

GUILDFORD BOROUGH GREEN BELT AND COUNTRYSIDE STUDY

Volume V

On behalf of Guildford Borough Council

Pegasus
Planning
Group

PPG Ref : BNL.0287
April 2014

COPYRIGHT The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced
in whole or in part without the written consent of Pegasus Planning Group Ltd

Crown copyright. All rights reserved. Licence number 100042093

**GUILDFORD BOROUGH
GREEN BELT AND COUNTRYSIDE STUDY**

On behalf of Guildford Borough Council

Volume V

Pegasus Group
Abbey House
Grenville Place
Bracknell
Berks
RG12 1BP

Telephone: (01344) 667373
Facsimile: (01344) 667376

PPG Ref: BNL.0287

Date: April 2014

COPYRIGHT

The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of **Pegasus Group Ltd**

VOLUME V

	Page No:
16. INTRODUCTION	1
17. POTENTIAL EXPANSION OF SETTLEMENTS LOCATED IN ADJOINING BOROUGH WITHIN GUILDFORD BOROUGH	2
18. POTENTIAL EXPANSION OF VILLAGES LOCATED WITHIN OR BORDERING THE SURREY HILLS AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY (AONB)	3
19. FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THE COUNTRYSIDE BEYOND THE GREEN BELT (CBGB) RELATING TO LAND ADJOINING ASH AND TONGHAM	5
20. POTENTIAL EXPANSION OR REDEVELOPMENT OF MAJOR PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED SITES ACROSS GUILDFORD BOROUGH	6
21. POTENTIAL MAJOR EXPANSION OF THOSE VILLAGES WITHIN GUILDFORD BOROUGH RANKED HIGHEST IN GBC'S SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY	11
22. POTENTIAL CREATION OF A NEW SETTLEMENT AT WISLEY AIRFIELD	25
23. ESTIMATED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CAPACITIES	28
24. SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS	29
 VOLUME V APPENDICES	 51
Appendix IX: Potential Development Areas (PDAs) surrounding urban areas and villages map (updated Volume V)	52
Appendix X: Potential expansion and redevelopment of major previously developed sites and villages inseting map	53
Appendix XI: Potential major expansion of villages and inseting map	54
Appendix XII: GBC Settlement Hierarchy	55
Appendix XIII: Sustainability schedules and mapping for land adjoining villages on the boundary of Guildford Borough	56
Appendix XIV: Sustainability schedules and mapping for villages within the Surrey Hills AONB	57
Appendix XV: Sustainability schedules and mapping for land parcels within CBGB	58
Appendix XVI: Sustainability schedules and mapping for the major expansion of villages across the borough	59
Appendix XVII: Key for environmental designations and local plans mapping	60

16. INTRODUCTION

- 16.1 Following the publication of Volumes I to IV of the Green Belt and Countryside Study in July 2013, Guildford Borough Council (GBC) commissioned Pegasus Group to undertake a further Volume V of the Study in September 2013.
- 16.2 The instruction of Volume V was to further consider a number of issues within the designated Green Belt and the Countryside Beyond the Green Belt (CBGB) that had not been assessed within the previous Volumes I to IV.
- 16.3 The Study undertaken within Volume V is intended to supplement the previous findings of Volumes I to IV with the following additional issues addressed within separate sections:
- Section 17 - The potential expansion of settlements located in adjoining Boroughs within Guildford Borough
 - Section 18 - The potential expansion of villages located within or bordering the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) in particular Chilworth, Gomshall, Shalford and Shere which were proposed for insetting within Volume IV
 - Section 19 - Further consideration of the Countryside beyond the Green Belt (CBGB) relating to land adjoining Ash and Tongham
 - Section 20 - The potential expansion or redevelopment of major previously developed sites at various locations across Guildford Borough
 - Section 21 - The potential major expansion of villages within Guildford ranked highest in GBC's Settlement Hierarchy
 - Section 22 -The potential creation of a new settlement at Wisley Airfield to the north east of Guildford Borough
- 16.4 The estimated residential development capacities for Volume V Sections 17 to 22 have been provided within Section 23 and the summary conclusions are detailed within Section 24.

17. POTENTIAL EXPANSION OF SETTLEMENTS LOCATED IN ADJOINING BOROUGHS WITHIN GUILDFORD BOROUGH

17.1 This section of the Study details the methodology for the potential expansion of settlements located in adjoining boroughs within Guildford Borough, providing a focussed review of the following settlements:

- Bramley
- Farncombe
- Godalming
- Old Woking

17.2 Bramley, Farncombe and Godalming are located within Waverley District and Old Woking is located within Woking District on the boundary of the Guildford Borough administrative area. This section applies the methodology used within Volume III, which identified land for potential development within the surroundings of villages across the Borough and includes the following assessment stages:

- **Stage 1:** Assessing the environmental capacity of the land parcels surrounding villages within adjoining boroughs and the identification of PDAs considering the Green Belt purposes; and
- **Stage 2:** Assessing the sustainability credentials of the identified PDAs surrounding villages in adjoining boroughs within Guildford Borough.

17.3 The detailed methodology for Stages 1 and 2 for this section are contained within Volume III paragraphs 10.2 to 10.12. The findings for the potential expansion of settlements located in adjoining boroughs within Guildford Borough are provided on the following schedules and informed by the environmental constraints and walking distance plans in Appendix XIII:

18. POTENTIAL EXPANSION OF VILLAGES LOCATED WITHIN OR BORDERING THE SURREY HILLS AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY (AONB)

18.1 Previous Volumes of the Study have not considered the potential expansion of villages located within or bordering the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This is an area that the Council have requested is explored further with the focus directed towards those settlements within or adjoining the AONB that were recommended for inseting within Volume IV. These were:

- Chilworth
- Gomshall
- Shalford
- Shere

18.2 Chilworth and Shalford are located on the boundary of the Surrey Hills AONB and the villages of Gomshall and Shere are located within the AONB. As such, this section recognises that any PDAs considered ‘major development’ brought forward within the AONB would have to constitute ‘exceptional circumstances’ and be in the public interest, as advised within NPPF paragraph 116.

18.3 Precisely what constitutes a ‘major development’ in this context is not clear. The AONB Boards approach has been to suggest more than 10 dwellings represents ‘major development’ but this has not always been supported in decision making. As an example in 2013, the Secretary of State concluded that a scheme for 39 dwellings in the Cotswold AONB did not constitute major development when granting planning permission for it. Some Councils have advised that the definition is affected by many factors such as location, scale, context and design, implying that a scheme for ‘x’ number of dwellings in one situation will be classed as major development, but an application for the same number of dwellings in a different situation will not be.

18.4 Whether exceptional circumstances exist will depend not only on the site specific circumstances, but the wider background also. For example, if it is established that insufficient alternative appropriate locations can come forward to provide for the necessary level of housing for the borough, then it is possible that exceptional circumstances will exist subject to the assessment of other considerations put forward in paragraph 116 of the NPPF.

18.5 It is not within the remit of this Study to assess whether exceptional circumstances exist to enable major development, and there is clearly some uncertainty over what

should be classed as major development in such instances. As a result, any PDAs that are identified in this Study within the AONB would require closer scrutiny by the Council prior to any allocation being made. This would take account of the latest information at the time before conclusions can be drawn on, firstly whether exceptional circumstances need to be demonstrated, and secondly if they can be.

- 18.6 Notwithstanding the environmental constraints posed by the Surrey Hills AONB, this section also applies the methodology used within Volume III, Land Surrounding the Villages across the borough (Stages 1 and 2) as outlined above and detailed within Volume III paragraphs 10.2 to 10.12. It should be noted that Potential Development Areas (PDAs) have been previously identified within Volume III at Shalford E56-A and Chilworth E51-B located outside of the AONB. The PDA previously identified at E52-A has been omitted from the Study due to the location of the conservation area to the north east of Chilworth near the Tillingbourne Gunpowder works. These PDAs are further detailed within Volume III of the Study.
- 18.7 The findings for the potential expansion of villages located within and bordering the Surrey Hills AONB are provided on the following schedules:

19. FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THE COUNTRYSIDE BEYOND THE GREEN BELT (CBGB) RELATING TO LAND ADJOINING ASH AND TONGHAM

- 19.1 Volume II of the Study included a review of the environmental capacity and sustainability criteria associated with the land parcels surrounding Ash and Tongham including K2, K5, K6, K7, K8 and K9 within Countryside beyond the Green Belt (CBGB) local plan areas. Volume V of the Study provides a further detailed review of the remaining land parcels K1, K3, K4 and K10 also located within CBGB within the surroundings of Ash, Ash Vale, Tongham and the Blackwater Valley near the Rushmoor District administrative boundary to the west of Guildford Borough.
- 19.2 Within Volume II it was considered appropriate to assess the CBGB within the surroundings of Ash and Tongham in accordance with the same methodology used for the assessment of the Green Belt adjoining urban areas.
- 19.3 However, this resulted in some of the land parcels adjoining Ash and Tongham that scored highly in terms of Green Belt purposes, not being assessed on environmental or sustainability grounds. Given that such land parcels are not actually within the Green Belt, and to ensure a thorough review of all non-Green Belt land is undertaken before Green Belt sites need to be allocated for development, the Council requested further assessment of those CBGB land parcels that were not assessed in detail within Volume II.
- 19.4 Therefore, a further detailed review of CBGB land parcels K1, K3, K4 and K10 has now been undertaken to determine any further potential for PDAs within these CBGB land parcels. If the review of land parcels K1, K3, K4 and K10 identifies PDAs, a comparison can then be made with those land parcels identified for expansion to urban areas within Volume II.
- 19.5 This section applies the following stages based upon the Volume II assessments described within paragraphs 7.15 to 7.50:
- **Stage 1:** Assessing the environmental capacity constraints of the land parcel to accommodate appropriate development, and if capacity is found;
 - **Stage 2:** Assessing the sustainability credentials of the PDAs within land parcels of CBGB areas.
- 19.6 The findings for the further consideration of the Countryside beyond the Green Belt (CBGB) are provided on the following schedules:

20. POTENTIAL EXPANSION OR REDEVELOPMENT OF MAJOR PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED SITES ACROSS GUILDFORD BOROUGH

20.1 This section details the methodology for the review of the major previously developed sites at various locations across Guildford Borough, these being:

- Bisley Camp
- BTRE Vokes, Normandy
- The University of Law, Guildford
- HM Prison, Send
- Keogh Barracks
- Merrist Wood College
- Mount Browne Police Headquarters
- Peasmarsh Industrial Estate
- Pirbright Barracks
- Pirbright Institute
- RHS Wisley

20.2 GBC wish to consider whether these major previously developed sites within the borough offer the potential for redevelopment or expansion, in order to assist with the borough's future growth. The methodology for this section consists of three main stages to assess whether the sites should be inset from the Green Belt and their potential for redevelopment or expansion in Green Belt terms:

- **Stage 1:** *Does the major previously developed site possess open character, justifying its retention within the Green Belt, and resistance of notable future redevelopment or expansion?*
- **Stage 2:** *If the site does not contribute to the openness of the wider Green Belt - Do environmental constraints preclude or restrict the potential redevelopment or expansion of the major previously developed site?*
- **Stage 3:** *If the site does not contribute to the openness of the wider Green Belt and if environmental constraints do not preclude or restrict potential redevelopment and/or expansion - Does the major previously developed site and potential expansion exhibit defensible boundaries that would allow for inseting in accordance with the NPPF, taking account of Green Belt purposes 2 and 4?*

20.3 This section of the Study does not explore the desire or likelihood of the current occupiers of the major previously developed sites to relocate or redevelop their

existing premises, and as a result the following comments are not intended to reflect any intentions that existing occupiers may have.

Stage 1: Does the major previously developed site possess open character, justifying its retention within the Green Belt, and resistance of notable future redevelopment or expansion?

