

WEST HORSLEY PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 30 July at 7.30pm in the Main Hall, West Horsley Village Hall

Present Cllr Murray, Cllr King, Cllr Rogers, Cllr Mattock, Deputy Clerk K Young, 5 residents

26.PE.098 **Apologies for Absence:** Cllr Walker, Borough Cllr Young

26.PE.099 **Declarations of Interest:**

Cllr King 26.PE.102a) Planning Application 26/P/00871: Oakdene, Silkmore Lane.

26.PE.100 **Minutes of the last Planning Committee Meeting** held 2 July 2026 were approved and signed.

Public Forum:

Guildford Borough Council (GBC) Green Belt Assessment (see significant correspondence):

Concerns raised as to what this report means for potential development sites in West Horsley and surrounding Parishes. The Parish Council will consider the report, liaise with neighbouring Parishes and publish information on the website. Whilst sites maybe flagged as potential greybelt sites, this does not automatically mean that development on such sites will get approval as all planning policies must be considered in each case.

Amended Planning Application 25/P/01245 Hornbeam, 174 The Street (see 26.PE.107.f): It was raised that objections to the original application still stand including concerns relating to flooding (resident to forward photos of flooding to Deputy Clerk), traffic and pedestrian safety at vehicular access to The Street, unsustainable location and kerbside collection of refuse/recycling bins

Planning Application: 26/P/00871 Oakdene, Silkmore Lane (see 26.PE.107a): Residents addressed Members to provide additional information and address some of the comments on the planning portal including size of extension, the 45 degree rule, planning precedents set by surrounding properties and maintaining privacy for neighbouring properties with trees and hedgerow.

Hedges: It was requested that the Parish Council remind property owners of their responsibility to cut back any hedgerow, trees etc which protrude or obstruct pavements, road sights lines etc.

26.PE.101 **Significant Correspondence** (not covered by other Agenda items):

- **Housing Needs Survey** is closed and a report analysing the results is awaited.
- **Land to the north of Lower Road, Effingham and Berkley Homes:** A presentation on 16 July was given by Berkeley Homes on a new development proposal for up to 600 homes. A scoping application (26/S/00002) has been submitted to GBC Planning. It was agreed by Members a response should be sent to protect the interests of residents. The letter will be circulated to Full Council for a majority approval (due to imminent deadline of 1 August).
- **Green Belt Assessment:** GBC commissioned an independent review of the Guildford Green Belt Assessment, undertaken by AECOM. The review together with FAQs are available on the GBC website: [Green Belt Assessment 2026 - Guildford Borough Council](#).
- **Petition** <https://petition.parliament.uk/petitions/766093#main-content>
In response to concerns relating to the classification of greybelt by the government, a petition has commenced due to concerns that the planning rules are framed in such a way that high quality Green Belt can be lost to development. This petition is not connected with the Parish Council. Residents should make their own decision whether to sign.

Signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record: _____

Date: _____

26.PE.102 **Consideration of applications received since the planning committee meeting held on 2 July:**

- a) **Planning Application: 26/P/00871: Oakdene, Silkmore Lane**
WHPC Response: No objection.
Cllr King was excluded from the discussion and decision.
- b) **Planning Application: 26/P/00928: Roselands, Nightingale Avenue**
WHPC Response: No objection
- c) **Planning Application: 26/P/00898: 3 West Horsley Place Cottages, Epsom Road**
WHPC Response: No objection
- d) **Listed Building Consent: 26/P/00899: 3 West Horsley Place Cottages, Epsom Road**
WHPC Response: Defer to the case officer
- e) **Planning Application: 26/P/00937: Rosedale, Shere Road**
WHPC Response: No objection, subject to comments.
- f) **Amended Planning Application: 25/P/01245: Hornbeam, 174 The Street**
WHPC Response: Objection

26.PE.103 **Consideration of Other Applications** between 29 June to 24 July (Appendix 1). Noted

26.PE.104 **Consideration of decisions reported by Guildford Borough Council** between 29 June to 24 July (Appendix 2). Noted

26.PE.105 **Consideration of Appeals Open and Closed** as of 26 June 2026 (Appendix 2). Noted

26.PE.106 **Local Plan Update:**

- a) **Site A37:** Land to the West of West Horsley: Nothing to report. Members asked how many properties were sold for affordable and social housing. Deputy clerk to make enquiries with GBC.
- b) **Site A39:** Land to the North of West Horsley: WHPC are meeting with the developers next week to begin building a positive working relationship.
- c) **Site A38:** Land near Horsley Railway Station, Ockham Road North, East Horsley: Nothing to report.

