

(e) Land at Liddington Hall Farm, Guildford

*Objection 1419*

*Merrist Wood College (H)*

10.4.16. Liddington Hall Farm is on the northern edge of Guildford, farmland used by the nearby Merrist Wood College, but now surplus to their requirements. The land, extending to about 28ha, adjoins the main built up area of the town to the east, but has lesser areas of development to the north and west and penetrating into it from the south.

10.4.17. I have earlier indicated that I do not see a requirement to identify further land for housing for the Plan period. I, therefore, see no exceptional circumstances that would justify removing this land from the Green Belt. The question arose as to whether it might be made "safeguarded land", to meet needs in future plan periods. I noted its general situation in relation to the urban area, the relatively poor quality of the land and that it had been considered for the expansion of Guildford in the early 1980s. At present, however, it is not clear what the future requirements for housing growth for Guildford will be.

10.4.18. In the present climate, if a requirement were to arise, being green field, the land would not be the first choice and there would be a need to evaluate the contribution to new housing that could be expected from the present built up area through an urban capacity study. It would be expected that the quantification of the housing requirement and the strategy by which it was to be met would be first determined through the Structure Plan. Only once that were done and, through the sequential test, a need established to seek further greenfield sites, would it be appropriate to consider the removal of the land from the Green Belt, whether for development, or reservation as "safeguarded land" for possible use in a future plan period.

(f) Land at Keens Lane, Guildford

*Objection 1455*

*The Shepherdsmead Trust*

10.4.19. The Shepherdsmead Trust is a long established Christian Church in Guildford, closely related to other Congregations in the area. A present it occupies premises in Shepherds Lane, Stoughton, premises in the heart of the urban area where there is no longer space to expand to accommodate the needs of the growing congregation. The Trust had purchased land on the edge of the urban area at Keens Lane - a broadly triangular site of about 0.9ha, bounded by Keens Lane and Tangle Lane - at present used for grazing, but including at one side a number of huts, seemingly stables. Keens Lane formed the boundary of the main urban area, but there were houses facing the land in Tangle Lane and several houses were lapped round by the site in both the Keens Lane and Tangle Lane.

10.4.20. The Trust had made a number of Objections relating to different Policies of the Plan which they saw as obstructive or insufficiently supportive of their ambitions to build new meeting rooms as an addition to or in replacement of their present premises. Particularly, the root of their problems had been seen to be the omission from PPG2 of the earlier concession that institutions in large grounds could be seen as appropriately located in the Green Belt. In their belief, this would have enabled development of the site they had acquired. They had, however, been refused permission on Green Belt grounds. Hence, one of the solutions seen

would be to remove the site from the Green Belt and incorporate it in the urban area.

10.4.21. I can sympathise with the Trust's predicament, and accept that the functioning of the Church could be much improved if they had larger premises with more car parking. There are arguments considered elsewhere as to whether the Plan could or should do more specifically for places of worship. In so far as this Policy is concerned, there being no alteration to the boundary proposed by the Structure Plan, I accept the Council's view that the circumstances are not so exceptional as to justify removing the site from the Green Belt.

(g) Land north of Tannery Lane, Send

*Objection 1605*

*RMC Properties Ltd*

10.4.22. The site is on the northern edge of Send, between Tannery Lane and the River Wey Navigation. It comprises about 7ha of land at one time worked for minerals, but now restored to agricultural use. Much of the land in this part of the Wey Valley has been worked for minerals, some of it restored as agricultural land, other areas remaining as standing water. Send is "washed over" by the Green Belt designation, although a settlement boundary is defined which abuts the south western side of the site.

10.4.23. The removal of this land, and other former minerals working sites, from the Green Belt is not in my view required in order to provide further housing land for the Plan period, nor is it anticipated by the Structure Plan. Whether there would be a need in future Plan periods cannot be said at this stage, but again removal of the land from the Green Belt for development, or for denoting as "safeguarded land" for future Plan periods, would be a process to be instituted through the Structure Plan. It should be borne in mind that, having been restored, the site is no longer "brownfield". Although adjoining the village, which has some modest sustainability credentials, a proposal for the development of so large a site would require consideration of matters of sustainability and the application of the sequential test before the land were selected even for some future housing need.

10.4.24. The site is open land, clearly separate from the built up area of the village. Having regard to the criteria of CD16, there would be no justification for including the site in the village envelope. In my view there are no grounds for removing the site from the Green Belt, or for extending the settlement boundary to take it, or any part of it, into the village.

(h) Land at Heath Farm, south of Tannery Lane, Send

*Objection 1606*

*RMC Properties Ltd*

10.4.25. The Objection relates to about 2ha of land to the south east of Tannery Lane, extending behind houses in Send Road. The site is currently a vineyard.

10.4.26. The site, though smaller and virgin land, is in much the same situation as the previous site, Green Belt land adjoining the settlement boundary of Send. There is no requirement to allocate more housing land for the Plan period, no suggestion in the Structure Plan that land should be removed from the Green Belt in this area and nothing about the site that