- 20.4 When assessing the appropriateness of the expansion or redevelopment of the major previously developed sites, it is considered necessary to assess whether the identified previously sites should remain ‘washed over’ or be inset within the Green Belt. Paragraph 85 of the NPPF advises that when defining Green Belt boundaries, local authorities should not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open, and if the major previously developed sites are of sufficient scale and do not possess an open character, it may not be necessary, or even possible, to keep them permanently open.
- 20.5 Paragraph 86 of the NPPF refers to villages within the Green Belt only being included within the Green Belt if the open character of the village makes an important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt. Whilst recognising that the major developed sites are not villages, it is considered reasonable to adopt a similar approach towards their potential for inclusion or insetting within the Green Belt. This approach is similar to that established within Section 13 of Volume IV.
- 20.6 As with the insetting of villages within Volume IV, if the major previously developed sites contribute little to the openness of the Green Belt at present, then it is unlikely to be necessary to keep the site within the Green Belt, and insetting would be justified and necessary in accordance with the NPPF.
- 20.7 The insetting of the major previously developed sites within the Green Belt would result in less policy restraint towards their growth and redevelopment proposals, albeit there would still be a need to adhere to other relevant planning policies and guidance controlling the development of such sites away from the urban areas.
- 20.8 If a major previously developed site is not considered appropriate for insetting and should remain ‘washed over’ within the Green Belt it would imply that the open character of the site makes an important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt. This would in turn imply that there is limited opportunity to redevelop, or expand the site, without detracting from the openness of the Green Belt. Redevelopment

proposals would therefore need to be assessed in the light of paragraph 89 (last bullet point) of the NPPF, which allows such redevelopment, subject to it not having a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt, and the purposes of including land within it, than the existing development.

20.9 In order to assess whether the major previously developed sites should be inset from the Green Belt, the proportion of the site that has been built upon will be calculated to help inform whether the site displays an open character. A potential Green Belt inset boundary would be indicated if the site does not generally display open character that contributes to the wider Green Belt. This potential Green Belt inset boundary would not necessarily follow the curtilage of buildings or development footprint within the site as these would need to conform with the Green Belt boundary principles and the formation of permanent defensible boundaries, as explained within the NPPF. The resulting appropriate boundary may therefore allow for the expansion or redevelopment within the site up to the identified inset boundary.

20.10 In addition to calculating the percentage of built coverage or development footprint of the site, consideration will also be given to its appearance and the site area when assessing the presence or absence of open character. There are inevitably lots of developments, including farm buildings and small hamlets that offer a notable element of development within the Green Belt but do not justify removal from it. As a result, sites will need to be of sufficient scale to justify being inset from the Green Belt. Such calculations are not conclusive with regards to the presence or absence of open character at each of the major previously developed sites, however, these provide an indication of openness supported by observations from site surveys.

Stage 2: If the site does not contribute to the openness of the wider Green Belt - Do environmental constraints preclude or restrict the potential redevelopment and/or expansion of the major previously developed site?

20.11 Following a review of the major previously developed sites in terms of open character, those sites considered not to contribute to the openness of the wider Green Belt are further reviewed in terms of environmental constraints and the potential for expansion or redevelopment. Those major previously developed sites that are considered to contribute to the openness of the wider Green Belt are not further reviewed within Stages 2 or 3 and are not recommended for potential inset within the Green Belt.

20.12 The environmental constraints are assessed in accordance with the Volume II and III methodologies with environmental designations and local plan policies identified and mapped for each major previously developed site considered suitable for inseting. The environmental constraints are listed within Volume II, Section 7, Table 5.4.

20.13 If a major previously developed site is constrained to such an extent by the Stage 2 environmental designations, local plan policies or physical constraints, that it is unlikely to be developed beyond the existing footprint, then it will still be appropriate to inset the site from the Green Belt (due to it being unnecessary to keep it permanently open). However, it will not be appropriate to identify any associated expansion areas for the site in these cases. Instead a new boundary will be drawn tightly around the existing buildings and development footprint, assuming they are likely to be defensible and permanent, within the Stage 3 assessment in accordance with paragraph 85 of the NPPF.

Stage 3: If the site does not contribute to the openness of the wider Green Belt and if environmental constraints do not preclude or restrict potential redevelopment or expansion - Does the major previously developed site and potential expansion exhibit defensible boundaries that would allow for inseting in accordance with the NPPF, taking account of Green Belt purposes 1, 2 and 4?

20.14 If the site does not possess open character and is not environmentally constrained, consideration is given to expansion areas, if this does not significantly detract from the purposes of the Green Belt in Stage 3, and if an appropriate Green Belt inseting boundary can be aligned around the particular expansion area.

20.15 With regards to the purposes of the Green Belt, it is acknowledged that the expansion of any major previously developed site would likely result in the encroachment of development in the countryside (Purpose 3) and would not encourage the recycling of urban land (Purpose 5). With regards to the prevention of urban sprawl of large built up areas (Purpose 1), it is considered that the two barracks sites are the only sites of sufficient scale to be classed as such. This leaves two of the five Green Belt purposes, as set out within paragraph 80 of the NPPF, which have the potential to score differently between the major previously developed sites. These are:

- To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another (Purpose 2); and

-
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns (Purpose 4).

20.16 The impact of any potential expansion or redevelopment upon Green Belt Purposes 2 and 4 is therefore reviewed in Stage 3. If it is considered likely that an expansion will clearly result in the merging of settlements, or have an adverse impact upon the settings and special character of historic towns, then the expansion area will be discounted from further consideration within the Study. A potential Green Belt inset boundary would be indicated for the major previously developed site if the principles of paragraph 85 of the NPPF could be accommodated, in particular the need to follow physical features that are recognisable and likely to be permanent.

20.17 The findings for the potential expansion or redevelopment of the major previously developed sites across Guildford Borough are provided on the following schedules and mapping:

21. POTENTIAL MAJOR EXPANSION OF THOSE VILLAGES WITHIN GUILDFORD BOROUGH RANKED HIGHEST IN GBC'S SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY

21.1 This section reviews the potential major expansion of villages within Guildford Borough ranked highest in sustainability terms within the GBCs Settlement Hierarchy (Appendix XII). The villages that have been assessed for potential major expansion therefore include:

- Chilworth
- East Horsley
- Fairlands
- Normandy and Flexford
- Pirbright
- Ripley
- Send
- Send Marsh and Burntcommon
- Shalford
- Wood Street Village

21.2 Volumes II and III of the Study sought to identify the locations of Potential Development Areas (PDAs) adjoining the urban areas of Guildford, Ash and Tongham and for the villages across the borough that are not located within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). As a further requirement of Volume V, GBC have requested that further consideration be given to the potential major expansion of villages that were ranked highest within GBCs Settlement Hierarchy defined as a semi-urban village (Category 2) or a large village (Category 3).

21.3 If Potential Major Development Areas (PMDAs) are found this would then enable an alternative or additional option in addressing the Council's future growth requirements within the borough. The introduction of major expansions and entirely new settlements alongside existing villages and towns has contributed greatly to accommodate the growth of the Country during the last Century and beyond. Such an approach has received renewed impetus and interest following the inclusion of paragraph 52 within the NPPF which reads as follows:

“The supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved by planning for large scale development, such as new settlements or extensions to existing

villages and towns that follow the principles of Garden Cities. Working with the support of their communities, local planning authorities should consider whether such opportunities provide the best way of achieving sustainable development. In doing so, they should consider whether it is appropriate to establish Green Belt around or adjoining any such new development.”

- 21.4 The subsequent success of major expansions to existing villages or new settlements will depend upon many factors including the precise uses to be incorporated, the overall layout of such developments, and detailed settlement design. None of these matters require further consideration as part of this Study, and will be subject to specific design briefs to be prepared, and consulted on, in advance of any planning applications being submitted. It is, however, necessary for this Study to give consideration to the likely scale of any new village expansion, the population growth and land take requirements, environmental constraints, sustainability considerations and the overall effect of the village expansion on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt. Such an approach will help ensure the requirements of paragraph 52 of the NPPF are achieved.
- 21.5 In order to identify approximate land take or coverage areas necessary to enable a sustainable development for such a major village expansion or new settlement, consideration will need to be given to the potential for population growth, the number and density of dwellings to be introduced, the type and scale of facilities serving the existing and potential community, and the amount of open space to be provided. In order to give guidance on such matters and to provide further background on the topic, a number of relevant settlement guidance documents are considered below.

Published Guidance on Settlement Expansion

- 21.6 This section considers the following guidance with regards to the identification of Potential Major Developments Areas (PMDAs) within the surroundings of villages and new settlements:
- Best Practice in Urban Extensions and New Settlements – TCPA, 2007
 - PPS: Eco Towns – a supplement to PPS1
 - The Rural Challenge – The Rural Coalition, 2010
 - Urban Design Compendium (2) – English Partnerships, Housing Corporation

- Creating Garden Cities and Suburbs Today – TCPA, 2012

21.7 Whilst only one of these guidance documents was published following the release of the NPPF in March 2012, they are all considered to give careful consideration to the requirements of sustainable development, and justify consideration in preparing the methodology for the identification of major village expansions and new settlements across Guildford Borough.

Best Practice in Urban Extensions and New Settlements – TCPA, 2007

21.8 While setting out the historical background to such forms of development, the guidance refers to previously used definitions of any new settlement that is **“a freestanding settlement, promoted by private and/or public sector interest, where the completed new development – of whatever size – constitutes 50% or more of the total size of the settlement, measured in terms of population/dwellings.”**

21.9 When commenting on the lessons learnt with regards to the provision of new settlements, the following factors are considered to be important:

- The need to provide the widest selection of housing tenures;
- The vital importance of ensuring that there is ample open ground;
- The essential requirement to incorporate communal buildings and facilities to match the scale of the settlement; and
- To ensure that transport serves rather than dictates the form of settlement, to allow organic growth which is sustainable and served by a variety of good quality public transport modes.

21.10 The guidance refers to a number of case studies, including one at Dickens Heath, Solihull which is considered relevant due to its mid-size village scale and Green Belt location. The case study referred to 1,672 dwellings being introduced to the village of Dickens Heath, which when completed will result in a population of approximately 4,000. The village expansion resulted in convenience shops, community facilities and a new primary school being introduced, with the study advising that these have been built.

21.11 The Dickens Heath case study concludes that a sense of community cohesion has been established, as borne out in the range of retail, restaurant and commercial uses

in the village centre. It highlights that there are issues to be resolved related to car parking and the inadequate provision of public transportation. Discussions with the Planning Officers at Solihull Council have confirmed that the expansion of the village is now almost complete and that the proposed range of community facilities are all in operation.

21.12 The Dickens Heath case study shows that securing public transport links will be a major factor in ensuring that such places involving a new or expanded smaller settlement that relies upon a larger neighbour for high level functions will be able to advance the cause of reduced carbon emissions.

21.13 The Dickens Heath case study also refers to the new settlements needing to be of a sufficient size to be regarded as a sustainable community. Reference is made to such a place needing to be large enough to support a secondary school, with the number of homes being at least 4,000. However, this does appear to conflict with the findings of the Dickens Heath case study, which provides a successful example of a new small scale settlement based on a resulting population of approximately 4,000.

PPS: Eco Towns – A Supplement to PPS1

21.14 The above document was prepared to assist Local Authorities in the preparation of Local Development Documents and in determining planning applications for eco town proposals. The standards set out within this statement were intended to ensure Eco Towns were examples of good practice, although the subsequent take up and approval of such projects was notably less than initially envisaged, possibly due to the standards required. Whilst not directly applicable to potential new settlements and expansions within Guildford Borough, some of the content is considered helpful for the identification of future allocations.