26.PE.107 **Special Projects:**

Site A35 Land of Former Wisley Airfield: School

WHPC Response: It was agreed that no response was required.

Site A25 Gosden Hill Farm: Nothing to report.

26.PE.108 **To agree any requirement for external advice in relation to applications considered:** None.

26.PE.097 **Date of the Next Meeting Agreed:** Thursday 3 September at 7.30pm in the Rubin Room, West Horsley Village Hall. **Meeting Closed:** 8.10pm

Appendices and objection responses are available on the WHPC website: www.westhorsley-pc.gov.uk
Electronic or hard copies of the appendices and objections can be requested from the Deputy Clerk at:
deputyclerk@westhorsley-pc.gov.uk

Signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record: _____

Date: _____

Objections and/or Comments submitted by the Parish Council in response to the following applications. Please note that there may be a delay in these responses being uploaded to the GBC Planning Portal.

26.PE.101 Significant Correspondence: Land to the north of Lower Road, Effingham and Berkley Homes: Scoping Application 26/S/00002. Text of letter sent in response to this application:

West Horsley Parish Council (The Parish Council) has considered the scoping request and submits the following representations:

The Parish Council recognises that this is a request for a Scoping Opinion under Regulation 6 and not an application for planning permission. No formal objection is made at this stage and this response is directed to the proper question before the Council, which is what the Environmental Statement must assess and the methodology by which it must do so. The Parish Council's position on the scheme itself will be made, if necessary, when an application is submitted.

The Parish Council asks the Council to note the following as directly material to scope. This land has previously been permitted for development only in combination with a rebuilt Howard of Effingham School, and the Applicant confirmed in spring 2026 that the school rebuild will not be delivered. The scoping report itself records at paragraph 2.16 that the Applicant "is no longer able to viably deliver the extant permissions in their entirety" and has brought forward a revised proposal, and at paragraph 2.17 that the development "would provide up to 600 residential units (Use Class C3). No other land uses are proposed." The proposal is therefore for a larger quantum of housing than previously permitted, with no school, no additional primary healthcare capacity and no public amenities beyond green space. Where the public infrastructure that previously accompanied development on this land has been withdrawn and the housing quantum increased, the socio economic, education, transport and cumulative effects chapters of the Environmental Statement require correspondingly greater rigour. The Parish Council asks that the Scoping Opinion reflect that.

The Parish Council supports the representations made by Effingham Parish Council and by the Effingham Residents Association and so do not repeat them. The Parish Council writes separately because residents of West Horsley and East Horsley would be directly and materially affected by this proposal and because a number of the effects will fall outside the Effingham parish boundary and outside any narrowly drawn study area.

The Parish Council asks that the following be scoped in:

1. Education. The Horsleys must be assessed as receptors by name

The Parish Council's principal representation is that the education assessment must extend beyond Effingham.

Secondary places at the Howard of Effingham School are allocated substantially by catchment and proximity and the application site adjoins the school. Children resident in West Horsley and East Horsley rely on the Howard of Effingham as their local secondary school. Introducing up to 600 households immediately beside the school with no additional education capacity provided by the scheme gives rise to a foreseeable displacement effect on children resident in West Horsley, East Horsley and other surrounding parishes, including the Bookhams, Ockham, Ripley and Send.

The Parish Council ask that the Scoping Opinion require the socio economic and education chapter to:

1. Identify West Horsley, East Horsley and the other parishes within the Howard of Effingham catchment as receptors by name rather than assessing effects only within the Effingham Neighbourhood Area or within a fixed radius of the site.
2. Assess displacement of existing catchment children expressly. Admission by proximity is not the absence of an effect. It is the mechanism by which the effect on neighbouring parishes would occur.
3. Be prepared in consultation with Surrey County Council as statutory education authority and use Surrey's own pupil yield multipliers, published capacity and forecasting data.

Signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record: _____
Date: _____

4. Not rely on the Applicant's own unevidenced forecast of falling demand. At the Applicant's public consultation webinar on 16 July 2026, its planning consultant stated that there is sufficient capacity "particularly as demand is predicted to decrease locally," and cited no Surrey County Council evidence for that proposition. Surrey County Council's Cabinet has confirmed that an additional 800 primary and 380 secondary places are needed to meet demand in 2026 and 2027. The assessment must test the Applicant's claim against the education authority's evidence rather than substitute for it.

5. Not treat the proposed Wisley Airfield secondary school as available mitigation. That school is four form entry, of which two forms are required for Wisley's own housing. Its delivery is a flexible parameter that is not triggered until several hundred dwellings are occupied and its provision remains subject to a decision by Surrey County Council. It cannot be assumed to exist, to be timely or to have spare capacity for pupils generated by an unrelated scheme.

