



SEND PARISH COUNCIL

Monday, 11th May 2026

Members of Send Parish Council are hereby summoned to attend the Planning and Environment Committee Meeting of SEND PARISH COUNCIL to be held on Monday, 18th of May 2026 at 7:00pm, in the Upper Room, Lancaster Hall, for the purpose of transacting the following business.

Public Session (5 minutes). Members of the public are invited to address the Council (7:00-7:05pm) and then are welcome to observe the rest of the meeting.

Signed:  Mrs N.G. Mair (Clerk to Send Parish Council)

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence
2. Declarations of Interest
3. Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 20th of April 2026 (**Appendix 1**).
4. Recent Decisions, Conditions and Informatives since the previous meeting.

26/P/00177, 4 Elm Close, Ripley – extension – **approve**

24/P/01627, 29 Send Road, Send – two new dwellings – **approve**.

24/P/01125 Burntcommon Nurseries – to discuss.

94 Potters Lane Hearing – to note the outcome of the permission hearing at the Royal Courts of Justice.

5. To receive and consider the following applications:

24/P/01710, Leodis, Send Hill, Send, Woking, GU23 7HW

Erection of a 90cm trellis attached to existing fence (retrospective application)

Contact: Mr Tang (Direct Line: 01483 505050; email: james.tang@guildford.gov.uk; planningenquiries@guildford.gov.uk).

26/P/00498, Little Waitrose Shell Service Station, Portsmouth Road, Send, Woking, GU23 7JW

Installation of six electric vehicle charging bays together with associated infrastructure including substation, two floodlights and a LV enclosure.

Contact: Mr Tang (Direct Line: 01483 505050; email: james.tang@guildford.gov.uk; planningenquiries@guildford.gov.uk).

26/P/00582 and **25/P/01654** Oaks Rise, 76 Potters Lane, Send, Woking, GU23 7AL

Application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to vary condition 2 (approved drawings) for an amendment to the rear dormer window (extension of dormer walls and flat roof) and an update to the roller garage door colour to match the front door of planning permission of planning application **25/P/01654** for the 'Single storey side and rear extension, loft conversion including one rear dormer window, front porch and a north side gate

Contact: Mr Tang (Direct Line: 01483 505050; email: james.tang@guildford.gov.uk; planningenquiries@guildford.gov.uk).

All other applications received before Monday, 18th of May 2026 will also be considered by the Planning and Environment Committee.

6. [PLAN/2026/0042](#) Sutton Green Golf Club

To NOTE that Woking Borough Council has now added Send Parish Council as a consultee, with a consultation response deadline of 26 May 2026 (*Appendix 2*). Following the last Planning and Environment committee meeting held on 20th April 2026, Send Parish Council agreed to submit comments that are attached in the minutes.

7. Generic Response to External Planning Applications

To consider and approve a generic response template for future planning applications outside Send Parish where the proposal may have wider cross-boundary impacts on Send, including cumulative traffic, infrastructure, environmental, and strategic planning impacts.

8. To receive an update on planning appeals and Enforcement cases (*Appendix 3*).

There are 2 low-priority enforcement cases open. No cases were closed.
No planning appeals have been circulated.

9. To note the next Planning & Environment Committee Meeting is on Monday, 1st of June 2026 at 7pm.

Parish Office - 28 Send Road, Send, Woking, GU23 7ET - 01483 479312 - clerk@sendparishcouncil.gov.uk



SEND PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES of PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

Held on Monday, 20th of April 2026 at 7:00pm in the Upper Room at the Lancaster Hall

**Present: Cllr H Thomas (Chair), Cllr D Hurdle (Vice chair), Cllr J Manktelow, Cllr J Osborn.
Officer present: J Caine (Assistant Clerk), N Mair (Clerk). Also, 3 members of the public.**

Public Session: A member of the public spoke in relation to the Planning Inspectorate appeal decision concerning land north of Heath Drive. The member of the public referred to the Inspector's comments on the impact of the proposed development on the setting of the River Wey Conservation Area and noted that, although the level of harm may not have been characterised as substantial, harm to a conservation area remained a material consideration.

The comments were noted by the Committee.

1. Apologies for Absence
Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr Bruton.
2. Declarations of Interest
There were no declarations of interest.
3. Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on 30th of March 2026.
RESOLVED: The minutes were unanimously approved.
4. Recent Guildford Borough Decisions, Conditions and Informatives since the previous meeting.
The decisions were noted by the Committee.
5. To receive and consider the following applications: -
[**26/P/00387**](#), **62 Send Barns Lane, Send, Woking, GU23 7BS**
Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed development to establish whether the construction of an outbuilding for use as a garage and gym would be lawful.

The Committee noted that the application was for a Certificate of Lawfulness and therefore the consideration was whether the proposed development would be lawful, rather than a conventional planning merits assessment.

Members raised concerns regarding the scale of the proposed outbuilding and the internal layout, including the provision of bathroom facilities. Concerns were also raised that the proposed double garage did not appear readily capable of accommodating two vehicles and that the layout could lend itself to future use as separate residential accommodation.

The Committee also noted existing parking and access constraints in the area.