21.15 The PPS makes reference to the locations for Eco Towns needing to be able to provide for a minimum of 5,000 homes in order to exploit the objectives for Eco Towns. This included taking advantage of significant economies of scale and increases in land value to deliver new technology and infrastructure.

21.16 The PPS also refers to locations for Eco Towns offering capacity for public transport links and other sustainable access to higher order centres and for consideration to be given to the proximity to existing and planned employment opportunities. With regards to the latter, job creation in the Eco Town itself is supported, with the

suggestion that one employment opportunity should be easily reached by walking, cycling, and/or public transport, for each new dwelling introduced.

- 21.17 Housing is encouraged to be within a ten minute walk of a frequent public transport service and other neighbourhood services, whilst specific reference is made to there being a maximum walking distance of 800 metres to the nearest primary school.

The Rural Challenge - The Rural Coalition, 2010

- 21.18 The above document covers many issues relating to rural communities. Whilst not focussing upon the issue of major village expansions, it does contain some comments of relevance.

- 21.19 Reference is made to the Eco Towns PPS, with the suggestion that this should be transformed into a code for development of sustainable communities, applicable to all types of growth and not just a handful of standalone new Eco Towns. Reference is made to a meaningful sustainable community featuring housing, community facilities, transport links, private gardens and community green spaces as well as spaces for local businesses.

- 21.20 The report advises that ***“only if people in rural communities have ready access to local schools, local jobs, local shops and pubs and homes which are affordable will they and their children thrive, and will the nation meet its environmental and economic needs.”***

Urban Design Compendium (2) - English Partnerships, Housing Corporation 2007

- 21.21 The above document refers to many elements of design and includes reference to mixed use areas, some of the content of which is helpful in assessing the likely necessary scale of development in order for it to offer such mixed use provision. Reference is made to efforts to re-vitalise the village centre at Tarporley in Cheshire, which had suffered a decline in the quality and number of amenities in the village during the 1980s and 90s. The success of revitalising the village centre through associated new developments across the village has helped sustain original facilities and attract new ones, making it one of the most desirable locations to live in Cheshire. The village has a population of just under 3,000.

- 21.22 The Urban Design Compendium (2) includes a table on page 82 that sets out the thresholds for viability for a number of key facilities as shown below:

Uses & Facilities	Illustrative Catchments (Population)	Indicative Site Area (ha)
Education		
Nursery School	2,000	0.5
Primary School (two-form entry)	4,000	0.9*
Health and Community		
Doctors' Surgery	4,000	0.08
Pharmacy	5,000	0.01
Community Centre	4,000	1
Retail		
Neighbourhood Centre		0.15
Local Centre		0.07
Pub	6,000	0.06
Post Office	5,000	0.06
Sport or Leisure Centre	24,000	1.00

(*Subsequent guidance on school development suggests a site of 2-3ha is likely to be required)

21.23 The Urban Design Compendium (2) refers to the need for convenience shops and services to be within a five to ten minute walk (400 to 800 metres) of the population with the following key messages in terms of mixed use areas:

- The mix of uses is required to make successful places;
- The mix of uses will attract a mix of users to contribute to vitality and
- Buildings and streets must be adaptable.

21.24 When commenting upon density, the Urban Design Compendium (2) advises that higher densities can help create successful places by supporting local businesses, services and facilities and that higher density should not automatically mean building tall, because good design can enable high densities to be achieved through a range of building and layout types.

Creating Garden Cities & Suburbs Today – TCPA, 2012

21.25 The purpose of this report is to highlight ways in which sustainable new communities can be delivered through Garden City principles. This followed reference to such principles in the NPPF published slightly earlier in 2012. The Garden City principles that might influence the location, scale and layout of a new settlement or expansion includes:

- A strong local jobs offer in the Garden City itself with a variety of employment opportunities within easy commuting distance of homes;
- Generous green space linked to the wider natural environment;
- Opportunities for residents to grow their own food;
- Access to strong local cultural, recreational and shopping facilities in walkable neighbourhoods; and
- Integrated and accessible transport systems.

21.26 The case for new Garden Cities, suburbs or villages is put forward in three parts:

- First, large scale new communities are an important part of the portfolio of solutions that will be essential in tackling today's acute housing shortage;
- Secondly, well planned communities provide an opportunity to provide high quality sustainable places, allowing the highest sustainability standards, economies of scale, and better use of infrastructure; and
- Thirdly, experience from the Garden Cities and New Towns shows that large scale new developments can be good for business and society.

21.27 When referring to the potential size of new settlements, reference is made to Ebenezer Howard's vision of Garden Cities accommodating around 30,000 people or 10 – 15,000 homes. It is however confirmed that Garden City principles can be applied to smaller developments, such as Garden Suburbs and model villages. The report advises that:

“Ultimately, in the context of localism it will be for local authorities, developers and communities to work together to decide on the most suitable location and the size needed to provide a sustainable community that creates jobs, meets local housing need, and finances and supports the necessary hard and soft infrastructure required to enable a community to thrive.”

21.28 When commenting on the supporting infrastructure, the report refers to the local transport network being of particular importance. Reference is also made to at least 40% of a new community's total area being allocated green space, of which at least half should be public and should consist of a network of well-managed, high quality green open spaces linked to the wider countryside.

Summary of Published Documents

21.29 Whilst the documents referred to above have approached the issue of new and expanded settlements from slightly different directions, there are considered to be a number of relevant general findings that consideration should be given to within the Study. In order to represent a sustainable development, as required by the NPPF, large expansions to existing villages, or an entirely new village, should result in a settlement that benefits from:

- A mix of uses, including residential, employment, community and retail;
- A critical mass of population to support the above uses, likely to be at least 4,000;
- A significant proportion of open space (40%); and
- Connections to the wider public transport network.

Methodology

21.30 The methodology for testing the appropriateness of the major expansion of villages applies the following stages or 'sieving process' based upon the NPPF sustainable development criteria identified above, alongside consideration of the impacts upon the purposes and openness of the Green Belt:

- **Stage 1:** Based upon the land take requirement, does the environmental capacity allow for a major expansion of the village that would enable a 'critical mass' population of at least 4000 being achieved, which is considered to be required to achieve Garden City principles as referred to in the NPPF?
- **Stage 2:** If capacity is demonstrated in Stage 1, what are the existing and potential sustainability credentials and does the Potential Major Development Area (PMDA) achieve at least two of the three sustainable development considerations below?

-
- *Will the village expansion provide opportunities for good public transport connections to the wider settlements within Guildford Borough and beyond?*
 - *Will the village expansion result in a village with a mix of uses, including residential, employment, community and retail?*
 - *Will the village expansion provide the opportunity for new facilities within the particular settlement, thereby enhancing the existing sustainability credentials of the settlement?*
- **Stage 3:** If capacity is demonstrated within Stages 1 and 2 – does the Potential Major Development Area (PMDA) exhibit defensible boundaries that would allow for the inseting of the village expansion in accordance with the NPPF? What impact would development of the PMDA have upon the purposes and openness of the Green Belt across the borough?
 - **Stage 4:** In summary, would it be appropriate to recommend a major expansion within the surroundings of the particular village given the guidance on large scale development and the Green Belt within the NPPF?

21.31 This section of the Study does not explore the desire, likelihood or intention of the current landowners surrounding the villages to develop any of the identified PMDA sites identified within Guildford Borough. The Council will need to explore the availability of such sites prior to any recommended allocation being made for development.

21.32 Further details regarding Stages 1 to 4 of the major village expansion methodology are outlined below:

Stage 1: Based upon the land take requirement, does the environmental capacity allow for a major expansion of the village that would enable a ‘critical mass’ population of at least 4000 being achieved, which is considered to be required to achieve Garden City principles as referred to in the NPPF?

21.33 The ability of a particular village to accommodate major expansion in terms of land take and environmental capacity is assessed within Stage 1. The current population of each village has been identified from the GBC Settlement Hierarchy within Appendix XII to determine the population target requirement of 4000 or the ‘critical mass’ for sustainable development.

21.34 The village expansion land take is calculated within Stage 1 based upon the population growth and mixed use sustainable development requirements. As part of Stage 1 and assessing how much land is likely to be necessary to accommodate a sustainable community in the region of 4,000 population, the following assumptions have been made:

- Residential development should make up approximately 50% of the land take area of the identified PMDA. The residential land take would be calculated on the basis of 30 dwellings per hectare with an average household size of 2.4 people to determine the population growth at the village;
- Open space should make up approximately 40% of the land take area in accordance with new settlement guidelines. This can include Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and public open space within the PMDA; and
- Village infrastructure such as roads and attenuation ponds together with other additional facilities including employment and a local centre with shops, food and drink outlets, primary school and nursery, would make up approximately 10% of the land take area depending on which facilities are applicable to the major expansion. If the village expansion does not include certain facilities due to scale, other uses such as housing may have increased capacity within the PMDA.

21.35 It is recognised that the exact breakdown of areas to be developed would evolve through the design process of the village expansion and may differ from those set out above. However, for the purposes of the Stage 1 assessment, the above land take percentages have been applied to the identified PMDAs.

21.36 Once the land take requirement has been calculated to bring the village population up to the 'critical mass' of 4000 the village surroundings are reviewed in terms environmental capacity to accommodate the land take area. The environmental capacity analysis has been undertaken in accordance with the methodology outlined within Volume III paragraphs 10.4 to 10.7 for PDAs surrounding villages.

21.37 Those villages that are able to accommodate the calculated land take requirements within the environmental constraints present are identified as PMDAs and are further assessed within Stages 2 and 3 of the methodology. Those villages that are not able

to accommodate the identified land take area within the environmental constraints present are not further considered within Stages 2 and 3 and a major village expansion is not considered appropriate within the Stage 4 summary.

Stage 2: Assessment of village expansion sustainability credentials

21.38 If the village in question is sufficiently able to accommodate the land take requirements within the environmental constraints present within Stage 1, the identified PMDAs are further assessed with regards to the sustainable development criteria as identified within the new settlement guidance:

- *Will the village expansion provide opportunities for good public transport connections to the wider settlements within Guildford Borough and beyond?*
- *Will the village expansion result in a village with a mix of uses, including residential, employment, community and retail?*

21.39 In addition, for the purposes of this exercise, it is considered relevant to assess how the sustainability credentials of the host village are likely to be affected by the PMDA. Whilst the above considerations will ensure that the new development is introduced in a manner that provides a sustainable environment for the new population, it is also considered relevant to take account of whether additional facilities and services will benefit the existing community. This relates to the requirement of the NPPF at paragraph 84, for the review of Green Belt boundaries to promote sustainable patterns of development. As a result the following consideration has been identified:

- *Will the village expansion provide the opportunity for new facilities within the particular settlement, thereby enhancing the existing sustainability credentials of the settlement?*

21.40 If the identified PMDA at a particular village supports at least two of the sustainable development criteria above, the PMDA is further considered with regards to impacts on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt within Stage 3. If the identified PMDA at a particular village supports one or none of the sustainable development criteria above, then the PMDA would not be considered within Stage 3 or be considered appropriate for a major village expansion within the Stage 4 summary.

21.41 As a comparative exercise, sustainability assessments for each of the identified PMDAs have been undertaken in relation to existing facilities in accordance with the methodology outlined within Volume III paragraphs 10.8 to 10.12. However, due to the scale of village expansions being considered, it is reasonable to assume that new

facilities will be introduced alongside residential development, and as referred to above, this will be necessary in order to create a sustainable form of development.

21.42 Stage 2 of the methodology therefore also reviews the potential sustainability credentials of the identified PMDAs based upon assumed facilities that could be delivered as part of the residential development and the calculated population growth within the village. This will be influenced by both the scale of the proposed development and the existing facilities that already serve the community. The GBC Settlement Hierarchy (Appendix XII) has been used to inform what facilities are present within the villages.

