

General comments report

Respondent Name	Comment	Attached files
Ms Susan Johnson	As the plan shows the availability of cycle paths is woeful. With all the increased traffic from development in the area it is dangerous and deters cycling. No provision has been made for a bridge at the Ash level crossing enabling parishioners to get across when the barrier is down. This can result in missed trains with an hours wait discouraging use of the train. No dog bins on the ranges or on roads as users exit the ranges has not been provided for. Until this is tackled you will get piles of dog poo bags at exits such as onto Foxhills Road. i support the need for pavement in foreman road before there is a fatality. Likewise in Harpers Road with lightening as there is currently no safe pedestrian access from Ash into Ash Green	
Thames Water (David Wilson)	Dear Sir/Madam, Thank you for allowing Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Thames Water) to comment upon the above. As you may be aware, Thames Water are the statutory sewerage undertaker for the THE Guildford area and the water undertaker for part and are hence a “specific consultation body” in accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012. We have the following comments on the consultation in relation to our water supply and sewerage undertakings: <u>Sustainable Development Principles - Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Comments</u> A key sustainability objective for the preparation of Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 20 of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2024, states: <i>“Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for... infrastructure for waste management, water supply, wastewater...”</i> Paragraph 11 states: <i>“Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For plan-making this means that: a) all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to: meet the development needs of their area; align growth and infrastructure; improve the environment; mitigate climate change (including by making effective use of land in urban areas) and adapt to its effects”</i> Paragraph 28 relates to non-strategic policies and states: <i>“Non-strategic policies should be used by local planning authorities and communities to set out more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods or types of development. This can include allocating sites, the provision of infrastructure...”</i> Paragraph 26 of the revised NPPF goes on to state: <i>“Effective and on-going joint working between strategic policy-making authorities and relevant bodies is integral to the production of a positively prepared and justified strategy. In particular, joint working should help to determine where additional infrastructure is necessary....”</i> The December 2025 draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) consultation, published by the UK Government, proposes updates to national planning policy. The draft highlights the importance of resilient water infrastructure, with Policy W4: Water Infrastructure supporting the delivery and upgrade of water supply and treatment facilities. The policy recognises the benefits of improving capacity, reliability, and water quality, stating that proposals for such infrastructure should be given ‘substantial weight’. The web based National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) includes a section on ‘water supply, wastewater and water quality’ and sets out that Local Plans should be the focus for ensuring that investment plans of water and sewerage/wastewater companies align with development needs. The introduction to this section also sets out that <i>“Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development”</i> (Paragraph: 001, Reference ID: 34-001-20140306).	26.01 Ash Parish NP Submission issued.pdf

Respondent Name	Comment	Attached files
	Thames Water therefore recommends that developers engage with them at the earliest opportunity (in line with paragraph 26 of the revised NPPF) to establish the following: • The developments demand for water supply infrastructure; • The developments demand for Sewage/Wastewater Treatment and network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met; and • The surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the development both on and off site and can it be met. Thames Water offer provide a Pre-Planning service which confirms if capacity exists to serve the development or if upgrades are required for potable water, waste water and surface water requirements. Details on Thames Water’s pre planning service are available at: https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Water-and-wastewater-capacity In light of the above comments and Government guidance we agree that the Neighbourhood Plan should include a specific reference to the key issue of the provision of wastewater/sewerage and water supply infrastructure to service development proposed in a policy. This is necessary because it will not be possible to identify all of the water/sewerage infrastructure required over the plan period due to the way water companies are regulated and plan in 5 year periods (Asset Management Plans or AMPs). We recommend that the Neighbourhood Plan include the following policy/supporting text: <i>“Where appropriate, planning permission for developments which result in the need for off-site upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades.”</i> <i>“The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/waste water company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of development.”</i> Water Efficiency/Sustainable Design The Environment Agency has designated the Thames Water region to be “seriously water stressed” which reflects the extent to which available water resources are used. Future pressures on water resources will continue to increase and key factors are population growth and climate change. Water conservation and climate change is a vitally important issue to the water industry. Not only is it expected to have an impact on the availability of raw water for treatment but also the demand from customers for potable (drinking) water. Therefore, Thames Water support the mains water consumption target of 110 litres per head per day (105 litres per head per day plus an allowance of 5 litres per head per day for gardens) as set out in the NPPG (Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 56-014-20150327) and support the inclusion of this requirement in the Policy. Thames Water promote water efficiency and have a number of water efficiency campaigns which aim to encourage their customers to save water at local levels. Further details are available on the our website via the following link: https://www.thameswater.co.uk/Be-water-smart It is our understanding that the water efficiency standards of 105 litres per person per day is only applied through the building regulations where there is a planning condition requiring this standard (as set out at paragraph 2.8 of Part G2 of the Building Regulations). As the Thames Water area is defined as water stressed it is considered that such a condition should be attached as standard to all planning approvals for new residential development in order to help ensure that the standard is effectively delivered through the building regulations. Within Part G of Building Regulations, the 110 litres/person/day level can be achieved through either the ‘Calculation Method’ or the ‘Fittings Approach’ (Table 2.2). The Fittings Approach provides clear flow-rate and volume performance metrics for each water using device / fitting in new dwellings. Thames Water considers the Fittings Approach, as outlined in Table 2.2 of Part G, increases the confidence that water efficient devices will be installed in the new dwelling. Insight from our smart water metering programme shows that household built to the 110 litres/person/day level using the Calculation Method, did not achieve the intended water performance levels.	