AGREED: comments submitted (*Appendix 1*)

25/P/00570 RE: 90 and Land Rear of 92 Potters Lane, Send, Woking, GU23 7AL

Erection of replacement dwelling and 3 new dwellings with associated vehicular and pedestrian access and parking following demolition of existing dwelling.

Contact: Joanna Chambers (Direct Line 01483 44423, joanna.chambers@guildford.gov.uk)
planningenquiries@guildford.gov.uk

AGREED: comments submitted (*Appendix 2*)

6. To receive an update on planning appeals and Enforcement cases.
Members received no update on previous planning applications or Enforcement cases; two Enforcement cases remain open.

6. **Planning Inspectorate Appeal [APP/Y3615/W/24/3350157](#)
[22/P/01069](#) and [24/P/00657](#), Land to the north of, Heath Drive, Send**
Outline planning application for up to 40 residential units with all matters reserved except for access.
The Committee noted that the appeal relating to the proposal for 28 dwellings had been dismissed on 25th March 2026.

Members discussed the Inspector's decision and noted that the decision followed a redetermination of the appeal. The Committee noted that the Inspector had considered matters including biodiversity, the impact on the character and appearance of the area, and the effect on the setting of the River Wey Conservation Area.

It was noted that the Parish Council had made a detailed submission to the appeal and that several of the Council's concerns appeared to have been reflected in the Inspector's assessment. Members particularly noted the Inspector's findings regarding the potential urbanising effect of the proposal and the biodiversity concerns, including impacts on protected species and habitat.

The Committee also discussed the wider issue of affordable housing provision and the concern that affordable housing commitments can sometimes be reduced or removed at a later stage through viability arguments or subsequent applications.

RESOLVED: The appeal decision was noted.

7. **Invitation to consult on [PLAN/2024/0475](#) - West Hall, West Byfleet – 461 dwellings, 12 traveller pitches**
The Committee noted that Woking Borough Council had invited Send Parish Council to comment on the West Hall proposal, notwithstanding that the site is outside the parish boundary.

Members considered that, although the site is outside Send Parish, development of this scale could have wider cumulative impacts on the local road network and infrastructure, particularly when considered alongside other committed and emerging development in the Woking-Guildford corridor.

The Committee discussed the need for a strategic and consistent approach to major applications outside the parish boundary where there may be implications for Send. Members agreed that a general response should be prepared for such applications, highlighting cumulative traffic, infrastructure, environmental and cross-boundary impacts.

AGREED: A general strategic response would be prepared and submitted in respect of the West Hall application, raising concern about cumulative impacts on the wider Woking-Guildford corridor and the need for proper cross-boundary assessment.

8. **[PLAN/2026/0042](#) Sutton Green Golf Club – 650 homes and 70-bed care home
Agreed response – objection (*Appendix 3*).**
9. To receive an update on planning appeals and Enforcement cases.
There are 2 low-priority enforcement cases open. No cases were closed.

No planning appeals have been circulated.

- 10. The next meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee was scheduled to take place on Monday, 18th of May 2026 at 7.00pm.**

There being no additional business, the Chair closed the meeting at 7:37pm.

These minutes are not a verbatim record of the meeting, but a summary of discussion and decisions made at the meeting.

Parish Office, 28 Send Road, Send, Woking, GU23 7ET - 01483 479312 - clerk@sendparishcouncil.gov.uk



SEND
PARISH COUNCIL

11th May 2026

Comments on 62 Send Barns Lane

GBC Ref	26/P/00387
Location	62 Send Barns Lane, Send, Woking, GU23 7BS
Description	Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed development to establish whether the construction of an outbuilding for use as a garage and gym would be lawful.

1. Remarks

- 1.1** Send Parish Council has considered the above application and notes that it is an application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed development. The Council therefore recognises that the determining issue is whether the proposed development would be lawful for planning purposes, rather than whether the proposal is acceptable on ordinary planning merits.
- 1.2** The Parish Council understands that the relevant assessment is likely to include whether the proposal falls within the permitted development rights for buildings incidental to the enjoyment of a dwellinghouse under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the Town and Country Planning Order 2015.
- 1.3** The Parish Council raises concern regarding the scale of the proposed outbuilding and its internal layout. Members noted that the proposed building includes bathroom facilities and that the arrangement of the accommodation could lend itself to future use as separate residential accommodation, rather than solely as a garage and gym incidental to the main dwelling.
- 1.4** The Parish Council also noted concern that the proposed double garage does not appear readily capable of accommodating two vehicles, and that there are existing parking and access constraints in the area. Whilst the Parish Council recognises that parking impacts are not determinative in a Certificate of Lawfulness application, the stated garage use should be considered carefully against the submitted layout and dimensions.
- 1.5** SPC therefore asks Guildford Borough Council to satisfy itself that the proposed outbuilding would be genuinely incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse; the building would not amount to independent or self-contained residential accommodation; the proposed garage/gym use is supported by the layout and submitted plans; all Class E limitations, including siting, height, curtilage and land coverage requirements, are fully met; and no previous planning conditions or restrictions affect permitted development rights at the property.