Stage 3: If capacity is demonstrated within Stages 1 and 2 – does the Potential Major Development Area (PMDA) exhibit defensible boundaries that would allow for the inseting of the village expansion in accordance with the NPPF? What impact would development of the PMDA have upon the purposes and openness of the Green Belt across the borough?

21.43 Stage 3 assesses the potential impact of the identified PMDA on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt and whether the PMDA exhibits defensible boundaries that would allow for Green Belt inseting, if recommended as a major village expansion. Stage 3 would only be progressed if a PMDA could be identified in terms of the land take requirement and environmental constraints within Stage 1, and at least two of the sustainability considerations within Stage 2 are achieved by the PMDA in question.

21.44 Stage 3 includes a more detailed consideration of the purposes and openness of the Green Belt as set out within the NPPF. With regards to the Green Belt purposes, it is acknowledged that the major expansion of any village would likely result in the encroachment of development into the countryside (Purpose 3) and would not encourage the recycling of urban land (Purpose 5). Due to the scale of the existing villages assessed in this section, they have all been classed as large built up areas within the Green Belt purposes assessment and as a result major expansion of all of them would represent sprawl when assessed against Purpose 1. Therefore, only two of the five Green Belt purposes, as set out within paragraph 80 of the NPPF, have the potential to score differently between all the identified PMDAs surrounding villages. These are:

- To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another (Purpose 2); and

- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns (Purpose 4).

21.45 The boundaries of the PMDAs are defined in accordance with NPPF paragraph 85 that states that local planning authorities should, “*define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.*” The locations of defensible boundaries commonly influence the degree of openness within the surroundings of villages across the Green Belt. Following the identification of defensible boundaries within Stage 3 an assessment on the effects on the openness of the Green Belt has been undertaken for the PMDAs. If impacts on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt are likely to result from the major village expansion, further commentary is provided in Stage 3 on potential mitigation measures to reduce the identified Green Belt impacts.

Stage 4: In summary, would it be appropriate to recommend a major expansion within the surroundings of the particular village given the guidance on large scale development and the Green Belt in the NPPF?

21.46 Stage 4 of the methodology provides a summary on whether the village can appropriately accommodate a PMDA and whether the sustainability credentials justify the impact upon the Green Belt across the borough. The summary for each village within Stage 4 reviews the balance between the potential harm to the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, with the sustainability credentials that could be brought forward through the PMDA and the population expansion at the village in question.

21.47 If the sustainability credentials of the PMDA are considered to outweigh the potential harm to the openness and purposes of the Green Belt considering potential mitigation measures, the PMDA is recommended as a major village expansion within the Study. Alternatively, if the harm to the purposes and openness of the Green Belt is considered to outweigh the sustainability credentials, then the identified PMDA is not recommended for inclusion as a major village expansion within the Study. The findings for the potential major expansion of villages are provided on the following schedules for:

- Chilworth - 1,852 population and 4th in sustainability ranking within Figure 2 of GBCs Settlement Hierarchy;
- East Horsley - 3,785 population and 3rd in sustainability ranking;
- Fairlands - 1,412 population and 6th in sustainability ranking;
- Normandy and Flexford - 1,784 population and 10th in sustainability ranking;

-
- Pirbright - 1,493 population and 9th in sustainability ranking;
 - Ripley - 1,620 population and 6th in sustainability ranking;
 - Send - 2,314 population and 5th in sustainability ranking;
 - Send Marsh and Burntcommon - 1,931 population and 20th in sustainability ranking;
 - Shalford - 2,439 population and 6th in sustainability ranking; and
 - Wood Street Village - 1,619 population and 13th in sustainability ranking.

22. POTENTIAL CREATION OF A NEW SETTLEMENT AT WISLEY AIRFIELD

- 22.1 A focussed assessment of the land at Wisley Airfield has been requested by GBC due to the known availability of the site to allow for the creation of a new settlement. This section has been included within Volume V to review Wisley Airfield as a Potential Major Development Area (PMDA) both in terms of the effects on the Green Belt and its appropriateness as a potential new settlement.
- 22.2 As explained in Section 20 above and with reference to published new settlement guidance on the matter, it is considered that a population level in the region of 4,000 has the potential to support notable facilities and services and, in turn, offer a sustainable form of development. Such a scale of development for a new settlement would therefore offer the potential for it to adhere to the sustainable development requirements of the NPPF, along with the Garden City principles referred to within paragraph 52 of the NPPF.
- 22.3 The methodology for assessing a potential new settlement at Wisley Airfield therefore attempts to establish whether a settlement of 4,000 population can be appropriately accommodated at the site, before turning to assess how sustainable it might be, and the impact of such development on the Green Belt. It includes the following stages or 'sieving process' to identify the appropriateness of a new settlement:
- **Stage 1:** Assessing the environmental capacity of the land at Wisley Airfield – how much developable land is available given the environmental constraints? This will be undertaken in the same manner as the environmental capacity analysis previously undertaken within the Study, details of which are set out in paragraphs 7.46 to 7.50 within Volume II and paragraphs 10.4 to 10.7 of Volume III.
 - **Stage 2:** Assessing the potential sustainability credentials of a new settlement at Wisley Airfield. This requires assumptions on the potential population that could be accommodated and the resulting facilities that could be supported including reference to potential public transport connections;
 - **Stage 3:** Assessing the potential sustainability scoring for a new settlement at Wisley Airfield with the potential facilities that could be supported through population growth;
 - **Stage 4:** How will the required scale of development impact upon the purposes and openness of the Green Belt? Does the site exhibit defensible boundaries that would allow for the inseting of a PMDA in accordance with the NPPF?

-
- **Stage 5:** Summary conclusion on whether Wisley Airfield offers an appropriate location for a new settlement within Guildford Borough.
- 22.4 The detailed methodology for Stages 1 and 2 for this section of the Study are contained within Volume III paragraphs 10.2 to 10.12.
- 22.5 As part of Stage 2 and assessing how much land is likely to be necessary to accommodate a sustainable community in the region of 4,000 population, the following assumptions have been made:
- Residential development should make up approximately 50% of the site and will be undertaken at an average of 30 dwellings per hectare, thereby being considerate of context, whilst making efficient use of land. Given an average household size of 2.4 people, it would require 1,666 dwellings to accommodate a population of approximately 4,000. If 1,666 dwellings were built at a density of 30dph, it would require 55.5 hectares.
 - Open space should make up approximately 40% of the site, in accordance with best practice. This can include Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and public open space.
 - Infrastructure and new facilities would comprise approximately 10% of the site including main roads, local centre, primary school, nursery, local centre, shops, food and drink units, Post Office, community hall and healthcare facilities and employment provisions.
- 22.6 It is recognised that the exact breakdown of areas to be developed would evolve through the design process of any new settlement and may differ from those set out above.
- 22.7 It is not considered of value to undertake a sustainability assessment based upon existing facilities at Wisley Airfield as these are generally absent and would be provided through the new settlement itself. The site will score very poorly at present as it contains no existing facilities or services as opposed to the potential major village expansions. However, a new potential settlement at Wisley Airfield could comprise sustainable development if new facilities can be brought forward through a development. A new settlement at Wisley Airfield will only proceed if it includes new

services and facilities, and as a result it is considered reasonable and necessary to allow for these, before sustainability assumptions can be made.

- 22.8 Stage 4 will include more detailed consideration of the purposes and openness of the Green Belt as set out in the NPPF. The methodology relating to how the land parcels contribute to the purposes of the Green Belt is set out in paragraphs 7.7 to 7.14 of Volume II and paragraphs 2.1 to 2.6 of the Volume II Addendum.
- 22.9 Assessment of the potential boundaries of the new settlement at Wisley Airfield, if identifiable in terms of environmental capacity and sustainability credentials, will also be undertaken in Stage 4. Any potential new settlement boundaries need to be assessed in accordance with NPPF paragraph 85 that states local planning authorities should, ***“define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.”***
- 22.10 The findings for the potential creation of a new settlement at Wisley Airfield are provided on the following schedule:

23. ESTIMATED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CAPACITIES

23.1 The estimated residential capacity of the identified PDAs or PMDAs has been undertaken for the separate sections of Volume V on the following schedules:

- Section 17 - The potential expansion of settlements located in adjoining Boroughs within Guildford Borough
- Section 18 - The potential expansion of villages located within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) in particular Chilworth, Gomshall, Shalford and Shere which were proposed for inseting within Volume IV
- Section 19 - Further consideration of the Countryside Beyond the Green Belt (CBGB) relating to land adjoining Ash and Tongham
- Section 21 - The potential major expansion of villages within Guildford ranked highest in GBC's Settlement Hierarchy
- Section 22 - The potential creation of a new settlement at Wisley Airfield to the north east of Guildford Borough

23.2 The estimated residential capacity has not been calculated for Section 20 - the potential expansion or redevelopment of major previously developed sites. This is due to their area either not being sufficient in scale to enable a sustainable form of development to come forward, or environmental constraints resisting additional residential development within the site.

Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study - Estimated Development Capacity Schedule (April 2014)					
Village PDAs - Estimated Development Capacity (Updated Volume V)					
LP - PDA	Identified Potential Development Area within LP (ha)	Approx Constrained Land Excluded from PDA Area (ha)	Remaining land within PDA	Area within PDA for residential development (ha)	Estimated Residential Capacity (dwelling numbers)
East Horsley and West Horsley (North)					
C14 - A	6.10	0.00	6.10	3.81	114
C14 - B	8.70	0.00	8.70	5.44	163
C14 - C	8.40	1.20	7.20	4.50	135
C14 - D	6.50	0.00	6.50	4.06	122
					534
West Horsley (South)					
E5 - A	2.00	0.10	1.90	1.57	47
E4 - B	3.00	0.00	3.00	1.87	56
D6 - C	9.80	0.00	9.80	6.13	184
					287
Send					
B16 - A	2.50	0.00	2.50	1.56	47
B10 - B	1.90	0.20	1.70	1.40	42
B16 - C	6.80	0.00	6.80	4.25	128
					217
Ripley					
B16 - A	10.40	0.00	10.40	6.50	195
					195
Shalford					
E56 - A	9.30	0.00	9.30	5.81	174
					174
Effingham					
D10 - A	17.00	1.10	15.90	9.94	298
E9 - B	6.00	0.00	6.00	3.75	113
					411

Residential Development Capacity: -
0 - 0.4ha - 100% area x 30 dph
0.4ha - 2ha - 82.5% area x 30 dph
2ha - 35ha - 62.5% area x 30 dph
35ha + 50% area x 30 dph

Pirbright					
J7 - A	0.80	0.00	0.80	0.66	20
J7 - B**	2.20	0.00	2.20	1.37	41
					61
Fairlands					
H8 - A	14.40	0.00	14.40	9.00	270
H8 - B	13.26	0.00	13.26	8.28	248
H8 - C	13.62	0.00	13.62	8.51	255
					773
Normandy					
J16 - A	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.83	25
J16 - B	1.30	0.00	1.30	1.07	32
H12 - C	2.80	0.00	2.80	1.75	53
H16 - D	3.40	0.00	3.40	2.13	64
					174
Wood Street Village					
H7 - A	4.70	0.00	4.70	2.94	88
H7 - B	5.00	0.00	5.00	3.13	94
					182
West Clandon (North and South)					
D2 - A	8.20	0.00	8.20	5.13	154
D2 - B	5.70	0.06	5.64	3.53	106
C5 - C	14.30	1.20	13.10	8.19	246
					506
Send Marsh and Burntcommon					
B16 - A	2.50	0.00	2.50	1.56	47
B16 - B	2.60	0.00	2.60	1.63	49
B15 - C	6.20	0.00	6.20	3.88	116
B13 - D	10.68	0.00	10.68	6.67	200
					412

Residential Development Capacity: -
0 - 0.4ha - 100% area x 30 dph
0.4ha - 2ha - 82.5% area x 30 dph
2ha - 35ha - 62.5% area x 30 dph
35ha + 50% area x 30 dph

