

**Guildford Borough Councils response to ExA's Written Questions (Ref: ExQ1)**  
**GBC ref: 19/CON/00026/ExA.Q1**

	Topic		Guildford Borough Council response
1.	<b>General</b>		
	n/a		
2.	<b>Principle and nature of the development, including need and alternatives</b>		
	n/a		
3.	<b>Air quality and human health</b>		
1.3.2	Applicant, Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC) and Guildford Borough Council (GBC)	For the purposes of assessing the operational effects of the Proposed Development on air quality is the baseline monitoring data that has been relied on the most up to date that could be used?	GBC is not aware of any more up to date data than that which has been set out in the ES in so far as the development relates to reports in Guildford
1.3.3	Applicant and GBC	In view of concern raised by SCC in its RR [RR-004] about the predictions for re-routed traffic passing through Ripley (paragraph 2.2.2), is the estimate for traffic travelling through Ripley of sufficient accuracy to enable the air quality effects for this settlement to have been adequately assessed in Chapter 5 of the ES [APP-050]?	GBC shares the concerns of SCC and remains to be convinced that the predicted traffic flows through Ripley are accurate, or that they are sufficiently accurate to enable the air quality effects on this village to have been adequately assessed.

**Guildford Borough Councils response to ExA's Written Questions (Ref: ExQ1)**  
**GBC ref: 19/CON/00026/ExA.Q1**

4.	Biodiversity and Habitats Regulations Assessment		
1.4.3	Local Authorities (LAs), ie EBC and GBC and SCC	Are you aware of any other plans or developments that should be taken into account in the in-combination assessment?	GBC is shortly expecting to receive a planning application of the development of the land known as Garlicks Arch. This is expected to be for c.500 residential units and is a site allocated in our Local Plan for development.
1.4.28	LAs, NE and Surrey Wildlife Trust	In Appendix 7.11 Great Crested Newts [APP-097], Appendix 7.12 Reptiles [APP-098] and Appendix 7.14 Otters and Water Voles [APP-100] the Applicant indicates the presence of great crested newts, reptiles (including sand lizards) and otters either within, or in close proximity, to the Proposed Development site. Do you consider that the Applicant has had sufficient regard to the presence of these species in drafting the Requirements in the dDCO, the Outline CEMP [APP-134], the Landscape and Ecology Management and Monitoring Plan (LEMP)[APP-106], the SPA MMP[APP-105]. If not, then what other measures would you wish to see included?	GBC has no further comments to make in this regard at this time
1.4.33	LAs, NE, RSPB and Surrey Wildlife Trust	Please confirm whether or not you are satisfied with the amount, nature and proposals for long-term management of both the SPA compensation land and the SPA enhancement areas. If not, then please state why and explain any other measures you would wish to see included?	GBC has no further comments to make in this regard at this time

**Guildford Borough Councils response to ExA's Written Questions (Ref: ExQ1)**  
**GBC ref: 19/CON/00026/ExA.Q1**

1.4.34	LAs, NE, SWT	Are you satisfied with the duration of management/monitoring for each management type as set out in Table 7.2.1 of [APP-105]?	GBC has no further comments to make in this regard at this time
<b>5.</b>	<b>Construction</b>		
	n/a		
<b>6.</b>	<b>Flood risk, drainage and water management</b>		
	n/a		
<b>7.</b>	<b>Historic environment</b>		
	n/a		
<b>8.</b>	<b>Landscape and Visual Impact</b>		
1.8.1	Applicant and LAs	Please confirm what consultations, if any, were held between the Applicant, LAs, the Forestry Commission and NE on baseline conditions. Can you please indicate the extent to which there is agreement with regard to the description of baseline conditions in Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-054].	GBC is not aware of any consultation between NE of the FC as to the baseline conditions.  GBC considers the baseline appropriate
1.8.6	LAs	Please comment on the 1.5km study area adopted for the assessment of landscape and visual impacts.	GBC supports the comments of SCC made in response to this question
1.8.15	LAs	Are you content with the list of other developments at Table 9.14 of ES Chapter 9 [APP-054] which were considered for the cumulative landscape and visual impact assessment.	Yes
1.8.18	LAs and HistE	Are you content with the justification provided by the Application in Appendix 1.1 of [APP-078] as to why photomontages of the Proposed Development as viewed	GBC supports the comments of SCC made in response to this question