Respondent Name	Comment	Attached files
	Proposed policy text: “Development must be designed to be water efficient and reduce water consumption. Refurbishments and other non-domestic development will be expected to meet BREEAM water-efficiency credits. Residential development must not exceed a maximum water use of 105 litres per head per day (excluding the allowance of up to 5 litres for external water consumption) using the ‘Fittings Approach’ in Table 2.2 of Part G of Building Regulations. Planning conditions will be applied to new residential development to ensure that the water efficiency standards are met.” <u>Sustainable Development Principles - Comments in Relation to Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems</u> The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) states that a sequential approach should be used by local planning authorities in areas known to be at risk from forms of flooding other than from river and sea, which includes "Flooding from Sewers". Flood risk sustainability objectives and policies should also make reference to ‘sewer flooding’ and an acceptance that flooding can occur away from the flood plain as a result of development where off site sewerage infrastructure and capacity is not in place ahead of development. With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of the developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, watercourses or surface water sewer. It is important to reduce the quantity of surface water entering the sewerage system in order to maximise the capacity for foul sewage to reduce the risk of sewer flooding. Limiting the opportunity for surface water entering the foul and combined sewer networks is of critical importance to Thames Water. Thames Water have advocated an approach to SuDS that limits as far as possible the volume of and rate at which surface water enters the public sewer system. By doing this, SuDS have the potential to play an important role in helping to ensure the sewerage network has the capacity to cater for population growth and the effects of climate change. SuDS not only help to mitigate flooding, they can also help to: improve water quality; provide opportunities for water efficiency; provide enhanced landscape and visual features; support wildlife; and provide amenity and recreational benefits. With regard to surface water drainage, Thames Water request that the following paragraph should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan <i>“It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding.”</i> <u>Site Allocations</u> There are no new allocations in the draft Neighbourhood Plan and the level of information does not enable Thames Water to make an assessment of the impact the proposed development will have on the waste water/sewerage network infrastructure and sewage treatment works. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the type and scale of development together with the anticipated phasing. We recommend Developers contact Thames Water to discuss their development proposals by using our pre app service via the following link: https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Water-and-wastewater-capacity It should be noted that in the event of an upgrade to our sewerage network assets being required, up to three years lead in time is usual to enable for the planning and delivery of the upgrade. As a developer has the automatic right to connect to our sewer network under the Water Industry Act we may also request a drainage planning condition if a network upgrade is required to ensure the infrastructure is in place ahead of occupation of the development. This will avoid adverse environmental impacts such as sewer flooding and / or water pollution. We recommend developers attach the information we provide to their planning applications so that the Council and the wider public are assured wastewater and water supply matters for the development are being addressed. We trust the above is satisfactory, but please do not hesitate to contact David Wilson on the above number if you have any queries.	
National Highways (Sir or	We have reviewed information available on your planning portal and have ‘No Comments’.	

Respondent Name	Comment	Attached files
Madam)		
David Barton	Utilise Traditional Architecture Design Codes for all new construction with a bon on demolition of all buildings constructed prior to 1950. See my PDF Umbrella Representation for additional Placemaking/ Planning and Greenery Proposals.	COMMUNITY CAMPAIGNER DAVID RICHARD BARTON- FEEDBACK SUBMISSION UK AND IRELAND PLANNING CONSULTATI ONS FV.pdf
Raymond Rogers	Concerning the consultation I would like to register my strong support for the Ash neighborhood plan and in particular the need for a large gap between Ash Green and Ash and Tongham to prevent coalescence. In particular I strongly support the gap shown shaded in grey in figure 6 page 18. However the gap should be further extended to include area "2" shown in that figure.	
Louise Robertson	I have been victim of the dreaded no gap already, [Address Redacted] my bathroom window now looks rather than onto a field into a gentleman's bathroom window. Thank you [construction company] who have been the most inconsiderate builders. The buffer is 4 inches between my fence and the new houses. GREEN GAP Therefore in the proposed plan I strongly support a large gap between Ash Green, Ash and Tongham to avoid coalescence in particular support the grey hatched area page 18 figure 6 however this needs to be supported with the inclusion of the wider areas labelled “1” and “2”.	
Surrey County Council (Sir or madam)	Thank you for consulting Surrey County Council (SCC) on the regulation 16 Ash Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2025-2045. We welcome the fact that our comments to the regulation 14 consultation have been taken into account and have no further comments.	
NHS Property Services (NHSPS) Ltd (Hyacynth Cabiles)	The following representation is a joint response submitted by NHS Property Services (NHSPS) and Surrey Heartlands Integrated Care Board (SH ICB). This response is in relation to suggested modifications to draft Policy ASH10 and supporting paragraphs seeking to ensure the principle of alternative uses for NHS land and property will be fully supported. Please see the attached for our response. [Text of attached representation reproduced below] NHS Property Services NHS Property Services (NHSPS) manages, maintains and improves NHS properties and facilities, working in partnership with NHS organisations to create safe, efficient, sustainable and modern healthcare environments. We partner with local NHS Integrated Care Boards (ICBs) and wider NHS organisations to help them plan and manage their estates to unlock greater value and ensure every patient can get the care they need in the right place and space for them. NHSPS is part of the NHS and is wholly owned by the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) - all surplus funds are reinvested directly into the NHS to tackle the biggest estates challenges including space utilisation, quality, and access with the core objective to enable excellent patient care. NHS Surrey Heartlands ICB NHS Surrey Heartlands serves over one million people across Surrey, which represents about 90% of the total Surrey population. NHS Surrey Heartlands is the statutory NHS organisation responsible for developing a plan for meeting the population’s health needs, managing the NHS budget and arranging for the provision of health services in the Surrey Heartlands area. NHS Surrey Heartlands commissions (plans, designs and purchases) many of the health services that local people use, including medicines, hospital care, urgent and emergency services, mental health care, GP services, dentistry, community pharmacy and general ophthalmology (eye care services).	2026.03 Ash NP- NHSPS_SH ICB Response.pdf

