

Guildford Borough Councils response to ExA's Second Written Questions (Ref: ExQ2)
GBC ref: 19/CON/00026/ExA.Q2

	Topic	Guildford Borough Council Response	
3	Air quality and human health		
2.3.6	Applicant and Local Authorities	Have the air quality implications of the Proposed Development for Ripley been robustly assessed within the ES, having particular regard to the number and suitability of receptor properties that have been used [paragraphs 5.3 and 5.4 of REP1/041] and the extent to which the Applicant's modelling has been verified and modified against the monitoring data that is available for Ripley?	The Council has no objection to the number or the suitability of the receptors used in the assessment and that it uses the most up to date data available.
4	Biodiversity and Habitats Regulations Assessment		
2.4.3	LAs, NE and Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	Are you content with the Species Monitoring Programme that is set out in Table 7.11.1 of the SPA Management and Monitoring Plan [AS-015]?	Yes however the Council would defer to the judgement of NE and the RSPB in this regard.
8	Landscape and Visual Impact		
2.8.1	Applicant and LAs	In RHS Wisley's RR [RR-024] and in [REP4-049] reference is made to the possible loss of redwood trees close to the boundary due to tree root impact and this issue not yet being resolved. Please comment on the current situation in regard to your assessment of this as in [REP2-014, page 85] you refer to tree root surveys "still being analysed".	The Council has not undertaken a detailed assessment of the impact of the scheme on tree roots in the vicinity of the proposal. The development will require the removal of a number of trees but post development impact should also be considered in the assessment of the scheme.
2.8.3	LAs	Please comment on the response made in the 'Applicant's comments on Joint Local Impact Report' [REP3-007] in regard to concerns you had raised about the absence from the methodology of a Zone of Theoretical Visibility, and also and absence of photomontages of the Proposed Development.	The Council supports the comments made by SCC regarding concerns about absence of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility and photomontages.
12	Socio-Economic impacts		
2.12.4	Wisley Property Investments	Given that to date there is no extant planning application concerning the airfield's redevelopment	The site promoter submitted evidence to the Council in September 2019 as part of the Council's update to

Guildford Borough Councils response to ExA's Second Written Questions (Ref: ExQ2)
GBC ref: 19/CON/00026/ExA.Q2

	Limited (WPIL) and Guildford Borough Council (GBC)	before GBC for determination, how realistic is the proposition that works associated with the airfield's redevelopment would commence in 2022, with first occupations in 2022/23 [Table 2.1 of REP1-048]?	the housing trajectory in which they stated that a planning application submission is expected in 2020 with 25 completions in 2022/23 rising to 150 in 2023/24. Whilst this appears to align with the dates listed, it is important to note that the housing trajectory is concerned with completions rather than occupations.
2.12.6	GBC	When is it expected that the Wisley Airfield Garden Village bid will be determined by the Government?	Unknown. The Council recently contacted MHCLG regarding an update of any further garden community bid announcements and received the following response in February 2020: We will look to make further announcements concerning garden communities in the coming months.
15	Content of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)		
15.5	LAs, NE, RSPB, SWT, EA	Further to the Applicant's response to the ExA's first written question 1.15.1 [REP2-013], the revised dDCO [REP2-002] has removed some activities from those not encompassed within the definition of commence. Nevertheless, a number of activities such as site clearance and the receipt and erection of construction plant and equipment remain outside the definition of commence. As such, these activities could take place outside the controls of the approved CEMP and the various management plans and method statements required by the CEMP. Please comment on this and indicate which, if any, activities that are currently excluded from the definition of 'commence' you consider should be included.	The Council considered that "commence" should include site clearance and the receipt and erection of construction plant and equipment as these works in themselves have the potential for a significant environmental impact.