**Guildford Borough Councils response to ExA's Written Questions (Ref: ExQ1)**  
**GBC ref: 19/CON/00026/ExA.Q1**

		from key visual receptors have not be provided despite these being requested in the Scoping Opinion	
1.8.23	LAs	Are you satisfied with the species proposed for planting that are to be decided during detailed design but which are outlined according to National Vegetation Classification types in Table 7.3.1 of the Landscape and Ecology Management and Monitoring Plan [APP-106]?	GBC is satisfied with this approach
<b>9.</b>	<b>Land use, recreation and non-motorised users</b>		
	n/a		
<b>10.</b>	<b>Noise, Vibration, Dust and Lighting</b>		
1.10.8	Applicant, EBC and GBC	In relation to the control of construction noise would the need to apply to EBC and GBC for consents under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 equally apply to works being undertaken during the day and night-time periods and not just particularly the night-time as implied in paragraph 6.94 of chapter 6 of the ES [APP-051]?	GBC consider that Section 61 consents would be submitted for daytime and night-time works which are likely to have a significant impact in respect of noise, vibration and lighting.
<b>11.</b>	<b>Pollution, Contaminated land, Geology and Ground conditions</b>		
	n/a		
<b>12.</b>	<b>Socio-Economic impacts</b>		
1.12.8	GBG	Please provide a copy of the policy and supporting text concerning the Wisley Airfield allocation included within the Guildford Local Plan of 2019.	<i>*attached*</i>

**Guildford Borough Councils response to ExA's Written Questions (Ref: ExQ1)**  
**GBC ref: 19/CON/00026/ExA.Q1**

<b>13.</b>	<b>Traffic, transport and road safety</b>		
1.13.5	WPIL, SCC and GBC	By reference to a map please provide details of all of the intended, agreed or otherwise, vehicular and non-motorised user access points for the redevelopment of Wisley Airfield.	<p>GBC understand that WPIL have provided a map showing access points.</p> <p>GBC would also agree that the ExA should note that the scheme considered at appeal involved the closure of Old Lane between the two car parks for southbound traffic. This means that whilst traffic could egress the site both left to the A3 and right to Martyr's Green, ingress off Old Lane would only be via the Black Swan / Mucky Duck crossroads: there would be no access into the site off Old Lane from the A3.</p> <p>SCC and Highways England previously agreed that the southbound closure of Old Lane as part of the access strategy for the scheme was being considered.</p>
1.13.7	Applicant, GBC, SCC and WPIL	Without south facing slip roads at the Oakham Park junction how would traffic originating from the south of this junction and heading for the Wisley Airfield redevelopment site exit the A3 and how would southbound traffic exiting the airfield site join the A3? The responses to this question should include any identified routes being drawn on a map base.	GBC supports the response to this question provided by SCC
<b>14.</b>	<b>Waste management</b>		
	n/a		
<b>15.</b>	<b>Content of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)</b>		

**Guildford Borough Councils response to ExA's Written Questions (Ref: ExQ1)**  
**GBC ref: 19/CON/00026/ExA.Q1**

1.15.4	LAs	Are you content with the definition of 'maintain' in the Part 1(2) Interpretation, and in particular the Applicant's intention that this would include terms such as adjust, alter, improve reconstruct and replace within this definition provided that such works do not give rise to any materially different effects to those identified in the ES?	GBC consider that this is somewhat vague and has concerns as to how this will be enforced and who would judge / adjudicate when a materially different impact on the ES would occur
1.15.8	LAs and NE	Are you satisfied with the relationship between the CEMP and the HEMP, and that the HEMP would provide sufficient safeguards in regard to environmental protection measures? If not, then please detail what measures you would wish to see specifically included in the HEMP?	GBC considers that subject to the final wording of the requirements / obligations that the combination of the documents would provide sufficient safeguards in regard to environmental protection
1.15.11	LAs and NE	Please comment on the proposed wording of R5(1) having particular regard to the tailpiece that would potentially allow for an amended scheme that has not been subject to this Examination process to be approved by the Secretary of State.	GBC shares SCC's concerns in respect of the wide-reaching tailpiece and further information / justification is required.
<b>16.</b>	<b>Compulsory Acquisition (CA)</b>		
	n/a		