6. Assess the consequential transport and air quality effects of displacement. If children cannot obtain places locally, journeys in a rural area are made by car. The additional school run trips arising from the absence of onsite education capacity should be quantified in the Transport Assessment and carried through to the air quality and climate chapters rather than omitted.

The Parish Council also asks that primary healthcare be assessed on evidence. The Applicant asserted at the webinar that GP capacity is sufficient because new patients continue to be accepted, without supporting evidence. The healthcare assessment should be prepared in consultation with the relevant Integrated Care Board and should address practices serving West Horsley and East Horsley residents where those practices also serve the application site.

2. Cumulative effects. The study area must include West Horsley and East Horsley

The Applicant confirmed at the webinar on 16 July 2026 that the list of cumulative developments has not yet been agreed with the Council. The Parish Council asks the Council to take an active role in fixing that list rather than allowing it to be defined by the Applicant and that no arbitrary study boundary be adopted for cumulative purposes.

West Horsley Parish Council set out its position on this issue to the Government recording in its formal response to the consultation on the Proposed Reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework that "planning applications are routinely assessed on their own merits, meaning cumulative infrastructure impacts are rarely given decisive weight." The cumulative effects requirement within the EIA Regulations exists precisely to close that gap and this proposal is the clearest local illustration of why it matters.

The Parish Council asks the cumulative assessment to:

1. Include, as a minimum, the former Wisley Airfield allocation, Gosden Hill Farm, Blackwell Farm and Slyfield, together with the Preston Farm scheme at Bookham, the schemes coming forward within Effingham and the pre application care home proposal on land east of Effingham Common Road.
2. Assess in combination effects on secondary and primary school places across the relevant Surrey County Council planning area, on GP and healthcare capacity, on the road network, on water and wastewater, and on policing, rather than assessing this site in isolation.
3. Extend the geographical scope of the assessment expressly to West Horsley, East Horsley and the wider Horsleys corridor, which lie within the catchment of the same schools, the same GP provision and the same road and rail network.

3. Transport. Study area, diversion routes and survey methodology

The Parish Council asks that the Transport Assessment scope includes the following and that the methodology is agreed in advance with Surrey County Council as local highway authority.

Study area: The A246, the local routes from West Horsley and East Horsley to Horsley station, and station parking and forecourt capacity, must all be within the study area. Both parishes have direct experience of substantial allocated growth placing pressure on these routes and will absorb a share of the trips generated by up to 600 dwellings at Effingham.

Signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record: _____

Date: _____

Strategic diversion routes: Effingham Common Road and the surrounding local network form part of the official A3 and M25 Junction 10 diversion arrangements. This point was raised at the Applicant's webinar but not answered. The Applicant's transport consultant said the relevant scenarios were "still in discussion with the highway authority" and a reasonable worst case remained to be established. The interaction of the proposed accesses and the local network with the strategic diversion routes should be expressly scoped in and evidenced, and not deferred.

Survey methodology and timing: The Scoping Opinion should require, as a condition of the Transport Assessment methodology, that all baseline traffic counts and junction surveys are undertaken on neutral term time weekdays, avoiding school holidays, half terms, bank holidays and the weeks either side; that they capture the full morning and afternoon school run peak periods and that survey dates, weather conditions and any local disruption are disclosed so that the data can be validated. Given that the principal transport issue on this site is school run traffic, an assessment based on holiday period or otherwise unrepresentative data would materially understate the effect.

Rail proximity is not capacity: As the Parish Council noted in its response to the National Planning Policy Framework consultation, "rail connectivity alone does not equate to infrastructure capacity or urban suitability." Any claim that this is a sustainable location must be tested against actual capacity on the routes and services concerned rather than on proximity alone.

Construction traffic: Construction traffic routing and the duration of the construction programme should be scoped in. The scoping report states at paragraph 2.19 that construction is anticipated to start in 2027 and to be built out by 2032 on a phased basis. A construction programme of that length has effects on the surrounding road network that extend well beyond Effingham.

4. Thornet Wood Ancient woodland must remain fully within scope

Thornet Wood, immediately to the north of the site, is Ancient Woodland and a Site of Nature Conservation Importance. Ancient woodland is an irreplaceable habitat and, under the National Planning Policy Framework, development resulting in its loss or deterioration should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy.