Respondent Name	Comment	Attached files
	Importantly, NHS Surrey Heartlands works with a range of other healthcare partners, including local government, other health organisations and the voluntary, community and faith sector as part of the wider Surrey Heartlands Health and Care Partnership (also known as the Integrated Care System, or ICS). This wider partnership is responsible for taking collective responsibility for the health and wellbeing of the local population. This includes working alongside partners to make decisions about health services based on feedback from healthcare providers, patients, carers and the wider public to ensure the services that are planned and bought are shaped by the views of the local population. Our detailed comments set out below are focused on ensuring that the needs of the health service are embedded into the Local Plan in a way that supports sustainable growth. Draft Policy ASH10: Existing and New Community Assets Draft Policy ASH10 focuses on the provision of new community facilities and redevelopment of existing community facilities. This includes the protection of existing community facilities as listed under Appendix B of the Neighbourhood Plan, including Ash Vale Health Centre to which NHSPS currently own the freehold to. SH ICB and NHSPS support the provision of sufficient, quality community facilities but does not consider the proposed policy approach to be effective in its current form in relation to existing healthcare facilities. Where healthcare facilities are included within the Local’s Plan definition of community facilities, policies aimed at preventing the loss or change of use of community facilities and assets can potentially have a harmful impact on the NHS’s ability to ensure the delivery of essential facilities and services for the community. The NHS requires flexibility with regards to the use of its estate to deliver its core objective of enabling excellent patient care and support key healthcare strategies such as the NHS Long Term Plan. In particular, the disposal of sites and properties which are redundant or no longer suitable for healthcare for best value (open market value) is a critical component in helping to fund new or improved services within a local area. Requiring NHS disposal sites to explore the potential for alternative community uses and/or to retain a substantial proportion of community facility provision adds unjustified delay to vital reinvestment in facilities and services for the community. All NHS land disposals must follow a rigorous process to ensure that levels of healthcare service provision in the locality of disposals are maintained or enhanced, and proceeds from land sales are re-invested in the provision of healthcare services locally and nationally. The decision about whether a property is surplus to NHS requirements is made by local health commissioners and NHS England. Sites can only be disposed of once the operational health requirement has ceased. This does not mean that the healthcare services are no longer needed in the area, rather it means that there are alternative provisions that are being invested in to modernise services. Where it can be demonstrated that health facilities are surplus to requirements or will be changed as part of wider NHS estate reorganisation and service transformation programmes, it should be accepted that a facility is neither needed nor viable for its current use, and policies within the Local Plan should support the principle of alternative uses for NHS sites with no requirement for retention of a community facility use on the land or submission of onerous information. To ensure the Plan is positively prepared, effective and is consistent with the adopted Guildford Local Plan (Policy ID7), SH ICB and NHSPS are seeking the following modification (<i>shown in red italics</i>) to Draft Policy ASH10 and clarity in supporting paragraphs to ensure the principle of alternative uses for NHS land and property will be fully supported: Proposed Modification to Draft Policy ASH10: A. The Neighbourhood Plan identifies existing community facilities on the Policies Map and listed in Appendix B. i) Proposals that will result in either the loss of, or cause significant harm to, a defined facility will be resisted, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that <i>either the operation of the facility is no longer financially viable, or adequate alternate provision exists or a replacement facility of an equivalent or better standard it to be provided in a location equally or more conveniently accessible to the facility’s current catchment area.</i> ii) Proposals to sustain or extend the viable use of existing community facilities and the development of new facilities, to ensure local residents have sufficient good quality social infrastructure will be supported. Proposed Addition to Supporting Paragraphs of Policy ASH10:	

Respondent Name	Comment	Attached files
	<i>“Where healthcare facilities are formally declared surplus to the operational healthcare requirements of the NHS or identified as surplus as part of a published estates strategy or service transformation plan, this will be considered to meet the requirements under Part A (i) of Policy ASH10.”</i> Conclusion SH ICB and NHSPS thank Ash Parish Council for the opportunity to comment on the draft Ash Neighbourhood Plan. We trust our comments will be taken into consideration, and we look forward to reviewing future iterations of the Plan. Should you have any queries or require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.	
Bewley Homes plc (Mr Tom Smailes)	Please see attachment for the detailed response. [Text reproduced below] 1. Introduction 1.1 Neame Sutton Limited is instructed by Bewley Homes Plc (“Bewley”) to prepare representations to the Regulation 16 consultation of the (Draft) Ash Parish Neighbourhood Plan (2025-2045), therein referred to as the Submission Plan. This consultation is run by Guildford Borough Council (“GBC”). 1.2 In preparing these representations, due regard has been had to Government policy set out in the Framework 2024 and accompanying Planning Practice Guidance (“PPG”) and in particular, the relevant basic conditions set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 1.3 These representations focus on comments relevant to the Submission Plan examination by a suitable qualified Examiner. 1.4 Where relevant, comments are made on the clarity, justification and effectiveness of individual policies, including whether they are supported by proportionate and robust evidence, are capable of consistent decision-making, and would not place unjustified or unnecessary constraints on the delivery of sustainable development within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. 1.5 The representations are not intended to revisit matters of local preference unless these raise issues of compliance with national policy, strategic local policy, or the basic conditions. Instead, they focus on matters that are material to the Examiner’s consideration of whether the Submission Plan should proceed to referendum and, if so, whether modifications are required to secure compliance. 1.6 Accordingly, where concerns are identified, these representations either seek the deletion or modification of specific policies or supporting text or invite the Examiner to recommend modifications necessary to ensure that the Submission Plan satisfies the basic conditions and is capable of being made. 1.7 These representations focus on the following areas: • Policies (including Policy Maps) • Supporting evidence-base • Basic Conditions Test 2. Land at Ash Manor, Ash Green Road 2.1 Bewley’s land interest lies in Land at Ash Manor, as shown in the red line plan in Appendix 1. 2.2 This land is an allocated site for residential development in the A31 allocation in the adopted Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites. 3. Policies Policy ASH1: Spatial Strategy 3.1 This policy encourages development within the built-up areas of Ash, Ash Vale and Ash Green. However, it is poorly worded and would benefit from clearer	NP Reps Reg 16 Ash FINAL.pdf