- | |
|--|
| <p>1.6 Should Guildford Borough Council be minded to issue a Certificate, the Parish Council asks that the Certificate is tightly worded so that it confirms only the use applied for, namely an outbuilding incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse as a garage and gym, and does not certify any use as a separate dwelling, independent residential accommodation, residential annex or sleeping accommodation.</p> |
|--|



20th April 2026

Response to March 2026 Design & Access Statement Addendum

GBC Ref	25/P/00570
Location	90 and Land Rear of 92 Potters Lane, Send, Woking, GU23 7AL
Description	Erection of replacement dwelling and 3 new dwellings with associated vehicular and pedestrian access and parking following demolition of existing dwelling.

1. Introductory Remarks

- 1.1** Send Parish Council (SPC) has reviewed the applicant's Design and Access Statement Addendum dated March 2026. SPC notes that the addendum seeks to address earlier concerns by reducing the size of Plot 2, re-working Plot 3, increasing landscaping to the western boundary, and adjusting the biodiversity land whilst writing that Biodiversity Net Gain still exceeds 20 per cent.

2. Body

- 2.1** Having reviewed the addendum, SPC maintains its objection. The applicant now says the scheme has been designed following an analysis of local character and context and refers to neighbouring plot ratios and the approved scheme at 94 Potters Lane. That is not, in itself, sufficient. Policy Send 1 requires proposals to demonstrate how they promote and reinforce the local distinctiveness of Send with reference to the SNDP Character Assessment, and for Character Area D, Potters Lane and Fishing Lakes, proposals must reflect its rural and unspoilt character with many trees, beautiful lakes and very little light pollution.
- 2.2** The addendum does not identify the relevant SNDP character area in any meaningful way, does not engage substantively with the Character Assessment, and does not show why this form of backland cul-de-sac development with four dwellings, hardstanding, engineered access and formalised plot subdivision positively reinforces that character. It simply asserts that the density is appropriate and that the scheme takes note of the rural setting.
- 2.3** SPC further notes continuing concern from adjoining occupiers that the amended scheme does not materially overcome the established issues arising from the relationship between the proposed rear dwellings and neighbouring homes and gardens. In SPC's view, the amendments appear limited in scope and do not convincingly demonstrate that the proposal has overcome the underlying concerns

regarding visual intrusion, overlooking, sense of enclosure and the effect of built form in this backland position.

- 2.4** SPC also notes the contention that further reduction in ridge heights and additional pulling back of Plots 1 and 2 from the more sensitive edge of the site may have been possible. Whether or not those exact revisions are ultimately pursued, the point illustrates that the current scheme has not been shown to represent the least harmful or most policy-responsive form of development on this constrained site.
- 2.5** The revisions to Plot 3, still falls short of a robust assessment of neighbouring amenity impacts. There remains no proper verified analysis of the effects on outlook, overbearing impact, privacy, overshadowing or the relationship with existing neighbours from the amended geometry. The Parish's concern is therefore not removed merely because the applicant has stated that the relationship has improved.
- 2.6** SPC remains concerned about the relationship between the proposed development, the site's low-lying levels and the practical operation of drainage infrastructure. Concerns have been raised locally regarding the position of soakaways close to boundaries, seasonal groundwater conditions, and the reliance on pumped foul drainage. In SPC's view, these matters go not merely to engineering detail but to whether the site can accommodate the proposed form of development without adverse consequences for neighbouring land and occupiers. The amended submission does not, in SPC's view, provide sufficient reassurance on these points.
- 2.7** Parking and movement remain a concern. The addendum states, in broad terms, that the development would provide suitable access and ample parking for all four dwellings. That assertion is not, however, a substitute for clear and secured evidence demonstrating that the parking, turning and servicing arrangements are genuinely usable in practice, particularly in a constrained backland scheme served from Potters Lane. Policy Send 8 requires off-street parking provision such that any resulting parking on the public highway does not adversely affect road safety or the movement of other road users, with Surrey County Council's Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance applied as a minimum. Given the well-established parking pressures in Send, it is important that this scheme does not create avoidable overspill parking or awkward manoeuvring within the site. In the absence of properly evidenced and policy-compliant parking and movement arrangements, compliance with Policy Send 8 has not been demonstrated.
- 2.8** Re landscaping and biodiversity, SPC notes the applicant's statement that the scheme would still exceed 20 per cent biodiversity net gain and that communal BNG areas would be held and maintained by a management company rather than private householders. Policy Send 4 provides that, wherever possible, development should include the provision and enhancement of green and blue infrastructure within Send Parish, including wildlife habitats and corridors, proportionate to the scale of development, and should seek to achieve net biodiversity gain proportionate to the scale of development. SPC does not dispute that a headline BNG figure is capable of being presented. However, the issue is whether the claimed gain has been shown with sufficient clarity and reliability to be realistically achievable on this constrained backland site. In SPC's view, that has not yet been demonstrated.