Flexford					
H15 - A	6.90	0.80	6.10	3.81	114
H10 - B	5.70	0.00	5.70	3.56	107
H12 - C	14.90	0.00	14.90	9.31	279
H11 - D	2.00	0.00	2.00	1.65	50
					550
Ockham					
C18 - A	2.10	0.00	2.10	1.31	39
C18 - B	1.40	0.00	1.40	1.15	35
					74
Chilworth					
E51 - B	5.00	0.00	5.00	3.13	94
					94
Peasmarsh					
F3 - A	6.80	0.00	6.80	4.25	128
					128
Farncombe					
F6 - A*	9.53	2.38	7.15	4.47	134
F6 - B*	6.29	1.57	4.72	2.95	89
					223
Gomshall					
E14 - A*	2.60	0.26	2.34	1.46	44
					44
Shere					
E28-A*	3.40	0.17	3.23	2.02	61
					61
Total					5100

Residential Development Capacity: -
0 - 0.4ha - 100% area x 30 dph
0.4ha - 2ha - 82.5% area x 30 dph
2ha - 35ha - 62.5% area x 30 dph
35ha + 50% area x 30 dph

Volume V - Estimated Residential Development Capacity fro Urban Areas (Updated April 2014)					
Guildford Urban Area					
LP	Identified Potential Development Area within LP (ha)	Approx Constrained Land Excluded from PDA Area (ha)	Remaining land within PDA	Area within PDA for residential development (ha)	Estimated Residential Capacity (dwelling numbers)
A1**	4.99	1.60	3.39	2.12	85
A4**	7.79	0.00	7.79	4.86	195
C1	36.82	3.20	33.62	21.01	840
C2	33.85	2.20	31.65	19.78	791
E1	50.66	0.00	50.66	25.33	1013
H1*	30.70	1.20	29.50	18.44	738
H2	74.80	15.00	59.80	29.90	1196
J1	27.70	2.70	25.00	15.63	625
J3**	19.10	9.70	9.40	5.88	235
Total (Guildford)					5718
Ash and Tongham Urban Area					
LP	Identified Potential Development Area within LP (ha)	Approx Constrained Land Excluded from PDA Area (ha)	Remaining land within PDA	Area within PDA for residential development (ha)	Estimated Residential Capacity (dwelling numbers)
K2	22.20	0.00	22.20	13.87	555
K3	24.10	1.21	22.89	14.31	572
K5	10.20	0.00	10.20	6.38	255
K6	6.50	0.00	6.50	4.06	162
K7	27.40	0.00	27.40	17.16	685
K8	14.19	0.00	17.00	10.63	425
K9	36.50	4.60	31.90	19.93	798
Total (Ash and Tongham)					3452
Total - Urban Areas					9170
* Partly located within Surrey Hills AONB					
**Located within Thames Basin Heath SPA 0-400 metre buffer					

Residential Development Capacity: -
0 - 0.4ha - 100% area x 30 dph
0.4ha - 2ha - 82.5% area x 30 dph
2ha - 35ha - 62.5% area x 30 dph
35ha + 50% area x 30 dph

Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study - Estimated Residential Development Capacity (April 2014)								
Potential Major Expansion of Villages - PMDAs								
Estimated Development Capacity								
LP - PMDA	Identified Potential Major Development Area (PMDA) within LP (ha)	Estimated Residential Capacity (50% of PMDA in ha)	Estimated Number of Residential Dwellings (based on 30 dph)	Estimated Open Space (40% of PMDA in ha)	Estimated Infrastructure and facilities (10% of PMDA in ha)	Existing Village Population	Village Population Growth (2.4 persons per dwelling)	Total Village Population (including major expansion)
Normandy/Flexford								
H12 - A	72.2	36.1	1083	28.9	7.2	1784	2599	4383
Sendmarsh and Burntcommon								
B14 - A	37.4	18.7	561	14.96	3.74	1931	1346	4357
B12/B13 - B	30.0	15.0	450	12	3	1931	1080	
Send								
B16 - A	41.1	20.55	617	16.44	4.11	2314	1481	3795
Total			2711				6506	12535

Residential Development Capacity:-
0 - 0.4ha - 100% area x 30 dph
0.4ha - 2ha - 82.5% area x 30 dph
2ha - 35ha - 62.5% area x 30 dph
35ha + 50% area x 30 dph

Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study - Estimated Residential Development Capacity (April 2014)						
Potential Creation of a New Settlement at Wisley Airfield to the north east of Guildford Borough						
Estimated Development Capacity						
LP - PMDA	Identified Potential Major Development Area (PMDA) within LP (ha)	Estimated Residential Capacity (50% of PMDA in ha)	Estimated Number of Residential Dwellings (based on 30 dph)	Estimated Open Space (40% of PMDA partly within SPA buffer)	Estimated Infrastructure and facilities (10% of PMDA in ha)	New Settlement Population (2.4 persons per dwelling)
Wisley Airfield						
C18 - A	126.40	63.20	1896	50.56	12.64	4550

* 50ha of land located with 400 metre SPA buffer (assumed open space can be included within SPA buffer)

Residential Development Capacity:-
0 - 0.4ha - 100% area x 30 dph
0.4ha - 2ha - 82.5% area x 30 dph
2ha - 35ha - 62.5% area x 30 dph
35ha + 50% area x 30 dph

24. SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

24.1 The Study undertaken within Volume V is intended to supplement the published Study findings of Volumes I to IV with the following issues addressed within Sections 17 to 22, with the estimated residential development capacities shown within Section 23 of the Study. The summary conclusions are as follows.

Section 17 - The potential expansion of settlements located in adjoining Boroughs within Guildford Borough

24.2 A review of the Green Belt land has been undertaken to determine where there are opportunities to release land for appropriate development as potential expansions of settlements in adjoining boroughs within Guildford Borough. The Study has identified Potential Development Areas (PDAs) to the north of Farncombe (F6-A and F6-B) however no PDAs have been identified on land adjoining the borough boundary at Bramley and Godalming within Waverley District and Old Woking within Woking District.

Bramley

24.3 Land parcels E57 and F4 located to the north of Bramley exhibit significant environmental constraints with no PDAs identified. Land parcel E57 is considered to be of medium sensitivity (scores 2) and F4 is of low sensitivity (scores 0) within the Green Belt Purposes sensitivity assessment of the Volume II Addendum. Bramley is physically separated from the borough boundary and constrained by the River Wey Navigation, woodland and the rising topography of Chinthurst Hill to the north of the village. The Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV), Ancient Woodland, a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI), a Local Nature Reserve and Registered Common Land constrains land parcel E57 to the north of Bramley. Land parcel F4 located to the north west of Bramley is also constrained by the AGLV, SNCI, woodland, a sewage treatment works, the River Wey flood zone and is physically separated from the majority of Bramley's settlement boundary. The identification of a PDA was therefore not considered appropriate on the borough boundary within land parcels E57 and F4 near Bramley within Guildford Borough.

Farncombe

24.4 Land parcel F6 provides opportunities to accommodate development without significantly compromising the purposes of the Green Belt. However, land parcel F6 is considered to be of medium sensitivity (scores 2) in the Green Belt purposes

assessment in the Volume II Addendum. PDAs have been identified at F6-A and F6-B to the north of Farncombe between the B3000 New Pond Road and the borough boundary that exhibit defensible boundaries and do not contribute notably to the openness of the wider Green Belt.

- 24.5 F6-A is surrounded by defensible boundaries including the B3000 New Pond Road to the north, Furze Lane to the east, a treebelt and woodland to the south, and woodland near the playing fields near Loseley Fields Children's Centre to the west of the PDA. F6-A is located within the Surrey Hills AONB and partly falls within a designated flood zone to the south. Development proposals brought forward within F6-A are therefore likely to need to constitute 'exceptional circumstances' and be in the public interest with regards to the NPPF's requirements in the AONB, and also consider the flood zone to the south of the PDA within woodland.
- 24.6 F6-A scored 6.5 was ranked 25th of the 45 village PDAs identified across the borough in terms of sustainability rankings. The estimated residential capacity of F6-A is 134 dwellings.
- 24.7 F6-B is located directly to the east of F6-A. F6-B is surrounded by defensible boundaries including the B3000 New Pond Road to the north, the railway line and residential areas on Birch Road to the east, a treebelt to the south, and Furze Lane to the west of the PDA. F6-B is also located within the Surrey Hills AONB and partly within a designated flood zone to the south.
- 24.8 F6-B scored 9 and was ranked 10th of the 45 village PDAs identified across the borough in terms of sustainability rankings. The estimated residential capacity of F6-B is 89 dwellings.
- 24.9 As explained in Section 18, it is not entirely clear what constitutes major development in terms of proposals in the AONB, as referred to at paragraph 116 of the NPPF. Whilst proposals of the scale indicated at PDAs F6-A and B appear likely to be classed as major development, and hence should only be allocated if exceptional circumstances are present and if such development was in the public interest, this is a matter that requires more detailed consideration by the Council at the time allocations are being proposed. At such time, presuming the AONB designation remains, an up to date assessment can be undertaken of whether major development is proposed and whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify it.

Godalming

- 24.10 Land parcels F5 and F18 located to the north east and west of Godalming are generally physically separate from the settlement boundary of Godalming. Land parcel F5 is considered to be of medium sensitivity (scores 2) and F18 is considered to be high sensitivity (scores 4) in the Green Belt purposes assessment in the Volume II Addendum.
- 24.11 Land parcels F5 and F18 exhibit significant environmental constraints with no PDAs identified. Godalming is constrained within land parcel F5 to the north east by the River Wey flood zone, Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), River Wey Corridor (Local Plan Policy G11), AGLV, AONB, and SNCI. Godalming is constrained within F18 to the west by the River Wey flood zone, SSSI, AGLV, Areas of High Archaeological Importance and the Conservation Area at Lower Eashing within Guildford Borough. The borough boundary is generally physically separated from the settlement boundary within land parcel F18 therefore any development would not be continuous with the settlement boundary, unless future development was brought forward to the west of Godalming within Waverley District. Therefore it was not considered appropriate to identify a PDA on the borough boundary adjoining Godalming within Guildford Borough.

Old Woking

- 24.12 Land parcels B17 and B18 located to the north of Send in Guildford Borough and to the south of Old Woking in Woking District exhibit significant environmental constraints with no PDAs identified. Old Woking is physically separated from Send by the River Wey Navigation, flood zone, River Wey Corridor (Local Plan Policy G11), SSSI, SNCI and Registered Common Land. The combination of these environmental and physical constraints precludes the identification of PDAs on the borough boundary adjoining Old Woking within Guildford Borough.

Section 18 - The potential expansion of villages located within or bordering the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

- 24.13 A review of the Green Belt has been undertaken to determine where there are opportunities to release land for appropriate development adjoining villages located within the designated Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) that covers a large proportion of land to the south of Guildford Borough.

-
- 24.14 Shalford and Chilworth are located on the boundary of the Surrey Hills AONB and the villages of Gomshall and Shere are located within the AONB itself. As such, this section recognises that any PDAs considered ‘major development’ brought forward within the AONB at Gomshall and Shere would have to constitute ‘exceptional circumstances’ and be in the public interest, as advised within NPPF paragraph 116.
- 24.15 It is not within the remit of the Study to assess whether ‘exceptional circumstances’ exist to enable ‘major development’ and there is clearly a degree of doubt over what should be classed as major development. As a result, any PDAs that are identified in this Study within the AONB would require close scrutiny by the Council prior to any allocations being made. This would take account of latest information at the time before conclusions can be drawn on firstly whether exceptional circumstances need to be demonstrated, and secondly if they have been met.
- 24.16 The Study has identified Potential Development Areas (PDAs) to the north east of Gomshall (E14-A) and to the south west of Shere (E28-A). No PDAs have been identified within the AONB at Shalford and Chilworth, although PDAs have been previously identified within Volume III at Shalford E56-A and Chilworth E51-B located outside of the AONB. These are further detailed within Volume III of the Study.