The Applicant confirmed at the webinar that Thornet Wood has been removed from the application red line and retained in the Applicant's ownership. The Parish Council asks the Council to record that this does not reduce what the Environmental Statement must assess. Specifically, that the ecology chapter be required to:

1. Assess indirect and edge effects on Thornet Wood arising from development adjacent to it, including changes to hydrology and drainage, air quality, artificial lighting, noise and recreational pressure from several hundred additional households, irrespective of the woodland's exclusion from the red line.
2. Apply the Natural England and Forestry Commission standing advice requiring a buffer of at least 15 metres of semi natural habitat between development and ancient woodland, and expressly a larger buffer where a development of this scale generates additional traffic, air pollution, recreational pressure, lighting and drainage change. We ask that the adequacy of the buffer be assessed as a matter of substance within the Environmental Statement and not left to reserved matters.
3. Assess effects on ecological connectivity between Thornet Wood and the woodland and hedgerow networks extending into West Horsley and East Horsley. Also setting out the biodiversity net gain on a basis that does not count land within the Applicant's retained ownership twice.

5. Building heights. The assessment must be based on the maximum parameters

The scoping report is explicit on building heights. At paragraph 2.18 it states that "the majority of homes will be two storey detached, semi-detached and terraced homes with apartment buildings of three storeys (together with plant)," and that "proposed buildings are anticipated to be between 2 to 4 storeys in height."

The Parish Council asks the Council to note that this is materially different from what was presented to residents at the public consultation webinar on 16 July 2026, at which the Applicant described homes of two to three storeys with some three storey apartment blocks. The Applicant's own scoping report anticipates buildings of up to four storeys. The Environmental Statement should assess the maximum parameters for height, scale and massing rather

Signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record: _____

Date: _____

than any indicative or illustrative layout and that four storeys be taken as the height against which effects are assessed unless and until the Applicant fixes a lower maximum.

The Parish Council notes and supports the Applicant's stated intention, at paragraph 3.13 of the scoping report, to describe "maximum building height and massing" and to use "grey parameter blocks" for the facade to provide a worst case. The Scoping Opinion should confirm this as a requirement rather than an intention and that it apply to the landscape, heritage, lighting and residential amenity assessments alike. Because this is an outline application with matters reserved, it is the parameters fixed at outline that determine the effect, and height and massing should therefore be assessed as a substantive matter now rather than deferred.

The Parish Council specifically asks that:

1. **The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment assess** the effect of the maximum built parameters, including four storey elements, on the openness of the Green Belt and on the character of the Ockham and Clandon Wooded Rolling Clayland landscape character area as defined in the Surrey Landscape Character Assessment 2015, including views across the gap between the Effingham and Little Bookham insets and including receptors in and on the approaches to West Horsley and East Horsley.
2. **Artificial light be scoped in and properly assessed.** The Parish Council does not accept the proposition that the effect of light pollution simply depends on the design of the proposed installations and can therefore be left to a later stage. The site adjoins ancient woodland and lies in a village with a dark skies policy in its Neighbourhood Plan. Lighting associated with buildings of this height together with the associated roads and parking will have an effect on the woodland edge, on nocturnal species and on the character of the wider rural area and must be assessed within the Environmental Statement. The scoping report itself contemplates the careful selection of equipment, mounting heights and optical control, which is a matter of mitigation and confirms that there is an effect to be assessed.
3. **Green Belt effects be assessed within the Environmental Statement** rather than scoped out or dealt with separately and any characterisation of the land as grey belt be tested on evidence rather than accepted as a premise. The Parish Council recorded in its response to the National Planning Policy Framework consultation that the proposed grey belt tests were "insufficiently robust to prevent incremental erosion of Green Belt in commuter belt villages" and that "preventing coalescence between settlements remains critical to maintaining distinct identity." The land in question performs that separation function, and the assessment should address it transparently and purpose by purpose.

6. Matters the Parish Council asks not be scoped out

The Parish Council supports Effingham Parish Council and the Effingham Residents Association in asking that the following remain within scope:

Ground conditions and contamination: It is understood that asbestos has been identified in 4 of 20 test pits, that there are local reports of historic unauthorised deposit of waste on the site, and that the Applicant proposes only a Phase 1 desk study with any further investigation left to a planning condition. Given the proximity of schools and residential property, this risk must be assessed at this stage rather than deferred.

Surface water and flood risk: Surrey County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority has confirmed that a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy will be required, that a sequential approach must be applied to placing development in the areas of lowest risk and that schemes must deliver genuine sustainable drainage against the four pillars of the SuDS Manual rather than the management of quantity alone. The Parish Council asks that off-site surface water effects on neighbouring roads and property as well as the present condition of drainage infrastructure and attenuation constructed under the earlier permissions, be assessed.