- 2.9** SPC is also concerned that the ecology material does not present a clear or consistent picture of the biodiversity case being advanced. The Design and Access Statement Addendum refers in general terms to BNG still exceeding 20 per cent, whilst elsewhere the applicant's material refers to a figure of 28.43 per cent. The amended metric material then records a habitat net gain of 37.69 per cent and a hedgerow net gain of 436.13 per cent, whereas the narrative conclusion of the amended biodiversity net gain calculation refers to an increase of 0.310 habitat units, described there as 20.0 per cent. SPC does not suggest that a numerical exercise cannot be undertaken. However, where different parts of the applicant's own material refer to materially different BNG outcomes, that inevitably reduces confidence in the precision and reliability of the case being put forward. That concern is reinforced by the presence of generic and apparently erroneous references in the ecology material to other administrative areas and policies unrelated to Guildford. In those circumstances, SPC is not satisfied that the application has demonstrated with sufficient clarity that the claimed biodiversity benefits are robustly evidenced, that the proposed habitat areas can realistically establish and function as intended alongside the drainage features, access arrangements, retained trees and domestic boundaries, or that effective long-term maintenance has been shown in practical terms. On the information presently available, SPC therefore remains unconvinced that compliance with Policy Send 4 has been satisfactorily demonstrated.
- 2.10** More generally, SPC considers that caution is required in attaching substantial weight to the supporting ecological and biodiversity material in its present form. For the reasons already set out, the documents do not present a wholly consistent or clearly site-specific picture of the biodiversity case being advanced. In those circumstances, SPC does not consider that the authority can safely proceed on the basis that the ecological benefits claimed have been robustly established merely because they are asserted within the applicant's technical submissions.
- 2.11** SPC also considers that the addendum still falls short in addressing the implications of the proposal for the dark and unspoilt character of this part of Potters Lane. Policy Send 1 requires proposals in Character Area D to reflect its rural and unspoilt character with many trees, beautiful lakes and very little light pollution. The creation of four dwellings in this backland position, with associated access, parking, activity and domestic lighting, has an obvious potential to introduce a more suburban character into an area which the Neighbourhood Development Plan identifies as notably dark and rural. The information presently provided does not contain any meaningful assessment of likely operational lighting effects on the character of the area, nearby ecological corridors or the general sense of rural tranquillity. In SPC's view, that is a material omission.
- 2.12** SPC remains concerned that the amended material does not adequately explain how the proposed drainage measures, biodiversity areas and wider landscaping strategy would operate together in practice on this constrained site. The addendum refers to swales, soakaways, communal areas and biodiversity land, but does not clearly demonstrate how those features have been designed as an integrated and workable form of green infrastructure rather than as separate elements competing for limited space. In SPC's view, the submission still lacks sufficient clarity as to whether the proposed habitats, drainage features and planted areas can all function as intended without conflict, particularly having regard to site levels, boundary relationships, retained trees and the practical requirements of long-term maintenance.

3. Concluding Remarks

- 3.1** Overall, SPC considers that the addendum shows the applicant has responded to criticism, but it does not go far enough. The revisions may reduce some impacts, but the proposal still appears to represent an intrusive form of backland development that has not been convincingly shown to reflect the rural character and settlement pattern of Potters Lane, nor to satisfy the evidential requirements of the Send Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- 3.2** Send Parish Council maintains its **OBJECTION** to application 25/P/00570 and respectfully requests **REFUSAL**.



20th April 2026

Representation on Sutton Green Golf Club

WBC Ref	PLAN/2026/0042
Location	Sutton Green Golf Club, New Lane, Sutton Green, Woking, Surrey GU4 7QF
Description	Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except access) comprising the erection of up to 650 homes (Use Class C3) with associated parking, infrastructure and open space; a care home (Use Class C2), and commercial and community uses and a publicly-accessible SANG country park (Environmental Statement submitted)

1. Introductory Remarks

- 1.1** Send Parish Council (SPC) submits the following comments for Woking Borough Council's consideration in respect of this application. Although the application site lies within the administrative area of Woking Borough Council, SPC notes that it was not initially consulted, notwithstanding the scale of the proposal for up to 650 dwellings and a 70-bed care home, and notwithstanding the site's close proximity to Send.
- 1.2** SPC is an affected neighbouring parish. The applicant's own transport material places Send within the wider study area and strategic movement context, yet the application materially under-assesses the likely effects on Send's infrastructure.
- 1.3** The Parish of Send is already affected by an exceptional concentration of approved, emerging and prospective development within the wider corridor. Within Guildford borough alone, SPC notes the approved Wisley scheme for 1,730 dwellings, the approved Gosden Hill scheme for 550 dwellings, the promoted Gosden Hill Farm proposal for approx 1,800 dwellings, an emerging proposal in West Clandon for approx 180 dwellings, a further emerging proposal in West Clandon on the Ripley border for approximately 600 dwellings, the Highlands Farm proposals in Ripley for 540 dwellings, proposals affecting Send itself at Polesden Lane for around 250 dwellings, and the Alderton's Farm proposal for 140 dwellings.
- 1.4** That pressure is not confined to Guildford borough. On the Woking side of the boundary, SPC notes the proposed West Hall development for up to 461 residential units and 12 traveller pitches. SPC also notes that Woking Borough Council currently has only 4.57 years of housing land supply, rather than five years. In those circumstances, speculative major applications are plainly more likely to come forward. SPC further notes that, in earlier Woking plan-making work, two sites in Pyrford were identified as safeguarded sites for longer-term needs

rather than immediate allocations: GB12, Land rear of 79–95 Lovelace Drive, Teggs Lane, Pyrford, with an anticipated capacity of 223 dwellings; and GB13, Land east of Upshot Lane and south of Aviary Road, Pyrford, with an anticipated capacity of 200 dwellings. SPC appreciates such speculative developments have little to no relevance when looking at [PLAN/2026/0042](#) by itself but this matters greatly for Send because pressure generated by Woking's constrained land supply does not stop at the borough boundary: it intensifies development pressure across the wider Woking–Guildford corridor, including on neighbouring settlements such as Send, which already functions as part of the same network of roads, services and countryside.