Chilworth

- 24.17 Land parcels E52 and E53 located to the north of Chilworth exhibit significant environmental constraints with no PDA identified within the AONB. The land parcels to the north of Chilworth are constrained by environmental designations and physical constraints including the rising topography of the North Downs ridgeline at St Martha’s Hill, the AGLV, Areas of High Archaeological Potential, the flood zone of Tillingbourne, Conservation Area and Scheduled Monument at Chilworth Gunpowder Mills, and the railway line that restricts access to the north of the village. The combination of these environmental and physical constraints precludes the identification of PDAs on the settlement boundary of Chilworth within the AONB.

Gomshall

- 24.18 Land parcel E14 to the north east of Gomshall provides opportunities to accommodate development without significantly compromising the purposes of the Green Belt. However, land parcel E14 is considered to be of high sensitivity (score 3) in terms of the Green Belt purposes assessment in the Volume II Addendum.

-
- 24.19 A PDA has been identified at land parcel E14-A on land between Gomshall Railway Station, Station Road and Churchfield Farm. E14-A is surrounded by defensible boundaries hedgerows and rising topography of Round Hill to the north, the railway line and station to the east, Gomshall Chapel Church and Station Road to the south, and hedgerows near Churchfield Farm to the west of the PDA.
- 24.20 E14-A scores 11 and was ranked 2nd of the 45 village PDAs identified across the borough in terms of sustainability rankings. The estimated residential capacity of E14-A is 44 dwellings.

Shalford

- 24.21 Land parcels E53 and E54 located to the north east of Shalford exhibit significant environmental constraints with no PDA identified within the AONB. The land parcels to the north east of Shalford are constrained by environmental designations and physical constraints including the rising topography of the North Downs ridgeline at Whinny Hill, the AGLV, the flood zone of Tillingbourne following the settlement boundary, and the Conservation Area at Shalford Mill. The combination of these environmental and physical constraints precludes the identification of PDAs on the settlement boundary of Shalford within the AONB.

Shere

- 24.22 Land parcel E28 located to the south west of Shere provides opportunities to accommodate development without significantly compromising the purposes of the Green Belt. However, land parcel E28 is considered to be of high sensitivity (score 4) in the Green Belt purposes assessment in the Volume II Addendum.
- 24.23 A PDA has been identified to the south west of Shere at E28-A on land to the west of Pathfields Road. E28-A is surrounded by defensible boundaries including woodland to the north, residential areas at Pathfields Road, Cricket's Hill, and Sandy Lane to the east, rising topography and hedgerows to the south near Shere Heath, and woodland following Dark Lane to the west of the PDA.
- 24.24 E28-A is located within the AONB and AGLV directly to the east of Albury Registered Park and Gardens and SNCI. The PDA is located to the north of Registered Common Land at Shere Heath and to the south west of Shere Conservation Area within the village centre. Any development proposals within E28-A would need to take account of these environmental constraints and if classed as 'major development' would need

to constitute 'exceptional circumstances' in accordance with the NPPF due to the AONB designation.

- 24.25 E28-A scores 9 and was ranked 10th of the 45 village PDAs identified across the borough in terms of sustainability rankings. The estimated residential capacity of E28-A is 61 dwellings.

Section 19 - Further consideration of the Countryside Beyond the Green Belt (CBGB) relating to land adjoining Ash and Tongham

- 24.26 A further review of land parcels K1, K3, K4 and K10 has been undertaken to determine whether there are opportunities to release land for appropriate development within the surroundings of the urban areas of Ash, Ash Vale and Tongham within the Blackwater Valley bordering Rushmoor District to the west of Guildford Borough.
- 24.27 The Study has identified additional Potential Development Areas (PDAs) within the Countryside Beyond Green Belt (CBGB) at land parcel K3 to the south of Tongham at Poyle Road. No additional PDAs have been identified within land parcels K1, K4 and K10 within the Blackwater Valley bordering Rushmoor District due to environmental capacity and physical constraints.

Tongham (South): Land Parcel K3, Land to the south of Poyle Road

- 24.28 A PDA has been identified within land parcel K3 on land to the south of Poyle Road either side of Tongham recreation ground and playing fields and to the south of St Pauls Churchyard near The Street. The PDA is enclosed by boundary features including St Pauls Churchyard and Poyle Road to the north, hedgerows and woodland to the east, the farm track to Manor Farm to the south, and The Street to the west.
- 24.29 K3 is partially constrained in environmental capacity terms by the Surrey Hills AONB located to the south on the Hog's Back ridgeline and the AGLV that covers the PDA up to Poyle Road. An area of Ancient Woodland and SNCI is located to the south of K3 on rising ground. Also an Area of High Archaeological Potential is located to the south west of K3 near Manor Farm.
- 24.30 K3 scores 11.43 and was ranked 3rd of the 16 PDAs according to sustainability rankings for urban extensions within Volume II and the Volume II Addendum. The estimated residential development capacity of K3 is 572 dwellings.

Blackwater Valley: Land Parcels K1, K4 and K10

24.31 Land parcels K1, K4 and K10 are situated within the Blackwater Valley between the urban areas of South Farnborough, Ash Vale, North Camp, Ash, North Town, Tongham and Aldershot. These land parcels exhibit significant environmental constraints within the Blackwater Valley with no PDAs identified. The identification of PDAs within the Blackwater Valley was also not considered appropriate due to the potential for the merging of urban areas on the Guildford and Rushmoor District boundaries.

Section 20 - Potential expansion or redevelopment of major previously developed sites across the borough

24.32 A review of the Green Belt land at the major previously developed sites located across the borough has been undertaken to determine whether there are opportunities for appropriate expansion or redevelopment at such sites. The table below provides a summary of the major previously developed sites across Guildford Borough considered inappropriate or appropriate for inseting within the Green Belt. Those proposed for inseting offer greater opportunity for notable redevelopment and/or expansion:

Major previously developed sites considered inappropriate for inseting and to remain 'washed over' by the Green Belt	Major previously developed sites considered appropriate for inseting within the Green Belt
Bisley Camp BTRE Vokes, Normandy Merrist Wood College RHS Wisley	Mount Browne Police Headquarters HM Prison, Send The University of Law, Guildford Peasmarsh Industrial Estate Pirbright Barracks Keogh Barracks Pirbright Institute

Bisley Camp

24.33 Bisley Camp generally exhibits a low proportion of built development to openness footprint (21.4%). Built development occupies 8.4ha of the overall 37.4ha major previously developed site. Large areas of open land are located between historic barracks, pavilions, offices, visitor centres and rifle shooting ranges. Due to the sparse arrangement of the barracks, shooting ranges and resulting open character,

defensible boundaries are often incomplete within the surroundings of the National Shooting Centre at Bisley Camp. On balance, it was not considered appropriate to inset Bisley Camp within the Green Belt due to the open character of the site and the insufficient or absent defensible boundaries identified within Stage 1.

BTRE Vokes, Normandy

24.34 BTRE Vokes, Normandy generally exhibits a low proportion of built development to openness footprint (13%). Built development occupies 1.1ha of the overall 8.7ha major previously developed site. Large areas of open land are located between isolated commercial buildings at Henley Business Park, car parking areas and open fields. Due to the sparse arrangement of isolated commercial buildings and open character, defensible boundaries are often incomplete within the surroundings of the BTRE Vokes site. On balance, it was considered inappropriate to inset the BTRE Vokes site within the Green Belt due to its open character and insufficient or absent defensible boundaries identified within Stage 1.

The University of Law, Guildford

24.35 The University of Law, Guildford generally exhibits a built development to openness footprint of 40%. Built development occupies 1.4ha of the overall 3.5ha major previously developed site. Limited areas of open land are located between College buildings and car parking areas, however, the site is generally visually enclosed by woodland on the North Downs ridgeline. Woodland enclosing the College and Braboeuf Manor separates the site from the Mount Browne Police Headquarters to the south west and provides defensible boundaries surrounding the site. Areas of open land between College buildings are considered to provide a limited contribution to the openness of the wider Green Belt.

24.36 A number of environmental constraints would limit the redevelopment or expansion of the University of Law including the designated Conservation Area at Braboeuf Manor and the Surrey Hills AONB covering the site. Ancient Woodland is also located to the south east, between the College and the A3100 Old Portsmouth Road.

24.37 The University of Law exhibits defensible boundaries including woodland to north of the car park on Sandy Lane and separating the site from Mount Browne to the east and south of the site.

24.38 The University of Law is located within land parcel F8 that is considered to be of high sensitivity (scores 3) in the Green Belt purposes assessment in the Volume II Addendum. In terms of Green Belt Purposes 2 and 4, the potential redevelopment or expansion of Guildford College of Law would not likely lead to settlement coalescence (Purpose 2) although may affect the historic setting of the Conservation Area at Braboeuf Manor (Purpose 4). However, given the existing urban character of the site, its appropriate redevelopment need not detract from the associated Conservation Area. The NPPF refers to inseting (albeit of villages) being encouraged even if there are elements of character other than openness that need to be protected. On balance, it is considered appropriate to inset The University of Law within the Green Belt due to the enclosed urban character of the site that does not contribute to the openness of the wider Green Belt and the location of defensible boundaries. However, given the site's location in the AONB, 'exceptional circumstances' would need to be demonstrated if the site's eventual redevelopment was to be classed as major development.

HM Prison, Send

24.39 HM Prison, Send exhibits a built development to openness footprint of 33.3%. Built development occupies 2.9ha of the overall 8.7ha major previously developed site. Areas of open land are located between prison buildings, parade grounds and open fields, however, these open areas are visually enclosed by surrounding woodlands and hedgerows. Open land within the prison site is not considered to significantly contribute to the openness of the wider Green Belt across the borough.

24.40 HM Prison, Send is located within land parcel C7 that is considered to be of medium sensitivity (scores 2) in the Green Belt purposes assessment within the Volume II Addendum. In terms of Green Belt Purposes 2 and 4, the potential redevelopment or expansion of the HM Prison site would not likely lead to settlement coalescence due its physical separation from West Clandon to the west and Send to the north of the prison (Purpose 2). Redevelopment or expansion of the site is unlikely to affect any historic settings (Purpose 4).

24.41 HM Prison, Send is relatively unconstrained in environmental capacity terms. Ancient Woodland is located to the north near Sussex Farm and an SNCI is located at woodland at Humphrey's Copse to the south of the site.

24.42 HM Prison, Send exhibits defensible boundaries including woodland near Sussex Farm to the north, treebelts to the east, woodland to the south, and hedgerows to the west following Ripley Road. On balance, it is considered appropriate to inset the HM Prison site within the Green Belt due to its visually enclosed character that does not contribute to the openness of the wider Green Belt and the location of defensible boundaries surrounding the site. It is recommended that the Green Belt inset boundary includes a small expansion area to the west with minimal environmental constraints to follow a defensible boundary and treebelt along Ripley Road. The small expansion area would include the HM Prison parade grounds and gardens and the open ground leading to the site entrance from Ripley Road to the west of the major previously developed site boundary.

Keogh Barracks

24.43 Keogh Barracks exhibits a built development to openness footprint of 40%. Built development occupies 8.4ha of the overall 21ha major previously developed site. Large areas of open land are located between MoD barracks, offices, museums, parade grounds, playing fields and Mytchett Lake located beyond the Guildford Borough boundary within Rushmoor District. Areas of open land within Keogh Barracks are considered to exhibit limited visibility with the wider Green Belt due to the visual enclosure provided by surrounding woodland at Ash Common, and treebelts following the railway and Basingstoke Canal forming defensible boundaries around the Keogh Barracks site.