Respondent Name	Comment	Attached files
	drafting and punctuation. The built-up area boundary for the Ash and Tongham Urban Area has not been updated since 2015, and the Guildford Local Plan remains some distance from being reviewed through the Local Plan process. 3.2 The policy does not seek to update the built-up area boundaries of any of the urban areas within the plan area and instead relies on the ‘out-of-date’ boundaries defined in the adopted Guildford Local Plan. These boundaries date from 2015 and are not expected to be reviewed until the adoption of the Guildford Local Plan Review, currently forecast for 2028. 3.3 The dependence on an out-of-date boundary result in tightly constrained development locations and adds absolute restrictions, the policy risks limiting the area’s ability to respond to changing housing needs, economic growth, or infrastructure opportunities over the plan period. This could conflict with the NPPF’s requirement to significantly boost the supply of homes and support sustainable economic development. 3.4 If no changes are proposed to built-up area boundaries in this plan, this policy simply duplicates the strategic policies of the adopted Guildford Local Plan and serves no development management purpose. Furthermore, it risks becoming out of date, having been prepared alongside an emerging development strategy for the area and in the context of a growing housing need. Retaining an unchanged built-up area boundary is likely to create unnecessary planning tension as the local plan progresses and housing requirements increase, resulting in an overly restrictive policy that conflicts with future development needs. 3.5 Recommended actions: Delete policy. <u>Policy ASH4</u> 3.6 The objections to this policy are weighty and wide ranging. They have been sub-divided for ease. Title of policy 3.7 This policy goes beyond setting out design principles. It is multi-faceted and raises significant challenges in both development management and the determination of planning applications, as it attempts to achieve too many objectives within a single policy. It would be clearer and more effective if it were divided into separate policies, each focused on a distinct main theme. In addition, it is unclear whether development proposals are expected to comply with all sections and sub-criteria of the policy, creating potential ambiguity for applicants and decision-makers. Part A 3.8 Bewley do not raise any concern with the need for developments to accord with the Ash Design Guidance and Codes in principle. This is a local appropriate criteria and compliments policy in the GBLP. Part B 3.9 This part of the policy seeks to ensure that sufficient heritage information is provided for development that may impact the setting of the Ash Manor Complex. It would be helpful to appropriately identify the complex in either the mapping or listed building reference, as there are other listed buildings in the vicinity of Ash Green. 3.10 This policy duplicates the validation requirements set out by GBC for planning applications and Policies D18 and D19 of the Local Plan (DM policies) and paragraph 207 of the NPPF (2024). It is not necessary to repeat these elements in NP policies. The only locally specific element is the protection of views to and from White Lane. Although even this element is a direct repetition of Policy A31(8) and is not therefore necessary. 3.11 It is unclear why there is such a focus to only Ash Manor in this policy where there are numerous other listed buildings in the Neighbourhood Plan Designated Area. Bewley submits that reference to Ash Manor should be removed particularly because it repeats the requirements of Policy A31(8). 3.12 Current Part B of the policy should be deleted to avoid duplication of policies already established in the development plan and within national policy and ensure it only focuses on locally appropriate requirements that are not repeated from the adopted Local Plan. Part C	

Respondent Name	Comment	Attached files
	3.13 This is a distinctly separate policy and should be treated as such. Part D 3.14 The introduction of a Local Gap represents a discrete and materially different policy mechanism from other landscape or design policies within the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) and should therefore be set out as a standalone policy. Its current inclusion lacks clarity of purpose and justification, particularly where it overlaps with land already allocated for development in the Local Plan and land within the defined urban area. 3.15 The justification for the Local Gap appears politically motivated and serves no meaningful planning purpose beyond obstructing development on land around Ash Manor. This is evident from both the policy justification and the supporting Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), which is narrowly framed and does not apply a consistent methodology for assessing reasonable alternatives. The assessment indicates that this location was the only option the NP group sought to pursue and that the reasonable alternative of ‘no gap’ was not considered at all. 3.16 Guildford Borough Council’s (GBC) strategic policies direct development to locations within the defined urban area. Nearly all of the proposed Local Gap lies within the Urban Area of Ash and Tongham and an identified housing allocation in the adopted Local Plan. This element of Policy ASH4 would therefore obstruct the delivery of housing within the A31 allocation. 3.17 The designation of a Local Gap at Land at Ash Manor, which forms part of the A31 allocation, is not supported by a robust or proportionate evidence base. In particular: • The Local Gap appears to have been introduced specifically to prevent development within an adopted housing allocation. • This approach conflicts with the findings of the SEA, which demonstrates a strong preference for Option B across all objectives except heritage. • The SEA does not provide adequate justification for overriding housing delivery and other sustainability objectives by imposing a restriction on development. 3.18 The Neighbourhood Plan must acknowledge and accept that development will come forward within the A31 allocation, therefore the designation of a Local Gap in this location serves no meaningful planning purpose. Any development, even if low density and sensitively designed, would introduce built form within the gap, rendering the policy internally inconsistent and unworkable. 3.19 The policy therefore operates as a presumption against development within part of an adopted Local Plan housing allocation. In doing so, it undermines the strategic housing strategy and conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole. 3.20 The policy adopts a blanket restriction on development within the Local Gap, irrespective of scale, design quality, or mitigation measures. This would exclude: • Well-designed, low-density schemes. • Proposals that preserve openness through landscape-led design; and • Development that would not materially undermine settlement identity or result in coalescence. 3.21 This approach fails to strike an appropriate balance between landscape or heritage considerations and other planning objectives, including sustainable growth, efficient use of land, and housing delivery. 3.22 The political motivation underlying the designation is apparent in the SEA’s recorded justification. Table 4-4 states: “As the primary purpose of the settlement gap is to restrict development and maintain open land between settlements, designating Option A as a Local Gap would provide a strong protective function. This would help safeguard the setting of the listed buildings by preventing development that could detract from their historic character and visual context.” 3.23 It is not possible to restrict development and maintain open land on a site allocated for housing through an adopted Local Plan. Land around Ash Manor is required to contribute to housing delivery, and the Neighbourhood Plan should not introduce policy barriers that frustrate the implementation of adopted Local Plan objectives. Furthermore, all of this land falls within the defined settlement boundaries and cannot by definition, comprise ‘open land between settlements’.	