- 1.5** SPC further notes that this cross-boundary pressure is not new, but has a clear planning history. Guildford, Waverley and Woking have long been assessed as forming part of the same West Surrey Housing Market Area, with an associated expectation of joint working to assess and, where possible, address housing need across that area. The Guildford Local Plan Inspector recorded that the 2015 Strategic Housing Market Assessment assessed Woking's housing need at 517 dwellings per annum, whereas Woking's Core Strategy made provision for only 292 dwellings per annum, leaving 225 dwellings per annum unmet. The Inspector also recorded that Waverley's adopted Local Plan incorporated 83 dwellings per annum of that unmet need, and that Guildford's modifications had at one stage proposed to accommodate a further 42 dwellings per annum. () In short, Woking's constrained ability to meet its own housing need has historically placed additional pressure on the wider Housing Market Area, including Guildford, and that history is directly relevant to the cumulative and cross-boundary effects now experienced by Send.
- 1.6** In the Westminster Hall debate of 17 December 2025 on the cumulative impact of housing development, Will Forster MP stated that the area was "already poorly connected and struggling with weak infrastructure as it is" and warned that, because the applications were speculative, "the cumulative impact has not been considered", including impacts on "the local environment, the transport system, wider public services and the character of the area". SPC considers that observation directly apposite here. This proposal should not be determined in isolation, nor should it be permitted to pre-empt the proper democratic and plan-led consideration of cumulative growth and infrastructure capacity across the wider Woking-Guildford corridor.
- 1.7** The present application should therefore be determined by reference to its cumulative effects within the wider Woking-Guildford corridor. In SPC's view, the proposal would materially erode the strategic gap between the southern edge of Woking and the northern edge of Guildford and would intensify pressure for coalescence within an already sensitive corridor. On SPC's understanding, the distance between the current southern edge of Westfield and the northern edge of Jacob's Well is approximately 2.6 km. If this development were permitted, the built edge of Woking would be brought substantially further south towards Pyle Hill, reducing the remaining gap to approximately 1.5 km. That would amount to an effective reduction of around 45% in this part of the corridor. Whether or not that would amount to literal settlement merger in the immediate term, it would plainly and materially weaken the strategic separation between Woking and Guildford and further diminish the countryside setting experienced by neighbouring settlements, including Send.

2. Applicant Docs	
2.1	SPC is concerned by the way Send is characterised in the application material. The Design and Access Statement Part 1 states at page 2 that the immediate area contains “a handful of small settlements including Send to the east”. SPC does not agree that this is an accurate description of Send. Send is not a small village in the ordinary sense of that term and has already experienced substantial development pressure, and it is now rather densely populated with corresponding loss of green space and erosion of rural character. That matters because the description understates the scale, sensitivity and existing development burden of the settlement likely to be affected by this proposal.
2.2	SPC further notes that the Design and Access Statement Part 2 contains only limited reference to Send. In transport terms, Send is referred to on page 3 merely as follows: “Accessed from PRoW SR46, is PRoW 45 and 52 which lead east towards the village of Send.” This is a strikingly narrow treatment of Send, given the site’s obvious relationship with Send not only by rights of way but also in terms of highway movements and wider cross-boundary effects.”
2.3	SPC notes that the applicant’s Transport Assessment Volume 1 states at page 16: “The Strategic Road Network is accessible with the A3 trunk road located 4.2km to the south of the site, which provides access to the M25 approximately 14km to the east.” SPC considers that, in practical terms, this strategic road connection plainly engages routes affecting Send. SPC also notes that Figure 3.1 in Volume 1 identifies a surrounding area extending across Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and the Ripley By-Pass. The applicant therefore includes Send within the scheme’s wider functional catchment, yet fails to carry that through into a proportionate assessment of impacts on Send.
2.4	SPC also objects to the apparent methodology used to identify key attractors, destinations and corridors. Transport Assessment Volume 1 states at page 19, under “Key Attractors/Destinations”, that: “Utilising the trip purpose information above and an analysis of Census 2011 Journey to Work data for residents of MSOA Woking 012, key locations relating to these land uses were identified within a reasonable catchment of the site.” SPC recognises that Census 2021 travel-to-work data were collected during the pandemic and may therefore require careful treatment. However, if the applicant has chosen to rely principally on Census 2011 journey-to-work data for a 2026 proposal, that decision should be expressly explained and justified. In particular, the applicant should demonstrate why the use of older data remains robust considering subsequent changes in land use, demographics, travel behaviour and network conditions, and should support that approach with more recent observed traffic evidence and appropriate sensitivity testing. As matters stand, SPC is concerned that the use of older data has shaped the assessment methodology in a way which materially underrepresents Send and the relevant cross-boundary routes and corridors. This follows on to SPC’s next section.
3. Transport	
3.1	SPC’s principal concern is that the applicant has failed properly to assess the likely cross-boundary effects of the proposal on the road network serving Send, including Burnt Common, Send Road, Potters Lane, Portsmouth Road and the wider

corridor extending to Ripley High Street.

