragraph 28 establishing design principles, conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment and setting out other development management policies. The inevitable change of land uses with change local factors with specific detriment to the already very poor local water basin. The NPPF paragraph 13 section 170 (e) states that Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing new developments from contributing to unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability.

The development tone that is currently happening within Send is excessive and the selling of this plot of land could potentially lead to the development of the land for the 40 houses and 2 traveller pitches which was suggested in the local plan. The local infrastructure of the doctors surgery, the school and the road networks cannot cope with the current capacity and more development in this area should be prevented.

These are the reasons I object strongly to this development. I hope you give my point sufficient weight when it comes to determining the disposal.

To whom it may concern.I am writing to object to the disposal of the land mentioned above.I would respectfully ask that this area of open green space can remain in its current use.Land currently is used as recreation for walkers, dog walkers, play area for children and a thriving area for many animals and birds and has a public right of way across the middle of it as shown on a 1985 Land Registry map. This is the only public open green space in this part of

Send.If this land were to be lost as an open space we wouldn't be able to replace it.

I am a resident of Send Hill and I live almost opposite the land to the west which was a sandpit, then a landfill site and subsequently a green open space bounded on its east and west borders by public footpaths.

I understand that Guildford Borough Council are planning to sell this land which was identified as suitable for housing development in the local plan - in spite of strong local objection and in the face of common sense that any housing could be built safely on land that has underlying toxic waste including blue asbestos.

Since 2003 I have lived in my property, Fir Trees, and the area was then characterised by large open spaces with free open access, I have seen a huge reduction in our access to the land which has reverted to active farming use.

The site of the Disused Sand Pit is the only remaining space that is enjoyed by many people for walking both with and without dogs, and is used by wild life including rabbits, foxes, deer, bats, grass snakes, and many birds including skylarks who have been driven from the local ploughed fields.

Local children have played ball games, running races - all in a safe setting away from roads and traffic.

Such an open space is an extremely valuable asset for the local community and for some who travel to enjoy the space with their dogs.

Please regard this letter as a formal objection to the proposal of selling this land which I suspect is most useful in its current evolution with council ownership.

Dear Sir/Madam

I am hereby writing to very strongly object to the sale of the council owned land west of Winds Ridge, which was previously a sand excavation pit and subsequently became and remains, a landfill site.

This plot of land provides an area for recreation in terms of walking, dog walking, ball games etc, and as such has been shown to be a vital asset for mental wellbeing.

This was particularly highlighted in the recent Covid outbreak, when we needed to have access to outside recreational space to exercise at a safe distance apart. Whilst I recognise that we do have a good network of footpaths in the area, those are inherently of restricted width in this respect, and during those months particularly our village did have a large increase in walkers, both locals and those from outside the area who were actively seeking wider open spaced areas.

In addition, the nature of this site; ie its openness together with the sense of security of houses being very nearby, provides a safe area on which to exercise for anyone feeling vulnerable walking alone etc.

There have also been several occasions over the decades when a helicopter paramedic team have landed on this very field, to attend to emergencies in the neighbouring roads. This is a very powerful argument for keeping these pockets of open access public land within populated areas (which are already very limited) available.

There are a large number of new builds in the vicinity and this would add to a larger population that Send had not planned for. The infrastructure had not expanded with the frowning number of new builds and this will exacerbate the situation.

If this land is sold into private hands it could potentially be developed for housing which will not only result in a substantial loss of wildlife habitat, but would also have serious health and safety implications to the nearby residents, regarding the consolidation and disturbance of the landfill contents.

Additionally, there are well established linden trees on this land which would be destroyed.

I feel very strongly that the sale proposal has not been publicised adequately or widely enough, nor with enough notice for us to respond effectively. We should not be expected to have to buy a publication to learn of this. At the very least a public notice should have been prominently posted on the land itself.

No mention has been made in any publicity as to WHY this sale is being considered, and when I requested an answer to this, through this same email

channel, it was not forthcoming. As part of due process to a public consultation, we must be given this information so that we have the opportunity to robustly not only make our objections to the sale of the land, but also to the council's rationale if applicable.

May I remind the council that as council owned land, this site actually belongs to all of us who use it and you the council are merely its custodians. I await a prompt and fully detailed response from you

I hereby object to the proposed sale of the land which is council owned to the west of Winds Ridge. This will result in the loss of a greatly valued amenity for dog walking and lead to concern that it would be developed for more housing in a road that is inadequate for a large number of vehicles. The land has been used in the past for the air ambulance to land.

this land has been used for recreation for very many years and we feel it should remain so.

It appears the land is surplus to GBC requirements therefore it should now be handed over to Send Parish Council...for all residents of Send Villages to enjoy!!! The land is so desperately needed to remain as an open space because of all the past future and present developments that have ..and will take over...most of the green spaces in Send.