Respondent Name	Comment	Attached files
	3.24 While the SEA references previous appeal decisions and heritage impacts, it does not demonstrate that a Local Gap designation is the only or most appropriate mechanism to address those concerns, particularly within a strategic housing allocation long intended to deliver development. 3.25 Heritage impact is a material consideration; however, reliance on past appeal decisions does not justify a permanent Local Gap designation across part of a strategic housing allocation. Heritage matters can and should be addressed through site-specific assessment, design, layout, and mitigation rather than through a blanket spatial designation that precludes development in principle. 3.26 These comments should be read alongside those relating to the SEA, particularly in respect of the assessment of reasonable alternatives. For the reasons set out above and below, the policy should be deleted. 3.27 Recommendation: The policy should be substantially revised and presented as a standalone policy. Part D should be deleted. The Plan should also clarify whether development proposals are required to comply with all criteria of the policy or whether a balanced planning judgement applies. Policy ASH6 3.28 This is a duplication of GBLP policies, which relate to the safeguarding of economically important areas in the borough. This policy offers nothing locally distinctive and should therefore be deleted. Policy ASH9 3.29 The NP Group recognise within the supporting text at paragraph 3.6.3 that this policy is a duplication of policies in the GBLP and that, despite this, residents expect this policy. Expectation of a policy that has no locally specific policy references is not a reason for its inclusion with a local plan and is not consistent with Basic Conditions of Neighbourhood Plans. This policy should be deleted. Policy ASH13 3.30 This is a duplication of GBLP policy and SPD. There is no need for its duplication in this plan and should therefore be deleted. Policy Maps 3.31 The draft Policy Maps are difficult to read due to the multiple layers, stacked on top of each other. Many of these layers are already available through the local plan policy maps and relate to policies in the NP which Bewley suggest should be deleted. As set out consistently in our representations, the NP doesn't need to duplicate policies in other plans or known statutory designations. 3.32 The Local Gap should be removed from land around the Ash Manor Listed Building complex, and option B should be pursued, this would provide a meaningful and purposeful Local Gap function. 3.33 The pink outlined box, with pink fill, should be clearly labelled. <u>4. Supporting evidence base</u> <u>Strategic Environment Assessment</u> 4.1 Bewley has carefully considered the Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) and whether it meets the legal requirements. Is SEA required? 4.2 Yes, it is agreed that a SEA is required for this plan. Was the SEA carried out early enough? 4.3 No, the SEA has been a retrospective process, particularly regarding the positioning of the Local Gap. This is clear from the wording of the SEA and the lack of influence of the SEA on the plan. Option B (a reasonable alternative) despite being the most sustainable option, is completely disregarded by the	

Respondent Name	Comment	Attached files
	Neighbourhood Plan Group. Were reasonable alternatives properly assessed? 4.4 No. The assessment of reasonable alternatives within the SEA is inadequate, inconsistent, and unsupported by sufficient evidence. 4.5 The SEA fails to properly acknowledge that land around Ash Manor, forming a substantial part of the proposed Local Gap, is allocated for residential development under the A31 allocation within the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (2015). The principle of development has therefore already been established at Borough level. The SEA does not assess the implications of imposing a Local Gap designation over land identified for growth, nor does it address the resulting policy tension or potential conflict with the adopted development strategy. 4.6 The reasonable alternative of designating no Local Gap has not been considered. Given the strategic allocation of the land and the more recent safeguarding of land as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG), a “no designation” option is clearly realistic and reasonable. SEA legislation requires the proper assessment of reasonable alternatives, and the omission of this option represents a significant flaw in the process. 4.7 There is also an inconsistent and selective approach to identifying alternatives. Option B appears to have been advanced primarily to demonstrate procedural compliance rather than emerging from a robust and transparent comparative appraisal. There is no clear explanation of how alternatives were generated, refined, or discounted. 4.8 Furthermore, no landscape evidence has been presented to justify either of the proposed Local Gaps. There is no Landscape Character Assessment or equivalent technical study demonstrating that the land performs a strategic settlement separation or landscape function warranting designation. In the absence of supporting evidence, the Local Gap proposals lack a sound basis. 4.9 The SEA also fails to explore variations in the extent or alignment of the proposed gap. Other parts of the A31 allocation, such as land either side of Foreman Road, have not been assessed for inclusion, and no alternative boundary configurations are tested. This selective treatment further undermines the robustness of the alternatives appraisal. 4.10 Finally, the SEA’s reasoning in relation to Option B is internally inconsistent. It states that Option B has been safeguarded as SANG and therefore benefits from protection against built development, making it less suitable for Local Gap designation. However, Option B performs better than Option A across all sustainability criteria and already benefits from Borough-level protection. The SEA does not reconsider whether an additional Local Gap designation is necessary at all. In effect, this approach results in two areas operating as de facto Local Gaps, one with formal SANG protection, without assessing whether Option B, or indeed any Local Gap designation, remains required. 4.11 For these reasons, reasonable alternatives have not been properly or comprehensively assessed. Was the scope and content of the SEA adequate? 4.12 Yes, it is an appropriate scope. Was the consultation meaningful? 4.13 An SEA was available during the Regulation 14 local consultation. Was a reasoned conclusion reached? 4.14 The SEA fails to reach a reasoned conclusion in respect of the selection of the preferred Local Gap. While Option A is identified as the preferred option (paragraphs 4.3.1–4.3.2), this represents a stated preference rather than a reasoned SEA conclusion. The assessment acknowledges that Option B performs more strongly across a broader range of SEA themes yet provides no transparent explanation as to why those wider environmental benefits are outweighed. <i>4.3.1 The preferred Local Gap for the purposes of ANP policy is Option A, primarily due to the significant beneficial effects the local gap will have on conserving the historic setting of Ash Manor and other designated historic assets.</i>	