Water and wastewater: Thames Water has asked that the development's demand for sewage treatment and network infrastructure, off site surface water and flood risk, phasing to ensure that infrastructure is delivered ahead of occupation and piling methodology all be covered. The Parish Council supports each of those and notes that Thames Water has confirmed that water supply falls to Sutton and East Surrey Water whereas the scoping report identifies the wrong supplier.

Signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record: _____

Date: _____

Construction effects: Construction noise, dust and air quality effects on nearby schools and dwellings should be assessed at this stage, supported by a Construction Environmental Management Plan, having regard to the phased construction programme running to 2032 and the possibility of occupation of parts of the site while construction continues elsewhere.

Conclusion

West Horsley Parish Council asks the Council, in issuing its Scoping Opinion, to require an Environmental Statement that:

1. Assesses education and healthcare effects on West Horsley, East Horsley and the other parishes in the Howard of Effingham catchment by name, in consultation with Surrey County Council and the relevant Integrated Care Board, and addresses displacement of existing catchment children expressly;
2. Adopts a cumulative effects study area and development list fixed by the Council rather than by the Applicant, extending to West Horsley, East Horsley and the wider Horsleys corridor;
3. Includes the A246, the routes to Horsley station and station parking within the transport study area, expressly addresses the A3 and M25 Junction 10 diversion arrangements, and is based on term time baseline surveys agreed with the highway authority;
4. Assesses indirect and edge effects on Thornet Wood notwithstanding its removal from the red line and applies the standing advice on buffers;
5. Assesses the maximum height, scale and massing parameters, taking the Applicant's own anticipated range of 2 to 4 storeys at paragraph 2.18 as the basis, together with artificial lighting and Green Belt effects rather than scoping them out or deferring them;
6. Does not scope out ground conditions and contamination, surface water and flood risk, water and wastewater capacity and phasing, or construction effects.

The Parish Council would be grateful if this response could be placed on the file for 26/S/00002 and taken into account when the Scoping Opinion is issued. The Parish Council would also appreciate being notified of any subsequent application so that it may respond on the merits at that stage.

26.PE.102 e) Planning Application: 26/P/00937: Rosedale, Shere Road

WHPC Response: No objection, subject to comments.

West Horsley Parish Council has considered the application and raises no objection in principle. However, the Parish Council requests that careful consideration be given to the potential impact of light spill from the proposed rear extension, particularly given the three large dormer windows and flat roof, in accordance with Policy WH15: Dark Skies of the West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2018.

The Parish Council also considers that any extension should remain subservient to, and in keeping with, the character and appearance of the original dwelling.

26.PE.102 f) Amended Planning Application: 25/P/01245 Hornbeam, 174 The Street

WHPC Response: Objection

West Horsley Parish Council reiterates the objection submitted on its behalf on 28th October 2025.

Signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record: _____
Date: _____

The amendment from 5 properties (three 4 bed and two 3 bed) to 4 four bedroom properties does not overcome the reasons put forward for refusal set out in the letter of 28th October 2025. Indeed, the new housing mix is a retrograde step and merely adds to the reasons for refusal.

In addition:

a] The 4th paragraph of 3.8 of the Design and Access Statement states: *'The provision of cycle storage will be provided within dedicated cycle storage lockers located within the gardens of each plot.'* However, there is no indication in the revised site plan as to where these cycle storage lockers will be located. Although, the Planning Statement point 4.23 dated September 2025 and 3.12 of the Transport Statements dated August 2025 and revised June 2026 suggest the cycle storage would be within the rear gardens of the properties to be decided by a planning condition. This must be set out in the current application.

b] The 5th paragraph of 3.8 of the same document states: *'Waste and recycling bins will be stored on a dedicated area of hard standing within the curtilage of each plot and on collection days brought to the kerbside (ready for collection).'* Again, there is no indication in the revised site plan as to where this dedicated hard standing will be located. The document numbered '25.37-001 rev a Refuse vehicle swept path and pedestrian visibility' and dated 11th December 2025 and drawing 25.37-001 rev b, attached to the revised Transport Statement, seem to be at odds with paragraph 3.8 mentioned above indicating that refuse vehicles will proceed into the site to collect refuse and not be collecting from the kerbside. This discrepancy must be dealt with should the application be approved as the prospect of possibly 12 bins (4 recycling and 8 garden waste, the latter being the norm for gardens of the size proposed, once a fortnight) plus 4 kitchen caddies littering the pavement is not acceptable. Even 4 general waste bins and 4 kitchen caddies every alternate week must not be allowed.

West Horsley Parish Council require this amended application be refused.

Signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record: _____

Date: _____