- 3.2** The proposal is of substantial scale and would introduce a significant volume of additional vehicle movements onto an already constrained network. In SPC's view, the Transport Assessment materially under-scopes the likely redistribution of traffic arising from the development and does not adequately assess realistic routeing choices towards the A3 and M25.
- 3.3** SPC notes that residents of the proposed development travelling towards the A3 / Guildford corridor could reasonably divert through Jacob's Well and via Clay Lane depending on prevailing congestion and journey times. However, SPC's principal concern lies with movements towards the M25 and the wider strategic corridor east of the site.
- 3.4** In practical terms, residents of the proposed development wishing to travel towards the M25 are likely to use several realistic routes which materially affect Send. These include:
- (a) travelling through Old Woking and then down Send Road before turning onto the already highly congested Portsmouth Road, continuing through Burnt Common and up Ripley High Street before joining the M25 via the Wisley By-Pass;
 - (b) travelling through Old Woking, then down Send Road and along Potters Lane in order to join the A3 corridor in that direction; and
 - (c) travelling via Jacob's Well, but still ultimately feeding into the Burnt Common / Portsmouth Road / Ripley High Street corridor in order to access the strategic road network eastwards.
- 3.5** These are obvious and realistic routeing responses to congestion, journey-time unreliability and the existing structure of the surrounding road network. Once a development of this scale is introduced into an already stressed system, traffic does not remain confined to the most direct or most heavily modelled routes. It redistributes onto alternative corridors. In this case, that redistribution is liable to affect Send's network directly.
- 3.6** The material effect on Send would be increased through-traffic on roads which are already sensitive in capacity, character and function. In particular:
- (a) Send Road would be exposed to greater use as a cross-boundary through-route for traffic moving between Old Woking and the Portsmouth Road / Ripley corridor;
 - (b) Potters Lane would be exposed to additional pressure as a route towards the A3 corridor, notwithstanding its constrained and sensitive character;
 - (c) Burnt Common and Portsmouth Road would be exposed to additional traffic associated with movements towards the M25 and Wisley corridor; and
 - (d) Ripley High Street would experience further pressure as part of the strategic route to the M25, with consequential effects on congestion, delay and wider network performance feeding back onto the Send corridor.
- 3.7** On the applicant's own modelling, a number of key junctions are already forecast to be at or over capacity by 2040 even without the development, including Turnoak Roundabout, the A320 Woking Road / A3 eastbound slip, Blanchards Hill / Clay Lane, Mayford Green Roundabout and Claremont Avenue / A247. With the

development in place, the position worsens at several locations. On the applicant's own figures, the A320 Woking Road / A25 / Stoke Road junction reaches up to 113.4% degree of saturation in the AM peak, Claremont Avenue / A247 rises to RFC 1.20 in the PM peak, and Mayford Green Roundabout exceeds RFC 1.0. Under the applicant's "pessimistic" scenario, Clay Lane reaches RFC 1.25 in the PM peak and Turnoak also exceeds RFC 1.0 in the PM peak.

- 3.8** Those figures are highly material. They show that the surrounding highway network is not a comfortably operating system with spare resilience, but an already stressed network to which the proposal would add substantial further demand. In those circumstances, traffic redistribution onto alternative corridors such as via Send is not speculative. It is a foreseeable and likely response to worsening congestion and journey-time unreliability.
- 3.9** In those circumstances, SPC argues that diversionary traffic onto alternative corridors is a foreseeable and likely response to congestion. In particular, drivers may seek to avoid the most stressed parts of the network by routing through Old Woking and onwards via Send Road, or through Jacob's Well and onwards towards Burnt Common, Portsmouth Road and Ripley High Street to access the M25 corridor.
- 3.10** SPC notes that the applicant's collision study area, as identified from page 54 of Transport Assessment Volume 1, does not appear to include these realistic routing options and turnings affecting Send and the corridor up to Ripley High Street. That omission is material. If those routes are realistic responses to congestion and strategic trip-making, they should have been included within the study area and assessed accordingly.
- 3.11** SPC is also concerned that the Transport Assessment does not appear meaningfully to model traffic movements towards the M25. That is a serious flaw in the context of this site. The M25 is an obvious strategic destination for future residents, and how traffic is likely to reach it has direct implications for neighbouring settlements including Send. In the absence of such modelling, the Council cannot be satisfied that the likely impacts on Send's road network have been properly understood.
- 3.12** SPC is also concerned that the Transport Assessment does not appear meaningfully to model traffic movements towards the M25. That is a serious flaw in the context of this site. The M25 is an obvious strategic destination for future residents, and how traffic is likely to reach it has direct implications for neighbouring settlements including Send. In the absence of such modelling, the Council cannot be satisfied that the likely impacts on Send's road network have been properly understood.
- 3.13** The concern is reinforced by the site access strategy shown in Transport Assessment Volume 2, page 11. SPC notes that one access from New Lane is to be retained and that three further access points are proposed onto New Lane. New Lane lies on the side of the site facing towards Send. The arrangement therefore increases the importance of understanding how vehicles will distribute eastwards and south-eastwards from the site, yet the submitted assessment does not appear to undertake a sufficiently robust evaluation of that cross-boundary distribution.
- 3.14** SPC further notes that the applicant's own modelling indicates that several surrounding junctions are already forecast to be at or over capacity, with performance worsening with the development in place. In such circumstances,