Respondent Name	Comment	Attached files
	4.3.2. <i>Although Option B performs more strongly across a broader range of SEA themes, the specific heritage value associated with Option A is a key consideration in this decision. The contribution of this area to the setting of Ash Manor is recognised as a locally important factor.</i> 4.15 The justification for selecting Option A relies primarily on a single heritage consideration relating to the setting of Ash Manor. The SEA does not demonstrate how competing SEA objectives have been balanced, nor does it explain why mitigation could not address heritage impacts associated with Option B. Reliance on a locally important factor, without a structured comparative assessment, is insufficient where an alternative performs better overall environmentally. 4.16 Paragraph 4.2.1 (SEA) indicates that the SEA has been undertaken retrospectively, describing work already carried out rather than informing plan development. SEA legislation requires reasonable alternatives to be developed, assessed, and consulted upon at a formative stage. In this case, the assessment appears to rationalise a preferred option rather than guide its selection. Basic Conditions Test Report 4.17 Bewley Homes strongly disagrees with the conclusions of the Neighbourhood Plan Group’s Basic Conditions Statement in relation to compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Guildford Borough Local Plan, specifically in respect of Policies ASH1 and ASH4. Policy ASH1 4.18 Bewley Homes is firmly of the view that Policy ASH1 would result in a level of development that is below that required by the relevant strategic policies for the area and therefore fails to be in general conformity with the Guildford Borough Local Plan. 4.19 Bewley Homes also agrees with the comments made by Guildford Borough Council at the Regulation 14 stage, which raised concerns regarding this policy. These comments appear to have been disregarded in the Regulation 16 version of the Plan, with no clear justification provided. Policy ASH4 4.20 Policy ASH4 is also considered to be in conflict with the strategic policies for the area, most notably Policy A31 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan. As drafted, ASH4 places constraints on development that are inconsistent with the strategic approach to housing delivery. 4.21 With specific reference to Table B: Neighbourhood Plan and Sustainable Development, Bewley Homes considers that, for both Policies ASH1 and ASH4, the social sustainability assessment should be downgraded from green to amber (yellow). 4.22 This is because the implementation of these policies would result in a reduction in housing delivery within the area, which would in turn exacerbate unmet housing need. As a consequence, the number of households requiring a home, including those on the affordable housing register, would be likely to increase. 5. Basic Conditions Test 5.1 The Examiner is required to determine whether the Ash Parish Neighbourhood Plan meets the basic conditions as set out in paragraph 8 of the Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The basic conditions can be summarised as: A) Does the Plan have regard to National Policies? B) Does the Plan have special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses? C) Does the Plan have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area? D) Is Sustainable Development achieved? E) Is the Plan in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority? F) There would be no breach in EU obligations.	

Respondent Name	Comment	Attached files
	G) Other basic conditions 5.2 Each of these is explored below. Does the Plan have regard to National Policies? 5.3 The Submission Plan has had a degree of regard to National Policies, but it does not deliver the Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing. Please refer to the comments regarding the NPPF in 3.13-2.18 above. Does the Plan have special regard for the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area? The Submission Plan has regard to listed buildings. Is Sustainable Development achieved? 5.4 No, this Submission Plan would not result in sustainable development. It will not deliver sufficient housing. Housing that is allocated in the GBLP (2015). Is the Plan in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority? 5.5 For the reasons set out in Bewley’s Representations above in paragraph 3.13-3.18, they do not consider the plan to be in general conformity. Bewley considers this NP to be disruptive to the delivery of a strategic allocation and that the supporting evidence base including the SEA has been a retrospective process to ensure that the land around Ash Manor remains free from development, however sympathetic to the historic environment. <u>6. Summary and Conclusion</u> 6.1 Neame Sutton Limited, on behalf of Bewley Homes Plc, has carefully reviewed the (Draft) Ash Parish Neighbourhood Plan (2025–2045) and its supporting evidence, including the Strategic Environmental Assessment and Basic Conditions Statement. While it is acknowledged that the Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared with some regard to national and local planning policy, significant deficiencies remain that prevent the Plan from meeting the basic conditions. 6.2 In particular, Policies ASH1 and ASH4 are considered to be poorly drafted, unjustified, and ineffective. Policy ASH1 relies on out-of-date built-up area boundaries, duplicates strategic Local Plan policies, and introduces unnecessary and overly restrictive constraints on development. As such, it serves no clear neighbourhood planning purpose and risks undermining the delivery of sustainable development and housing growth over the plan period. 6.3 Policy ASH4 is fundamentally flawed in both structure and substance. It combines multiple, unrelated policy objectives into a single policy, resulting in ambiguity, duplication of national and Local Plan policy, and uncertainty for decision-makers and applicants. The designation of a Local Gap within part of the A31 strategic housing allocation is particularly problematic, as it conflicts with the adopted Guildford Borough Local Plan, introduces a de facto presumption against development, and frustrates the delivery of an established strategic allocation 6.4 The Local Gap designation is not supported by a robust or proportionate evidence base. The SEA demonstrates that an alternative option performs more strongly across the majority of sustainability objectives, yet this reasonable alternative has neither been meaningfully consulted upon nor transparently rejected. The SEA appears to have been undertaken retrospectively, serving to justify a pre-determined policy position rather than informing plan-making at a formative stage, contrary to SEA requirements. 6.5 As a result of these issues, the Neighbourhood Plan fails to demonstrate that it will contribute to sustainable development, fails to significantly boost the supply of homes, and is not in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan, particularly Policy A31 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan. 6.6 In addition, Policies ASH6, 9 and 13 are all duplications of existing Policies and SPD’s adopted by Guildford Borough and hold no useful, locally specific purpose that justifies their inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan. These policies should be deleted. 6.7 Bewley Homes therefore considers that, in its current form, the Submission Plan does not meet the basic conditions set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B	