24.44 Keogh Barracks is located within land parcel J19 that is considered to be of medium sensitivity (scores 2) in the Green Belt purposes assessment in the Volume II Addendum. In terms of Green Belt Purposes 2 and 4, the potential redevelopment or expansion of Keogh Barracks would not likely lead to settlement coalescence with Ash Vale to the east (Purpose 2) due to the intervening railway line and Basingstoke Canal, however, may affect the setting of the Conservation Area to the west between the railway line and Basingstoke Canal (Purpose 4). Due to its scale, expansion of the site would potentially represent sprawl of a large built up area, as referred to at Purpose 1.

24.45 A number of environmental constraints would limit the redevelopment or expansion of Keogh Barracks including the 400m buffer zone of the SPA covering the site. This would preclude the redevelopment or expansion of residential development at Keogh Barracks, however, may permit other types of redevelopment. Furze Hill within

Cleygate Common is also designated as a SPA, SAC and Grassland Inventory site. A designated Conservation Area is located between the railway line and Basingstoke Canal to the west of the site. On balance, it was considered appropriate to inset Keogh Barracks within the Green Belt due to it not displaying an open character and the location of defensible boundaries. It is recommended that the Green Belt inset boundary does not include an expansion area and the boundary follows the development footprint of Keogh Barracks due to the environmental constraints surrounding the site.

Merrist Wood College

24.46 Merrist Wood College exhibits a built development to openness footprint of 50%. Built development occupies 6.4ha of the overall 12.7ha major previously developed site. Buildings are generally agricultural in land use and sparsely arranged within open grounds. Areas of open land between the agricultural college buildings are considered to contribute to the openness of the wider Green Belt within land parcels J5 and J6. Due to the sparse arrangement of agricultural buildings and the openness of the College grounds, defensible boundaries are often incomplete or absent within the surroundings of the site. On balance, despite the built development coverage, it was considered inappropriate to inset land at Merrist Wood College (Site A and B) within the Green Belt due to the open character of the sites and incomplete, or absent defensible boundaries identified within Stage 1.

Mount Browne Police Headquarters

24.47 Mount Browne exhibits a built development to openness footprint of 42%. Built development occupies 2.1ha of the overall 5.1ha major previously developed site. Areas of open land are located between the HQ buildings and car parking areas, however, these are generally visually enclosed by woodland surrounding the Mount Browne site. Areas of open land between the HQ buildings are considered to provide a limited contribution to the openness of the wider Green Belt.

24.48 A number of environmental constraints would limit the redevelopment or expansion of the Mount Browne site including the Surrey Hills AONB, the Conservation Area at Braboeuf Manor to the north, Ancient Woodland to the east, the treebelt to the south, and woodland within the disused quarry to west of the Mount Browne site.

24.49 Mount Browne exhibits defensible boundaries including woodland that separates the site from Guildford College of Law to the north, the woodland between car parking

areas and the A3100 Old Portsmouth Road to the east, the treebelt to the south, and woodland within the disused quarry to the west of the site.

24.50 Mount Browne is located within land parcel F8 that is considered to be of high sensitivity (scores 3) in the Green Belt purposes assessment in the Volume II Addendum. In terms of Green Belt purposes 2 and 4, the potential redevelopment or expansion of Mount Browne would not likely lead to settlement coalescence due to the physical separation from south Guildford to the north east and Littleton to the south west of the site. However, redevelopment or expansion would potentially affect the historic setting of the Conservation Area at Braboeuf Manor. On balance, it is considered appropriate to recommend the Mount Browne site for inseting within the Green Belt due to it not presenting an open character and possessing defensible boundaries surrounding the site. It is recommended that the Green Belt inseting boundary includes a small expansion area to the south with minimal environmental constraints to follow a defensible boundary along an existing road and treebelt boundary. However, if subsequent redevelopment proposals were to be classed as major development, exceptional circumstances would need to be demonstrated due to the AONB designation.

Peasmarsh Industrial Estate

24.51 Peasmarsh Industrial Estate generally exhibits a high proportion of built development to openness footprint (59%). Built development occupies 4.8ha of the overall 8.1ha major previously developed site. Limited areas of open land are located between commercial and industrial estate buildings, mainly including car parking areas, however, these are generally enclosed by built form within the industrial estate and woodlands following the River Wey Navigation. Open areas within Peasmarsh Industrial Estate are not considered to notably contribute to the openness of the wider Green Belt across the borough.

24.52 Peasmarsh Industrial Estate is located within land parcel F3 which is considered to be of medium sensitivity (scores 2) in the Green Belt purposes assessment in the Volume II Addendum. In terms of Green Belt purposes 2 and 4, the potential redevelopment or expansion of Peasmarsh Industrial Estate would not likely lead to settlement coalescence due its existing location between residential areas of Peasmarsh village (Purpose 2). Redevelopment or expansion at Peasmarsh Industrial Estate would not likely affect the historic setting of the River Wey

Navigation or the River Wey Corridor (Local Plan Policy G11) to the east of the site due to the industrial character of the existing site (Purpose 4).

24.53 Peasmarsh Industrial Estate is relatively unconstrained in environmental capacity terms. The River Wey Navigation to the east is designated as a SSSI, Protected Open Space (POS) and the River Wey Corridor (Local Plan Policy G11). Peasmarsh Common to the west of the A3100 Old Portsmouth Road is designated as Registered Common Land, and the Surrey Hills AONB is located further to the west of the railway bordering Peasmarsh Common.

24.54 Peasmarsh Industrial Estate exhibits defensible boundaries including Mill Lane to the north, woodland following the River Wey Navigation to the east, woodland near Tiltham's Farm to the south, and the A3100 Old Portsmouth Road to the west of the site. On balance, it is considered appropriate to inset Peasmarsh Industrial Estate within the Green Belt due to it not presenting an open character and possessing defensible boundaries. It is recommended that the Green Belt inset boundary does not include an expansion area and the boundary remains within the development footprint of the Peasmarsh Industrial Estate site.

Pirbright Barracks

24.55 Pirbright Barracks exhibits a built development to openness footprint of 46%. Built development occupies 33.7ha of the overall 74ha major previously developed site. Areas of open land are located between the MoD barracks, offices and rifle shooting ranges. Areas of open land within Pirbright Barracks are considered to provide a limited contribution to the openness of the wider Green Belt due to the visual enclosure provided by surrounding woodland at Pirbright Common and along Basingstoke Canal that also form defensible boundaries.

24.56 Pirbright Barracks is located within land parcel J11 that is considered to be of medium sensitivity (scores 2) in the Green Belt purposes assessment in the Volume II Addendum. In terms of Green Belt purposes 2 and 4, the potential redevelopment or expansion of Pirbright Barracks would potentially lead to coalescence with Bisley Camp to the north (Purpose 2) and may also affect the historic setting of the Conservation Area at Bisley Camp (Purpose 4). It is also relevant that due to the scale of the site, expansion would potentially result in the sprawl of a large built up area (Purpose 1).

24.57 A number of environmental constraints would limit the redevelopment or expansion of Pirbright Barracks including the 400m buffer zone of the SPA covering the site. This is likely to preclude the redevelopment or expansion of residential development at Pirbright Barracks, however, may permit other types of development. Pirbright Common to the north and Sheets Heath to the east of the site is designated as an SPA, SAC and Grassland Inventory site. On balance, it is considered appropriate to inset Pirbright Barracks within the Green Belt due to it not possessing an open character whilst providing defensible boundaries.

Pirbright Institute

24.58 The Pirbright Institute exhibits a built development to openness footprint of 46%. Built development occupies 4.9ha of the overall 10.7ha major previously developed site. Areas of open land are located between institute buildings and car parking areas with some open areas of derelict brownfield land present. However, these open areas are visually enclosed by woodland including Bullswater Common to the north, woodland following Stanford Brook to the east and the south, and Stanford Common to the west of Pirbright Institute. These woodlands together with the B380 Ash Road form defensible boundaries surrounding the site. Areas of open land within Pirbright Institute are considered to provide a limited contribution to the openness of the wider Green Belt.

24.59 Pirbright Institute is located within land parcel J6 that is considered to be of high sensitivity (scores 3) in the Green Belt purposes assessment in the Volume II Addendum. In terms of Green Belt purposes 2 and 4, the potential redevelopment or expansion of Pirbright Institute would not likely lead to settlement coalescence due to its physical separation from Pirbright village (Purpose 2) or affect any historic settings (Purpose 4).

24.60 A number of environmental constraints limit the redevelopment or expansion of the Pirbright Institute including the 400m buffer zone of the SPA at Bullswater Common to the north east and Cobbethill Common to the south west of the site. Bullswater Common and Cobbethill Common are also designated as a SAC, Important Bird Areas and Grassland Inventory site. This would preclude the redevelopment or expansion of residential development at the Pirbright Institute, however, may permit other forms of development. On balance, it is considered appropriate to inset the Pirbright Institute within the Green Belt due to it not displaying an open character,

and possessing defensible boundaries. It is recommended that the Green Belt inset boundary does not include an expansion area and the boundary remains within the development footprint of the site due to environmental constraints.

RHS Wisley

24.61 RHS Wisley exhibits a built development to openness footprint of 43%. Built development occupies 9.4ha of the overall 21.8ha major previously developed site. Large areas of open land are located between the visitor centre, glasshouses and other horticultural buildings. Buildings are generally horticultural in land use and sparsely arranged within open gardens and grounds. Due to the sparse arrangement of horticultural buildings and openness of gardens, defensible boundaries are often incomplete or absent within the surroundings of the site. On balance, it is considered inappropriate to inset RHS Wisley within the Green Belt due to the open character of the site and insufficient or absent defensible boundaries identified within Stage 1.

Section 21 - Potential major expansion of those villages within Guildford Borough ranked highest in GBCs Settlement Hierarchy

24.62 A review of the Green Belt land has been undertaken to determine where there are opportunities to release land for appropriate major development as potential expansions of villages ranked highest in GBCs settlement hierarchy within Appendix XII. The Study has identified Potential Major Development Areas (PMDAs) between Normandy and Flexford to the west of the borough (PDMA H12-A), to the north east of the borough at Send (PMDA B16-A) and to the south and east of Send Marsh and Burntcommon (B14-A and B12/B13-B) to the north east of the borough. No major village expansions were considered appropriate within the surroundings of Chilworth, East Horsley, Fairlands, Pirbright, Ripley, Shalford and Wood Street Village due to a combination of environmental constraints, limited sustainability credentials, and the potential impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt within Guildford Borough.

Potential major village expansions considered inappropriate within the Green Belt within Guildford Borough	Potential major village expansions considered appropriate within the Green Belt within Guildford Borough
Chilworth	Normandy and Flexford
East Horsley	Send
Fairlands	Send Marsh and Burntcommon
Pirbright	

Ripley Shalford Wood Street Village	
---	--

Chilworth

24.63 Chilworth would not be appropriate for a major village expansion due to the necessary population growth requirement of 2,148 with a land take requirement of 59.6 hectares, and the environmental constraints in land parcels at E51, E52 and E53. The current population of 1,852 at Chilworth means that a large population growth requirement of 2148 would be required to reach the ‘critical mass’ population of 4000. However, the environmental constraints including the Surrey Hills AONB, AGLV, Tillingbourne flood zone, Chilworth Gunpowder Mills Conservation Area and Scheduled Monument generally precludes the identification of a major village expansion site within the surroundings of Chilworth.

East Horsley

24.64 East Horsley would not be appropriate for a major village expansion due to the current population of 3,785 meaning that only a relatively small population growth requirement of 215 would be needed to reach the ‘critical mass’ population of 4000. The opportunities to bring forward new facilities through a small population increase would therefore be limited at East Horsley. A major expansion site would be precluded by environmental constraints within land parcels C16, C21, D6, D7 and D9 due to the Registered Common Land and Ancient Woodland near the Drift Golf Course and Effingham Common, the Registered Park and Gardens and Conservation Area at Horsley Towers, and the SSCI and Ancient Woodland at Lollesworth Wood within the surroundings of East Horsley.