I wish to object to the sale of this land by the council as it is a valuable open space often used by local children and is a place many families enjoy. Rather than develop in their own back yard Guildford BC seems to have given the nod to a lot of development infills in Send, which is now putting a strain on local infrastructure and putting a premium on the open spaces left – so please do not accelerate the demise of these spaces by the sale of land you

own. Far better to leave to nature with all the benefits that brings to the local eco system. Thanks

Dear Sir or Madam

Re: Sale of land of above

I object to the sale of this land, as it will constitute the loss of a much used amenity and green space at Send Hill.

I also object and am offended that the residents of Send Hil have not been made aware that this is a proposed land sale, not a proposal of housing.

This is not apparent, and has been discovered by an astute and concerned neighbour, who, upon scouring the Surrey Advertiser, found the advert for the proposal of sale.

On first sight, the information provided has been grossly misleading, and now, at this late hour, we are faced with objecting to an entirely different matter than the one first presented.

I should like, by return, an explanation as to how this matter became so confused.

Dear Sir/Madam

Ref Send Hill disused sandpit

I am hereby writing to very strongly object to the sale of the council owned land west of Winds Ridge, which was previously a sand excavation pit and subsequently became and remains, a landfill site.

Having lived in Send most of my life and very close to the aforementioned last for the past 13 years I can testify to the fact that it has been enjoyed as an open access green space amenity by a vast number of people, not least locals regularly.

This plot of land provides an area for recreation in terms of walking, dog walking, ball games etc, and as such has been shown to be a vital asset for mental wellbeing.

This was particularly highlighted in the recent Covid outbreak, when we needed to have access to outside recreational space to exercise at a safe distance apart. Whilst I recognise that we do have a good network of footpaths in the area, those are inherently of restricted width in this respect, and during those months particularly our village did have a large increase in walkers, both locals and those from outside the area who were actively seeking wider open spaced areas.

In addition, the nature of this site; ie its openness together with the sense of security of houses being very nearby, provides a safe area on which to

exercise for anyone feeling vulnerable walking alone etc.

There have also been several occasions over the decades when a helicopter paramedic team have landed on this very field, to attend to emergencies in the neighbouring roads.

I personally feel this is a very powerful argument for keeping these pockets of open access public land within populated areas (which are already very limited) available.

If this land is sold into private hands it could potentially be developed for housing which will not only result in a substantial loss of wildlife habitat, but would also have serious health and safety implications to the nearby residents, regarding the consolidation and disturbance of the landfill contents.

I feel very strongly that the sale proposal has not been publicised adequately or widely enough, nor with enough notice for us to respond effectively. We should not be expected to have to buy a publication to learn of this. At the very least a public notice should have been prominently posted on the land itself.

No mention has been made in any publicity as to WHY this sale is being considered, and when I requested an answer to this, through this same email channel, it was not forthcoming. As part of due process to a public consultation, we must be given this information so that we have the opportunity to robustly not only make our objections to the sale of the land, but also to the council's rationale if applicable.

May I remind the council that as council owned land, this site actually belongs to all of us who use it and you the council are merely its custodians. I await a prompt and fully detailed response from you

It has come to my notice that Guilford Borough Council, who are the owners of this land on behalf of the residents of Guildford, are proposing to sell this land. It appears that the Council expect the offer to be taken up by developers who would presumably seek planning consent in accordance with the local plan that was approved by the last outgoing Tory controlled council. We strongly objected to the local plan at earlier consultations. I am writing now to formally object to the sale of this land to anyone on the basis that with the changes we have seen since 2003, this open space has become green land in keeping with the rural character to the west of Send Hill. The community have enjoyed free access to this land for personal recreation including walking, exercising dogs, children to run and play safely and our own grandchildren have explored the diversity of a natural setting with such a rich floral spectrum that invites bees and butterflies throughout the summer. The bird life that thrives in the field includes magpies, crows,

woodpeckers and in the summer our own cuckoo. Blackbirds, robins, Blue tits, chaffinches, goldcrests, bull finches are all regular nesters. Skylarks and woodlarks have moved in from local fields that have been under the plough regularly. The area is home to rabbits, foxes, deer, and squirrels. The area is sheltered by the many old oak trees along the western footpath. To lose this community asset would be reckless as such a space could not be recreated. I would add that when we were purchasing our house so close to the landfill site, the building society were minded to refuse a mortgage loan. We would assume that developers would be mindful of such restrictions in the financing possibilities for those seeking affordable housing. Lastly, it appears that the council have deliberately withheld advertising to the public at large their intention to put this land up for sale. Such tactics do not allow for the maintenance of trust between the borough residents and those who are the elected representative and who are the servants of the people. It's called democracy in case someone has forgotten.