Respondent Name	Comment	Attached files
	to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner recommend: • The deletion of Policy ASH1, ASH6, ASH9 and ASH13 • Substantial modification or deletion of Policy ASH4, including the removal or significant revision of the Local Gap designation to avoid conflict with the strategic housing allocation. • Amendments to the policy maps to improve clarity and remove unnecessary duplication; and • Revisions to the supporting evidence, including the SEA, to ensure compliance with legal requirements and proper consideration of reasonable alternatives. 6.8 Without such modifications, Bewley Homes considers that the Ash Parish Neighbourhood Plan should not proceed to referendum, as it would undermine the delivery of sustainable development and conflict with both national policy and the adopted development plan	
Tim Scott	With regards to the Ash Parish Plan I would like to state that I strongly support a large gap between Ash Green, Ash and Tongham to avoid coalescence in particular support the grey hatched area page 18 figure 6 however this needs to be supported with the inclusion of the wider areas labelled 1 and 2. It's quite clear that the gap is not big enough to prevent coalescence between Ash, Tongham and Ash Green which doesn't align with the Guildford Local Plan which says it needs to be there in policy A31.	
David Lynton-Bunn	With Ref to the above matter I would like to have my views acknowledged and taken into account. Firstly I would like to thank AGRA for sharing the update and for the work being done on the Ash Green Residents Association spring newsletter. I appreciate the effort that Ash Parish Council has put into the Neighbourhood Plan and the fact that previous comments have been taken into account. However, I would like to raise a strong concern regarding the size of the proposed local gap between Ash, Tongham and Ash Green. As currently indicated, the gap appears far too small to effectively prevent coalescence between the three communities. The remaining separation — particularly around the junction of Ash Green Road, White Lane and Foreman Road — seems minimal and could easily be eroded further if areas 1 and 2 are developed in the future. If development were to occur in both of these areas, the practical result would be that Ash, Ash Green and Tongham would visually and physically merge into a single continuous settlement. This would undermine the purpose of maintaining a defined local gap and conflict with the principle set out in the Guildford Local Plan, particularly policy A31, which recognises the importance of maintaining separation between settlements. For this reason, I believe the proposed gap should be significantly larger and more robustly protected to ensure that the distinct identities of Ash, Ash Green and Tongham are preserved in the long term. I hope this concern will be carefully considered as part of the consultation process.	
June Bunn	I write with reference to the above subject and would like to raise my concerns that the buffer between Ash, Tongham and Ash Green are not big enough to prevent coalescence. If building is permitted to take place in areas 1 and 2 as marked on the Ash Parish Council map then the whole area becomes 1 large infusion of housing which will ultimately result in these three small villages losing their own identities which I believe is what was wanting to be safeguarded against when reading Policy A31. Please take my views and objections into account when making a decision on this.	
Kim Puttick	I write with concerns reference the above subject. I fear and am concerned that the buffer zones left between our three villages is too small at present and should planning be permitted in areas 1 and 2 as seen in the latest plan, that this will cause coalesce between the 3 villages. This surely goes against what was trying to be prevented in policy A31. Please take my concerns into account when making a decision.	

Respondent Name	Comment	Attached files
Natural England (Planning Consultations)	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and to the following information. Natural England does not hold information on the location of significant populations of protected species, so is unable to advise whether this plan is likely to affect protected species to such an extent as to require a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Further information on protected species and development is included in Natural England's Standing Advice on protected species. Furthermore, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all environmental assets. The plan may have environmental impacts on priority species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites, soils and best and most versatile agricultural land, or on local landscape character that may be sufficient to warrant a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Information on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees is set out in Natural England/Forestry Commission standing advice. We therefore recommend that advice is sought from your ecological, landscape and soils advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local soils, best and most versatile agricultural land, landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by the plan before determining whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment is necessary. Natural England reserves the right to provide further advice on the environmental assessment of the plan. This includes any third party appeal against any screening decision you may make. If an Strategic Environmental Assessment is required, Natural England must be consulted at the scoping and environmental report stages.	
Ash Green Residents Association (AGRA) (Sir or Madam)	This response is on behalf of Ash Green Residents Association (AGRA) of which I am a committee member. AGRA: Ash Parish Neighbourhood Plan consultation Hi, Ash Green Residents Association (AGRA) greatly welcomes the Ash Parish Neighbourhood plan and has the following comments for this consultation. ASH4 DESIGN PRINCIPLES ASH GREEN (INCLUDING LOCAL GAP) The major aspect on which AGRA has comments regards the provision of a buffer/gap between Ash Green and Ash as required by the Guildford Local Plan, policy A31 in particular. In this respect AGRA strongly supports the gap which the plan proposes around the Ash Manor cluster of heritage buildings namely, in essence, the field between Ash Manor and Ash Green Road. However, AGRA has considerable concern about the absence of any provision of a buffer/gap between Ash Green and Ash to the West of White Lane/Forman Road plus also to the north between Ash Manor and the railway line. Such a gap was proposed in the draft Ash Parish Neighbourhood Plan but was withdrawn at the request of GBC. Nevertheless without such a gap there will be nothing to distinguish Ash Green and Ash to the West or North and thereby be in conflict with the Guildford Local Plan. We appreciate this problem but nevertheless express the strongest possible desire to see a gap/buffer comprising the field to the west of White Lane/Forman Road from the White Lane Bridge to The Croft and the field to the north between Ash Manor and the railway line. AGRA hopes that this minimal, small gap of a field will be seriously considered. Sue Wyeth-Price (CC'd), Ash South and Ash Parish councillor, wrote the following on this subject during the Ash Neighbourhood Plan draft consultation (https://www.ashpcsurrey.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Review-of-ANP-Reg-14-responses.pdf): "The diagram below shows the boundary of Ash Green and the Proposed Local Gap. The land immediately to the north and northwest of the Local Gap is not protected by this policy (Marked 1 in the diagram). The boundary of Ash extends to the new development along Foreman Road adjacent to the railway line and extending either side of the Ash Road Bridge (Stonehill Road). This is shown as the red hatched area. The Bloor Homes development at May and Juniper Cottages in Ash Green Road (The Paddocks) and the approved development at The Firs in Ash Green Road are shown as the hatched green area. These developments are in Ash Green as it is defined in the LPSS Policy A31 (6) which specifically states "The properties along Ash Green Road form part of Ash Green village". Any development taking place in this unprotected area (marked 1) would not leave any gap between Ash and Ash Green. This would allow the coalescence which should be prevented as stated in Policy A31 (6) of the LPSS.	AshParishNP_Pg18_Figure6_ProposedLocalGap_Cropped.png AGRA_AshGreenDevelopments_090725.png