	there is an obvious risk that drivers will divert away from the most congested nodes and seek alternative routes through neighbouring corridors. That makes it more important that the assessment should have captured displacement effects onto Send Road, Potters Lane, Burnt Common, Portsmouth Road and Ripley High Street. SPC does not consider that it has done so.
3.15	The consequence is that the likely impacts on Send have been materially under-assessed. The proposal would not merely add traffic to Woking-side junctions in isolation. It would create a real risk of increased traffic, congestion and delay on the roads serving Send and the wider corridor to Ripley High Street, with associated implications for highway safety, residential amenity, rural road character and the effective operation of the local network.
3.16	Also Burnt Common Nurseries warehouse development phase 3 has now been refused by Guildford Borough Council as of March 2026 but this will go to appeal and If the Inspector is minded to approve Phase 3 then more HGVs will go on the old, cramped roads in the Eastern Villages which causes lots of traffic through the roads connecting up to the M25 mainly Ripley High Street and Portsmouth Road. A solution would be to build the Burntcommon Slips but the Department for Transport thought the best thing to do was remove it from National Highways Road Investment Strategy 2026 - 31.
3.17	In those circumstances, SPC argues that the transport evidence is inadequate and that the application fails to demonstrate that the residual cumulative impacts on the road network affecting Send would not be severe. At a minimum, the applicant should be required to undertake further assessment which: (a) expressly models routing towards the M25; (b) expands the study area to include Send Road, Potters Lane, Burntcommon, Portsmouth Road and Ripley High Street; (c) reassesses the collision analysis by reference to those routes and turnings; and (d) identifies and secures any necessary mitigation for cross-boundary impacts on Send's network.
3.18	Unless and until that work is undertaken, SPC considers that the application should be refused on transport grounds.

4. Rural Setting Harm to Send's Approach Roads	
4.1	SPC further objects on the basis that the proposal would be likely to harm the rural setting and approach to Send by intensifying pressure on roads and lanes which are valued not merely as traffic corridors but as part of the settlement's countryside character and arrival experience. The Send Neighbourhood Plan places specific weight on the protection of the rural and unspoilt character of Potters Lane and Fishing Lakes, the very green and rural character of Send Hill, and the retention of landscape quality and mature planting in the Portsmouth Road / Burnt Common area.
4.2	SPC is concerned that the likely redistribution of movements associated with this proposal would increase the urbanising pressure experienced on those approach roads through higher traffic volumes, greater activity, more frequent congestion and increased use of lanes and corridors that presently retain a semi-rural

character. The resulting effect is not limited to delay. It would materially erode the amenity, tranquillity and landscape setting experienced by residents and visitors approaching or moving through Send, particularly along Potters Lane, Burntcommon and Portsmouth Road.

- 4.3** In SPC's view, this is an important cross-boundary effect which has not been properly captured by the application material. A scheme may lie outside the parish boundary and yet still alter the character of roads, lanes and transition points that form part of Send's setting. The fact that the development is proposed elsewhere does not prevent real and harmful impacts being experienced within Send itself. SPC therefore submits that the application under-assesses the likely harm to the character and rural setting of Send's approach roads

5. Air Quality

- 5.1** Send Parish Council also considers that the likely air-quality and road-safety implications for Send have been materially under-assessed. If, as SPC contends, traffic generated by the development is liable to redistribute through Old Woking, Send Road, Potters Lane, Burnt Common, Portsmouth Road and Ripley High Street in response to worsening congestion and limited network resilience, then the effects of that redistribution are not confined to queue lengths and journey times. They also include consequences for pedestrian safety, cyclist safety, equestrian movements, residential amenity and exposure to traffic-related pollution on roads already subject to local constraint.

6. Cross Boundary Infrastructure

- 6.1** SPC is concerned not only by the transport implications of the proposal, but also by the wider cross-boundary demands it is likely to place on infrastructure and everyday services used by residents of Send. A development of up to 650 dwellings together with a 70-bed care home can generate substantial additional demand for healthcare, education, local shops and services, recreation space, utilities and community infrastructure across a wider functional area extending beyond the Woking borough boundary.
- 6.2** SPC is concerned that the submitted material does not appear to grapple adequately with the extent to which future occupants may rely upon facilities and infrastructure serving neighbouring settlements, including Send. The Parish already experiences significant cumulative pressure from approved, emerging and promoted development within the wider corridor, and the addition of a scheme of this scale gives rise to a clear risk of further strain on shared local services and infrastructure. That concern is not speculative. Woking Borough Council's own recent public discussions of this application and related schemes have expressly referred to infrastructure requirements including healthcare, utilities and sewage as matters requiring scrutiny
- 6.3** In SPC's view, the application should therefore not be determined without a more robust assessment of the proposal's wider infrastructure effects, including any cross-boundary demands likely to fall upon the Send corridor and surrounding settlements. In the absence of such work, the Council cannot be satisfied that the

impacts of the development on local infrastructure have been properly understood, nor that any necessary mitigation has been identified and secure