Fairlands

24.65 On balance, Fairlands would not be appropriate for a major village expansion due to the potential impacts on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt. A PMDA at land parcel H8-A has been identified within the environmental constraints that would allow for a population expansion of 2,614 and a total population of 4,026, above the ‘critical mass’ population of 4000. Fairlands has a good public transport rating of 4 within GBCs Settlement Hierarchy and is already supported by a number of facilities. However, whilst it does offer a sustainable location at present, a major expansion site provides limited opportunities to provide enhanced new facilities and sustainability

benefits at Fairlands. The location of H8-A to the south west of Fairlands is visually exposed within the surroundings of Round Hill, Graylands Farm and Littlefield Manor and a major expansion would cause the merging of settlements with Wood Street Village located to the south (Purpose 2).

Normandy and Flexford

24.66 A PMDA at land parcel H12-A between Flexford and Normandy would be appropriate as a major village expansion due to the established public transport links alongside potential improvements to sustainability credentials, being considered to outweigh the potential harm to the openness and purposes of the Green Belt. A major expansion at H12-A between Flexford and Normandy would generate an additional population of approximately 2,599 and a total population of 4,383, this being very likely to enable a wide range of new facilities with associated sustainability benefits. The location of H12-A between Normandy and Flexford is considered to be particularly sustainable in terms of public transport connections with Wanborough Station located directly to the south within Flexford in addition to the bus services. The PMDA would result in greater settlement coalescence of Flexford and Normandy (Purpose 2). Whilst recognising that any major village expansion will detract from the openness of the surroundings, in this instance, the PMDA's impact will be limited on the wider Green Belt due to extensive woodlands, treebelt and hedgerows, particularly at Waldens Copse and Pusseys Copse within the village expansion site.

Pirbright

24.67 Pirbright would not be appropriate as a major village expansion due to the population growth requirement of 2,507, the landtake requirement of 69.6 hectares, and the environmental constraints identified within land parcels J7, J8, J9 and J10. The current population of 1,493 at Pirbright means that a large population growth requirement of 2,507 would be required to reach the 'critical mass' population of 4000. However, the locations of environmental constraints including Pirbright Conservation Area, Pirbright Common SPA, SAC, SSSI and Brookwood Cemetery, together with Hodge Brook flood zone, Areas of High Archaeological Potential and the SNCI generally precludes the identification of a major expansion site within the surroundings of Pirbright.

Ripley

24.68 Ripley would not be appropriate to accommodate a major village expansion due to the population growth requirement of 2,380, landtake requirement of 66 hectares, and the environmental constraints identified within land parcels B16, B19 and B20. The current population of 1,620 at Ripley means that a large population growth requirement of 2,380 would be required to reach the 'critical mass' population of 4,000. However, the location of environmental constraints including Ripley Conservation Area, Areas of High Archaeological Potential, Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Site, together with the River Wey flood zone, River Wey Corridor (Local Plan Policy G11) and SNCI at Ripley Green, and the flood zone and SSSI at Papercourt Lake, generally precludes the identification of a major expansion site within the surroundings of Ripley.

Send

24.69 A PMDA at land parcel B16-A to the north of Send would be appropriate as a major village expansion as the potential improvements to sustainability credentials are considered to outweigh the potential harm to the openness and purposes of the Green Belt. A major expansion at B16-A would generate an additional population of approximately 1,481 and a total population of 3795 at Send, this being likely to enable the improvement of a small range of existing facilities rather than the provision of entirely new facilities. Send has a bus service rating of 3 within GBC's Settlement Hierarchy therefore has good public transport connections. B16-A might not provide considerable new facilities, however, Send does offer a sustainable location at present and is likely to provide good public transport connections.

24.70 In terms of the Green Belt purposes, the PMDA would not result in settlement coalescence due to physical separation from Old Woking to the north by the River Wey and Send Marsh and Burntcommon to the east by the open land surrounding Broughton Hall (Purpose 2). The PMDA would not likely affect any historic settings within the wider Green Belt (Purpose 4). The major village expansion would potentially detract from the openness of land to the north of Send within the surroundings of Send Business Centre, however, this would be visually contained by treebelts following the River Wey Navigation to the north, treebelts following Tannery Lane, and hedgerows between Prews Farm and the B368 Send Marsh Road to the east of the PMDA. The PMDA at B16-A provides a unique opportunity to form part of a waterfront development and pedestrian linkages with the River Wey Navigation and Broadmead Cut as part of a major village expansion to the north of Send.

Send Marsh and Burntcommon

24.71 A PMDA at land parcels B14-A and B12/B13-B to the east and south of Send Marsh and Burntcommon would be appropriate as a major village expansion as the potential improvements to sustainability credentials are considered to outweigh the potential harm to the openness and purposes of the Green Belt. A major expansion at B14-A and B12/13-B would generate an additional population of approximately 2,426 and a total population of 4,357 at Send Marsh and Burntcommon. This would potentially enable a range of new facilities with associated sustainability benefits including a new local centre, community hall, and amenity open space that is generally absent from the village centre. Send Marsh and Burntcommon is served by a good bus service scoring 3, as defined within GBCs Settlement Hierarchy (Appendix XII). The locations of B14-A and B12/13-B within close proximity to the A3 dual carriageway does offer transport connection benefits to commuters. In terms of Green Belt purposes 2 and 4, a major expansion to the south and east of Burntcommon would not likely lead to settlement coalescence (Purpose 2) and would not likely affect any historic settings (Purpose 4). The major village expansion would potentially detract from the openness of the Green Belt when viewed from the A3 dual carriageway in a northbound direction within PMDA B14-A located to the east of Burntcommon. However, the impact on views could be limited by new treebelts between the A247 Clandon Bridge and Kiln Lane to the east of a major village expansion at B14-A.

Shalford

24.72 Shalford would not be appropriate for a major village expansion due to the population growth requirement of 1,561, landtake requirement of 44 hectares, and the environmental constraints identified within land parcels E54, E55, E56, F1, F2 and F3. The current population of 2,439 at Shalford means that a population growth requirement of 1,561 would be required to reach the 'critical mass' population of 4000. However, the environmental constraints including the Surrey Hills AONB, AGLV, Tillingbourne flood zone, Shalford Mills Conservation Area, Registered Common Land, together with the River Wey POS, flood zone and River Wey Corridor (Local Plan Policy G11) generally precludes the identification of a major village expansion site within the surroundings of Shalford.

Wood Street Village

24.73 Wood Street Village would not be appropriate for a major village expansion due to the population growth requirement of 2,381, the landtake requirement of 66.12

hectares, and the environmental constraints identified within land parcels H5, H6, H7, H8 and H9. The current population of 1,619 means that a large population growth requirement of 2,381 would be required to reach the 'critical mass' population of 4000. However, environmental and physical constraints including the Conservation Area within the village green, Registered Common Land and SNCIs at Rydeshill, Broadstreet Common and Pinks Hill, together with visually exposed areas within the Green Belt to the north of Wood Street Village near Graylands Farm, Round Hill and Anger's Hill generally precludes the identification of a major expansion site within the surroundings of Wood Street Village.

Section 22- Potential creation of a new settlement at Wisley Airfield to the north of Guildford Borough

- 24.74 Wisley Airfield, to the north of the borough is considered to provide an appropriate opportunity to accommodate a new settlement. Land parcel C18, within which it lies, is considered to be of medium sensitivity (scores 2) in the Green Belt purposes assessment in the Volume II Addendum, and therefore is not one of the parts of the borough that best serves the purposes of the Green Belt.
- 24.75 A potential new settlement, also referred to as a Potential Major Development Area (PMDA) has been identified at C18-A at Wisley Airfield between woodland at Ockham Common to the north, Old Lane near Hatchford End to the east, Ockham Lane, Hatch Lane and Hyde Lane near Bridge End Farm and Ockham to the south, and the A3 dual carriageway to the west of the PMDA. These form recognisable and defensible boundaries within the surroundings of Wisley Airfield in accordance with the NPPF.
- 24.76 In terms of the Green Belt purposes, the potential new settlement at Wisley Airfield would not contribute to urban sprawl due to the spatial separation from the main urban areas (Purpose 1) and offers limited potential for settlement coalescence except for the hamlet at Bridge End located to the immediate south east of the airfield (Purpose 2). The location of PMDA C18-A at Wisley Airfield would not likely affect historic settings due to physical separation from the designated Conservation Area at Ockham village (Purpose 4). It is acknowledged that a new settlement at Wisley Airfield would result in encroachment into the countryside (Purpose 3) and would not assist with urban regeneration (Purpose 5). However, the site does not lie within one of the most sensitive parts of the Green Belt. When combined with the previously developed nature of the site, the visual enclosure provided by woodland and

hedgerows, and the sustainable community that would result, this is considered to justify the loss of openness that would inevitably occur within the site, or any other site, on which a new settlement is introduced within Guildford Borough.

- 24.77 A number of environmental constraints would limit the provision of a new settlement at Wisley Airfield including the 400m buffer zone of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (SPA) and the Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) covering the site itself. The Wisley Airfield site also includes a waste management allocation/composting facility that would have implications for how the site can be developed, however, environmental constraints do not preclude development across much of the site outside of the 400m buffer for the SPA.
- 24.78 Outside of PMDA C18-A at Wisley Airfield, Ockham Common located to the north is designated as a Local Nature Reserve, SPA, SAC, Important Bird Area and Registered Common Land. The RHS Wisley gardens to the west are designated as a Registered Park and Garden although are physically and visually separated from the airfield by woodland and the A3 dual carriageway. A designated flood zone follows a small tributary near Hyde Lane to the south west of the site and a Conservation Area is located at Ockham further to the south of Wisley Airfield. These environmental constraints would need to be taken into account if a new settlement is progressed at Wisley Airfield.
- 24.79 The location of C18-A is considered to be sustainable in terms of transport connections, with the A3 dual carriageway junction for Ripley located directly to the west of the PMDA, potentially serving public transport connections to the new settlement at Wisley Airfield.
- 24.80 The estimated residential development capacity of C18-A is approximately 1,896 dwellings, which would enable the introduction of a population of approximately 4,550. Such a population could potentially support the following facilities:
- A local centre and village shop
 - Primary school and nursery
 - Healthcare facility
 - Accessible natural and semi-natural greenspace
 - Amenity open space

-
- Community or village hall

24.81 The estimated residential capacity of the PMDA at approximately 1,896 dwellings, and associated population of 4,550 will enable sufficient facilities and services to be brought forward to result in a sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF and Garden City principles.

24.82 In summary, it is considered that C18–A at Wisley Airfield, which incorporates some land adjoining the airfield site, does represent an appropriate location for a new settlement, and should be considered alongside other Potential Development Areas (PDAs) and Potential Major Development Areas (PMDAs) identified in the Green Belt to accommodate the borough's future growth requirements.

VOLUME V APPENDICES

Appendix IX: Potential Development Areas (PDAs) surrounding urban areas and villages map (updated Volume V)

Appendix X: Potential expansion and redevelopment of major previously developed sites and villages inseting map

Appendix XI: Potential major expansion of villages and inseting map

Appendix XII: GBC Settlement Hierarchy

Appendix XIII: Sustainability schedules and mapping for land adjoining villages on the boundary of Guildford Borough

Appendix XIV: Sustainability schedules and mapping for villages within the Surrey Hills AONB

Appendix XV: Sustainability schedules and mapping for land parcels within CBGB

Appendix XVI: Sustainability schedules and mapping for the major expansion of villages across the borough

Appendix XVII: Key for environmental designations and local plans mapping