Respondent Name	Comment	Attached files
	The “Local Gap” to the south at the junction of Foreman Road and White Lane would also be insufficient as this would leave a gap of less than 20 metres between Ash Green and Ash. Ash already extends to the boundary with Ash Green, therefore any development on the land marked 2 on the diagram would lead to the coalescence of Ash with Ash Green." See attachment: AshParishNP_Pg18_Figure6_ProposedLocalGap_Cropped.png This is from the Ash Parish Neighbourhood plan Page 18 Figure 6 left hand diagram. "I am aware that GBC have written to APC with their comments on the proposed Local Gap. Section 3.5 of that response misrepresents the nature of the separation/buffer zone in that it only discusses any proposed new development being separated from Ash Green Road. The wording of Policy A31 looks to prevent the coalescence between Ash and Ash Green. I am fully aware that GBC has permitted development of fewer houses than allocated in the local plan for some sites and that Policy A31 only states “Approximately” 1750 homes. There is no specific requirement for exactly 1750 homes. GBC has referred to the need for additional houses in paragraph 3.13, where it apparent that one of the main drivers for GBC’s objections is the need to obtain contributions from developers to cover the cost of the Ash Road Bridge. Indeed, GBC have contracted with Homes England to raise £11 million from contributions and are substantially short of their commitment. This would suggest a financial motivation for their objections which run contrary to the LPSS which demands a buffer zone to prevent coalescence between Ash and Ash Green. A “Local Gap” would not run contrary to the LPPS, rather it would strengthen the policy to prevent coalescence.” The above is concerning for AGRA and it is imperative that this consultation gets to the bottom of the drivers around the local gap provision, the area it should cover and not leave it open to interpretation. The Guildford Local Plan and Ash Parish Neighbourhood plan must prevent coalescence between Ash, Ash Green and Tongham. It’s also important to visualise this with the developments that are ongoing, approved and applications submitted. This slide is from AGRA dated 09/07/25 and shows the development in the area in Figure 6 above. It does require an update as more development is ongoing, and an updated Ash Manor application (bottom) has been submitted but shows the pressure on the coalescence between Ash, Ash Green and Tongham. We also understand talks are ongoing for road access and housing development in Figure 6 area 1 which has previously been subject to a planning application that was rejected. See attachment: AGRA_AshGreenDevelopments_090725.png We suggest that during the consultation a visual representation like this is used to help discussions. Please ask if you’d like AGRAs help. ASH9 HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND TENURE Sites locally, such as The Paddocks (previously known as May and Juniper), have been granted planning permission with an affordable housing mix of ~40% which meets planning policy and is a stated public benefit of these developments which AGRA welcomes. The issue is that the developers on several sites have been unable to find Registered Providers to take on the affordable homes and manage them. Then unfortunately what happens is that the developers sell these houses at normal rates gaining more profit without delivering the public benefits that were stated when planning permission was given. Please give some thought as to whether the Ash Parish Neighbourhood Plan could be strengthened to either ensure delivery of these affordable homes as a public benefit or stop them being stated as a benefit during the planning permission decision process. The local community has strong views on affordable home delivery and need to see them being delivered if they are promised. Regards, Paul Finning, Ash Green Residents Association committee member on behalf of AGRA	
Mr Paul Finning	ASH4 DESIGN PRINCIPLES ASH GREEN (INCLUDING LOCAL GAP) I’d like to stress the importance of getting an adequate local gap that separates Ash from Ash Green which is required in the Guildford Local Plan, policy A31, and needs to be more clearly defined. It’s welcome to see this included In the plan but it is more limited than I expected and not what I saw in the draft Ash Parish Neighbourhood plan earlier which I believe was challenged by GBC.Ash Parish Neighbourhood plan Page 18 Figure 6 left hand diagram (see attached	Figure 6.png

Respondent Name	Comment	Attached files
	image):Two things in particular stick out about the gap/buffer: • Area 2, The local gap to the south west where Foreman Road goes round to meet White Lane needs to be extended over a much wider area to even be recognised as a gap. This contradicts the Guildford Local Plan, policy A31, which requires a buffer to prevent coalescence of Ash and Ash Green and I don't think a normal person would recognise the proposal in this area as a gap as if measured it comes out at about 20 metres. • Area 1, Historic England guidance to previous planning applications to the north and north east of Ash Manor indicate this area is in the historic setting and I'd suggest any review of this Ash Parish Neighbourhood plan converses with Historic England to understand their guidance for the area. Therefore to prevent any more cumulative harm to the historic assets this area to the north and north east up to the railway line, that isn't already being developed for housing, should be included in the gap. This would prevent coalescence between Ash and Ash Green on the northern side. Sites close to or in the historic setting which are already in place or approved are Chester Bridge (red area), the Persimmon site round it (read area), Orchard Farm (north over railway line), Streamside (north over railway line), The Paddocks (green area) and The Firs (green area). The planning inspectors guidance at the appeal for the Land At Ash Manor site shows how important the historic setting is and I believe can be interpreted for this area as well. ASH8 HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND TENURE I note the commendable target for affordable homes that is always addressed in each planning application. However recently there have been many cases of developers getting planning approval with ~40% affordable homes and then not being able to find Registered Providers (RPs) to own and manage the affordable homes for them. What appears to happen then is that the houses are sold at normal rates at a significant advantage and profit to the developers and the loss of affordable housing to the community. It is not right that planning approval is given with a set of parameters and then changed after the event not realising the public benefits of affordable housing. The plan should be tightened if possible to require the actual delivery of affordable housing if planning permission is given. ASH13 ACTIVE TRAVEL As an avid cyclist and walker I'm really pleased to see this section of the plan. What I would say is that I would like Ash to have better links out wider such as Guildford, Ash Vale, etc. For example cycling, living in Ash Green the Guildford Local Plan indicates to either take the A323 to Guildford or go via the Christmas Pie trail off road. The issue is that the A323 is for experienced cyclists only and even then, now the Chester Bridge is in, it is so busy it is horrible to cycle down. The Christmas Pie trail is lovely in summer but in the winter it is a mud bath made much worse as some Ash Green parts are BOATs and therefore shared with 4x4s and motorbikes that cut it up really badly. I would like to see the neighbourhood plan strengthened to realise how these long distance routes can be joined up and the local parts in Ash Parish made more hospitable to cyclists and walkers. I'd like you to think of your son or daughter riding or walking along the routes to school. Please take these comments into account.	

Report run at 9 Sep 2026 14:09:09. Total records: 16