7. Drainage and Wastewater

- 7.1** SPC is also concerned that the application does not adequately address the potential cross-boundary implications of the proposal for drainage, wastewater infrastructure and the wider water environment affecting Send. The Parish has an established interest in the protection of its water environment, ditches, wetland landscapes and watercourses.
- 7.2** A development of this scale, together with a care home and associated uses, is plainly capable of increasing foul-water loading and placing additional pressure on drainage and sewerage systems which do not respect administrative boundaries. Where there is already concern in the wider area regarding utilities and sewage capacity, it is not sufficient simply to assume that such effects can be absorbed without consequence for neighbouring communities. SPC is concerned that the application material does not clearly demonstrate that the proposal can be accommodated without adverse knock-on effects for settlements within the wider corridor, including Send

8. Concluding Remarks

- 8.1** For all these reasons, SPC argues that the proposal's effects on Send have been materially under-assessed. The application does not properly evaluate the extent to which a development of this scale would export transport, infrastructure, drainage, amenity and environmental impacts across the borough boundary into the Send corridor. In the absence of a more robust and transparent assessment, the Local Planning Authority cannot be satisfied that the proposal complies with the requirements of sound decision-taking in respect of cumulative and cross-boundary impacts. Send Parish Council submits its comments to Woking Borough Council for CONSIDERATION and respectfully requests **REFUSAL**.

Jessaline Caine



Civic Offices
Gloucester Square
Woking
Surrey GU21 6YL

Telephone (01483) 755855
Facsimile (01483) 768746
Website www.woking.gov.uk

Send Parish Council
Send Parish Office
28 Send Road
Send
Woking
Surrey
GU23 7ET

5 May 2026

Dear Sir/Madam,

STANDARD CONSULTATION
Application for Outline Planning Permission

Application Reference: PLAN/2026/0042

Application Type: Outline Planning Application

Proposal: Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except access) comprising the erection of up to 650 homes (Use Class C3) with associated parking, infrastructure and open space; a care home (Use Class C2), and commercial and community uses and a publicly-accessible SANG country park (Environmental Statement submitted)

Location: Sutton Green Golf Club , New Lane, Sutton Green, Woking, Surrey, GU4 7QF

Letter Reference: DC/WBC/TEKGV0RU02X00

I have received the above application and would be grateful for your views by the **26 May 2026**. In the absence of a reply by this date I will assume that you have no observations to make.

Should you wish to view the plans, these are available to be viewed and printed via the Internet by using the link below. To view details of this application on our PublicAccess for Planning website, please use your web browser to go to: <https://caps.woking.gov.uk/online-applications/> (see *Note).

If you wish to print any of the documents when you view them on the above website, please note that a "View PDF" button is provided and you can then use Adobe Acrobat to print the complete document. (Pages "as first viewed" cannot be printed fully by your web browser alone.)

If you have any queries please contact the case officer Harsha Bhundia on 01483743052, quoting application number **PLAN/2026/0042**. Please send your response to development.control@woking.gov.uk

Yours faithfully

Beverley Kuchar
Strategic Director – Place





Note re. <https://caps.woking.gov.uk/online-applications/> : In the left-hand margin, **click** the link to **Planning** and on the next page to “**Application Search**”. Then enter **PLAN/2026/0042** as the Application Reference, scroll down and press the **Search** button. You should then see summary details for the case. Press the “**Click to view**” button to the right of summary details. All available information and associated documents such as plans, etc., can then be viewed.



Current Enforcement Cases Send

Report date: 01/05/2026

Total Number of all Open Cases: 2

Total Number of **HIGH** Priority Cases Open: 0

Total Number of **MEDIUM** Priority Cases Open: 0

Total Number of **LOW** Priority Cases Open: 2

Send

Total cases for parish: 2

- | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | Case No: EN/25/00374 | Received: 14/10/2025 | Case Status: Investigating |
| | Officer: Marie Parmar | | Priority: Low |
| | Location: Seale, Send Hill, Send, Woking, GU23 7HR | | |
| | Description: Alleged unauthorised development consisting of the siting, in the rear garden of the property, of a mobile home being used as an independent dwelling | | |
| 2 | Case No: EN/26/00052 | Received: 27/02/2026 | Case Status: Investigating |
| | Officer: Peter Muir | | Priority: Low |
| | Location: Fermain, Greyfriars Road, Ripley, Woking, GU23 6JD | | |
| | Description: Alleged breach of conditions 2 and 5 of planning approval 24/P/01871, specifically the addition of a false roof over the existing garage and the roof light windows in the east side elevation not being obscure glazed or fixed shut (unless the opening part is more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room they are installed in) | | |