It has just come to my attention that the council are proposing to sell off this public open space. It also appears that the Council are in advanced discussions with a developer. I object to the proposed sale and the development of genuine open amenity land which is becoming more and more scarce and its removal will be detrimental to the area. I am also disappointed that the land was not advertised to any significant extent (the most cost effective method being a 'for sale sign') and has not enable local residents to mount their own bid. It seems the Council have an agenda to sell and get the land developed with the least hassle or public consultation.

To whom it may concern,
I'm emailing to object to the proposed sale of the Land West of Winds Ridge, Send Hill. This is public land, held in trust for local taxpayers, and should not be for sale. This land is currently a green space, which was vital during the recent lockdowns - it is still in use by walkers and dog-owners etc. As former landfill, there is a lot of unknown, potentially hazardous material dumped there, and it should be left undisturbed - any work, even making an access road, could throw up dust with hazardous material, asbestos etc. Leave it alone.
If sold, it might be bought by yet another property developer - we have enough of this happening on Send Hill already, with cases 19/P/00721 (8 houses now under construction), 21/P/01658, 21/P/01925 (another 5 houses proposed, adjacent to the 8), 21/P/00307 (another 4 houses, already approved). There are already 8 houses under construction, 4 approved, and 5 more in the throes of Planning / appeals etc. The quiet road I moved into is

already changing in character, to the detriment of the current occupants. If development is needed in Guildford, let it happen elsewhere.
Finally, this sale should have been notified, in writing, to all the residents on Send Hill. A small advert in a local paper giving us 2 weeks' notice to object is not right. It's almost as if GBC didn't want local residents to know...

To whom it may concern,
I'm emailing to object to the proposed sale of the Land West of Winds Ridge, Send Hill. This is public land, held in trust for local taxpayers, and should not be for sale. This land is currently a green space, which was vital during the recent lockdowns - it is still in use by walkers and dog-owners etc.
As former landfill, there is a lot of unknown, potentially hazardous material dumped there, and it should be left undisturbed - any work, even making an access road, could throw up dust with hazardous material, asbestos etc.
Leave it alone.
If sold, it might be bought by yet another property developer - we have enough of this happening on Send Hill already, with cases 19/P/00721 (8 houses now under construction), 21/P/01658, 21/P/01925 (another 5 houses proposed, adjacent to the 8), 21/P/00307 (another 4 houses, already approved). There are already 8 houses under construction, 4 approved, and 5 more in the throes of Planning / appeals etc. The quiet road I moved into is already changing in character, to the detriment of the current occupants. If development is needed in Guildford, let it happen elsewhere.
Finally, this sale should have been notified, in writing, to all the residents on Send Hill. A small advert in a local paper giving us 2 weeks' notice to object is not right. Its almost as if GBC didn't want local residents to know...

Dear GBC

I am opposed to the proposed sale of the disused sandpit by GBC for the following reasons:

1. This land serves as a recreation space for us and many other local residents. Such areas are of significant importance during these times when we need space for mental wellbeing.
2. It is an area of importance for local wildlife.
3. This is also a contaminated landfill site.

Taking this space away from public use will have a significant impact on us as local residents.

Dear Sir,

I object to the disposal of the land called "Send Hill Disused Sandpit" by Guildford Borough Council.

The piece of land is very much a rural setting with evidence of badger sets and much other wild life. In selling the piece of land there would be a huge potential loss of wildlife habitat.

The land is used extensively by the local residents of Send for exercise and it would be loss to the mental health and wellbeing of the residents. I regularly visit my family in sent and this is one of the few places to walk locally.

The development that is currently happening within Send is excessive and the selling of this plot of land could potentially lead to the development of the land for the 40 houses and 2 traveller pitches which was suggested in the local plan. The local infrastructure of the doctor's surgery, the school and the road networks cannot cope with the current capacity and more development in this area should be prevented.

To whom it may concern, I am at a loss as to why the Council are selling the land to the west of Winds Ridge in Send. This area, previously a sand pit and then a land fill, is contaminated and of little value to any potential developer. Awarding planning permission for dwellings on this landfill would be unlikely. Any development would disturb the land fill and expose neighbouring properties and any workers to the decomposing by-products of the fill – what is known to be there and what might be there but is not known. As a consequence of the risks associated with the contaminated fill and securing planning any sale is likely to generate little revenue while potentially removing this part of the land bank from those areas that have important recreational value. This area is used by walkers and dog walkers and I have enjoyed this area and associated network of footpaths for the almost 30 years I have lived in Send, and most specifically over the last 2 years - offering mental well-being for many Send residents during COVID. While footpaths are all well and good, having islands of open space along such a network have been invaluable to enjoy wild life, particularly the wide range of birds, and to stand and stare while being socially distanced. Do not sell this land. It is valued by the residents who I am sure strongly wish to retain access. It is unlikely to generate much revenue as it cannot credibly be awarded planning permission. Planning or developing this site for residential use would have Grenfell levels of incompetence and potentially criminality.

I wish to lodge my objection to the proposed sale of the disused sandpit.

This land should be retained for the benefit of the local community.

The sale will only lead to the increasing over development of this rural area.

Dear Asset Management Team

Re: Land West of Winds Ridge, Send Hill – proposed Sale (Notice 11 February 2022)

As a Send Resident since 1977 I strongly oppose the proposed sale of the above site.

If this land is owned by Guildford Borough on behalf of the people of the Borough

then this land should be under the advice of Send Parish Council and in accordance

with the village plan.

There is no need for additional housing in Send. Recently approved developments

already exceed housing needs forecasts and risk exceeding local infrastructure

ie drainage, schools and medical facilities.

Open space in Send is at a premium. Many sites are designated for development

since the infamous plans imposed on the Borough and Send Parish by the previous

administration.

The site is a former waste tip, potentially unsuitable for domestic residences without

remediation. However, it is suitable as a public open space for local residents and wildlife.

PLEASE do not sell this site.

Equality Impact Assessment

The purpose of an assessment is to understand the impact of the Council’s activities* on people from protected groups and to assess whether unlawful discrimination may occur. It also helps to identify key equality issues and highlight opportunities to promote equality across the Council and the community. The assessment should be carried out during the initial stages of the planning process so that any findings can be incorporated into the final proposals and, where appropriate, have a bearing on the outcome.

(*Activity can mean strategy, practice, function, policy, procedure, decision, project or service)

Name of person completing the assessment	Damien Cannell	Date of assessment	08/03/2022
Name of the proposed activity being assessed	Proposed disposal of Land to the West of Winds Ridge, Send Hill.	Is this a new or existing activity?	Existing
Who will implement the activity and who will be responsible for it?	Officers will implement any decision on the disposal of the land made by the Executive.		

1. Determining the relevance to equality

What are the aims, objectives and purpose of the activity?	To dispose of surplus amenity land for a capital receipt in accordance with the Council’s Land and Property Disposals Policy.		
Is this a major activity that significantly affects how services or functions are delivered?	No	Who will benefit from this activity and how?	The Council will benefit from a capital receipt and ongoing revenue savings.
Does it relate to a function that has been identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?	No	Who are the stakeholders? Does the activity affect employees, service users or the wider community?	Councillors, officers, professional advisors, contractors, members of the public

Based on the above information, is the activity relevant to equality?

<p>Yes – continue to section 2</p> <p>No – please record your reasons why the activity is not relevant to equality</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>The activity does not have an impact or create barriers to any of the groups with protected characteristics.</p> <p>It is also difficult to assess any impact when no decision has been made on whether or not to dispose of the land and no planning permission has yet been granted therefore would be based on assumptions.</p>
--	--

2. Is the proposed activity accessible for all the protected groups listed below?
(Consider in what ways the activity might create difficulties or barriers to parts of the workforce, community or protected groups. How might one or more groups be excluded because of the activity?)

Protected groups	Yes	No	Evidence
Disability			
Race			
Gender			
Sexual orientation			
Age			
Religion or belief			
Transgender or transsexual			
Marriage and civil partnership			
Pregnancy or maternity			

3. Is it likely the proposed activity will have a negative impact on one or more protected groups?

Protected groups	Yes	No	Evidence
Disability			

Race			
Gender			
Sexual orientation			
Age			
Religion or belief			
Transgender or transsexual			
Marriage and civil partnership			
Pregnancy or maternity			
<p>4. What action can be taken to address any negative impact? What measures could be included to promote a positive impact? <i>(Consider whether it is possible to amend or change the activity due to the likely adverse impact whilst still delivering the objective. Is it possible to consider a different activity which still achieves the aims but avoids an adverse impact? Is an action plan required to reduce any actual or potential adverse impact?)</i></p>			
<p>5. What are the main sources of evidence that have been used to identify the likely impacts on the different protected groups? <i>(Use relevant quantitative and qualitative information that is available from sources such as previous EIA's, engagement with staff and service users, equality monitoring, complaints, comments, customer equality profiles, feedback, issues raised at previous consultations and known inequalities).</i></p>			
<p>6. Has any consultation been carried out (e.g. with employees, service users or the wider community)? Please provide details</p>			
<p>7. Is further consultation required as a result of any negative impact identified? If so, what groups do you intend to engage with and how?</p>			
<p>8. Conclusion of Equality Impact Assessment - please summarise your findings</p>			

Agenda item number: 5

Appendix 5

Name of person completing assessment: Damien Cannell
08/03/2022

Date:

Job title: Asset and Property Manager

Signature:

Senior manager name: Melissa Bromham
08/03/22

Date:

Deputy Head of Asset Management

Signature:

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 5
Appendix 6

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank