

Wanborough Parish Council

MEETING MINUTES of Wanborough Parish Council Meeting held on Wednesday 29th July 2026 at Wanborough Village Hall

Attendees: Councillor James Henry - Chair
Councillor Oscar de Chazal
Councillor Martin Bramley
Councillor Robert Drummond
Mrs B Weddell - Clerk

Three members of the public were in attendance.

Apologies: Apologies for absence had been received from Cllr Matthew Harrison, Cllr Matt Furniss and Cllr Sallie Barker

		Action
26/33	Representations from members of the public Members of the public expressed concern about the recently published Green Belt Review and asked Cllrs Furniss and Barker to provide some clarification. Residents also expressed ongoing concern about the dangerous junction opposite East Flexford Lane. The Chair advised that Speedwatch could be set up if there was enough interest from volunteers to support it. The Chair also agreed to contact Cllr Matt Furniss about the potential for a crossroads sign from SCC. Concerns were also expressed about anti-social behaviour. The Clerk would invite the Borough Commander to attend the next meeting.	J Henry Clerk
26/34	Declarations of Members' Interests Cllr Henry and Cllr Bramley declared a personal interest in planning application 26/D/00103.	
26/35	Reports from Borough and County Councillors There were no reports from councillors in their absence.	
26/36	Minutes The minutes of the meeting held on 28th May were approved as a correct record of the meeting.	
26/37	Matters arising from the meeting of 28th May Due to the hot weather, the Clerk had yet to inspect the trees along the bridleway, but would aim to do so before the next meeting.	Clerk
26/38	Highways and public rights of way The Clerk reported that a members of the public had been in touch about the overgrown pavement on the B3000 near the bus stop and that Cllr Furniss had advised this was being dealt with as a priority by Surrey County Council.	

26/39	Finance The Clerk advised that she was in the process of setting up a new system for the accounts, and that up to date accounts would be presented prior to the next meeting.	Clerk
26/40	Planning and enforcement updates a) The parish council considered the following new planning applications: 26/T/00179 Treeworks subject to TPO– Horse Chestnut. Meadow View, Westwood Lane, Wanborough – no objection. 26/W/00042 Prior notification for the creation of an agricultural access track. Lot D1, Land to the west of Westwood Lane, Wanborough. Letter of objection appended. 26/T/00165 Treeworks in Conservation Area. Waverley Cottage, Manor Farm, Wanborough – no objection. 26/D/00103 Discharge of conditions (visibility splays and surfacing improvements to Pilgrims Way) of planning permission 23/P/01598. Puttenham Golf Club. James and Martin declared an interest non pecuniary interest. Letter of comment appended. 26/P/00815 Refurbishment and thermal upgrading of the existing listed building. Wanborough Barn, Westwood Lane, Wanborough. No objection. Appeal Ref 6008909 Plot 15, Berry Farm. 1 Traveller pitch .Letter of objection appended. b) It was agreed that the clerk would produce a brief update on planning issues, for circulation to residents.	Clerk
26/41	Items of business for information or inclusion on a future agenda Cllr De Chazal advised that he was regrettably standing down from the parish council with immediate effect, as he had left the village. The Clerk would advise Guildford Electoral Services. On behalf of local residents, the Chair thanked Cllr De Chazal for all his hard work and support of WPC in recent years, particularly with regard to planning matters.	Clerk
26/42	Next meeting 29th September.	

Wanborough Parish Council

Clerk: Mrs Beverley Weddell. Tel: 07752062215
The Great Barn, Wanborough GU3 2JR
Email: Wanborough_pc@outlook.com
Chairman: Mr James Henry

30 July 2026

Morgan Laird
Planning Officer
Guildford Borough Council
Millmead House
Millmead
Guildford GU2 4BB

Dear Morgan Laird,

26/W/00042 Lot D1, Land to the west of Westwood Lane, Wanborough GU23 2JN. Prior notification under Schedule 2 Part 6, Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for the creation of an agricultural access track.

Wanborough Parish Council wishes to register a formal objection to the above Prior Approval application for the formation of a new agricultural access road at Lot D1, Westwood Lane.

After reviewing the application form and accompanying site plan, the Parish Council has identified several material planning concerns which, taken together, mean that Prior Approval should **not** be granted.

1. Direct breach and conflict with High Court restrictions

The Parish Council draws immediate attention to the High Court proceedings and standing injunction boundaries spanning across Lots A1-G at Wanborough fields. While the court noted personal adjournments for specific individuals (the Fourth and Ninth Defendants) to resolve separate disputes of fact, the geographic protection over these plots remains active. Lot D1 sits entirely within the constrained zone. The applicant enjoys no personal exemptions or procedural immunity under these ongoing cases. A fresh prior approval application cannot be used as a vehicle to circumvent the court's clear intent to halt unauthorised operational layout alterations on this land.

2. Direct violation of standing Article 4 Direction

Guildford Borough Council has established a strict Article 4 Direction over Wanborough Fields specifically to halt ad-hoc capitalisation, plot splitting, and progressive urbanisation of the pasture. Allowing this extensive track layout to proceed under the guise of prior approval would completely nullify the explicit regulatory protection the Article 4 Direction is intended to maintain.

3. The proposed width (20 metres) is excessive and unjustified

The application seeks permission for a track 20 metres wide, far beyond what is reasonably required for agricultural access. Typical agricultural tracks are between 3–5 metres. A 20-metre engineered corridor would:

- introduce a visually intrusive feature into the landscape
- significantly alter the openness of the Green Belt and AONB
- resemble a development platform rather than a functional farm track

The scale is wholly disproportionate to the stated agricultural unit size of 1.2 hectares and the parcel size of less than 0.4 hectares.

3. Boundary infringement and encroachment on neighbouring plots

The submitted site plan indicates that the proposed route physically carves across boundaries and cuts directly through structures, fences, and land occupied by third-party establishments (specifically Lot F). On-site photographic evidence explicitly confirms that these physical third-party establishments are built along

the line of the proposed route. The applicant does not possess a single-unit control or clear possession of this land, meaning the application is procedurally flawed and invalid for permitted development consideration.

4. Insufficient evidence of agricultural need

The applicant asserts that the track is “reasonably necessary” for agricultural purposes, citing turkey rearing and Christmas tree planting. However:

- No evidence of active agricultural operations is provided
- No stocking records, cropping plans, or business details accompany the application
- The land has only been in agricultural use for 5 years and 3 months, with no supporting documentation to provide evidence this is the case

Wanborough Parish Council is not satisfied that the proposal meets the test of demonstrable agricultural necessity required under Part 6 of the GPDO.

5. Harm to the openness and rural character of the green belt and Surrey Hills National Landscape

The site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Surrey Hills National Landscape [included under the Boundary Review], where openness is a fundamental characteristic. A 154.8-metre long, 20-metre wide gravel road would:

- materially reduce openness
- introduce an engineered, urbanising feature
- conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt and AONB/AGLV

Even under Prior Approval, the LPA must consider whether the works genuinely fall within permitted agricultural development. In this case, the scale and nature of the proposal exceed what is reasonably required.

6. Visual and landscape impact

The applicant confirms the site is visible from public land. The proposed gravel/crushed stone track would be highly conspicuous in an otherwise open rural landscape.

The Parish Council considers the visual harm to be significant and unacceptable.

7. Risk of enabling future non-agricultural development

The scale of the proposed track raises concerns that it may:

- facilitate future intensification
- support non-agricultural uses
- create a precedent for further engineered works

This is contrary to the intention of Part 6, which is to allow minor agricultural works, not substantial infrastructure.

8. Lack of environmental and heritage assessment

The application states that the proposal would not affect listed buildings, archaeological sites, or nature conservation designations, yet no evidence is provided to support these assertions.

Given the sensitivity of the Wanborough landscape, this absence is concerning.

9. Highway safety concerns arising from siting and design

Under Schedule 2, Part 6, Class B of the GPDO, the Council must consider whether the siting and design of the proposed works are acceptable. The location of the access onto Westwood Lane is a critical element of siting, and the geometry of the junction forms part of design. On both counts, the application fails to demonstrate that the access can operate safely.

The plans provided do not show:

- Visibility splays in accordance with Surrey County Council highway standards.

- Measured sightlines in both directions along Westwood Lane.
- The speed environment of the road or any assessment of stopping sight distance.
- The width, radii or construction detail of the access to show that agricultural machinery can enter and exit without encroaching into opposing traffic.
- Any swept-path analysis for tractors, trailers or HGVs that may use the track.

Without this information, it is impossible to conclude that the proposed access would not result in unsafe turning movements or conflict with other road users.

Conclusion

Wanborough Parish Council concludes that:

- the proposal is not reasonably necessary for agriculture
- the scale and width of the proposed track are excessive and unjustified
- the development would cause material harm to the Green Belt and AONB
- the visual impact would be significant and adverse
- insufficient evidence has been provided to support the claimed agricultural need
- the application fails to provide information to demonstrate highway safety

For these reasons, the Parish Council respectfully requests that **Prior Approval be refused.**

Yours sincerely

Beverley Weddell
Clerk to Wanborough Parish Council

Wanborough Parish Council

Clerk: Mrs Beverley Weddell. Tel: 07752062215
The Great Barn, Wanborough GU3 2JR
Email: Wanborough_pc@outlook.com
Chairman: Mr James Henry

22 July 2026

The Planning Inspectorate
c/o QUADIENT
69 Buckingham Avenue
Slough
SL1 4PN

Dear Sir or Madam,

PINS Ref: 6008909.

Plot 15, Berry Farm, Westwood Lane, Wanborough, Guildford.

Material change of use of land for the creation of 1 pitch Gypsy/Traveller site

Introduction

Wanborough Parish Council submits this further objection to the Appeal concerning Plot 15, Berry Farm. We have reviewed the appellant's Statement of Case in full and strongly disagree with the conclusions presented. The Council supports Guildford Borough Council's refusal and considers that the reasons for refusal are robust, well-founded, and fully supported by national and local planning policy. The Parish Council's concerns relate to Green Belt harm, landscape impact, unsustainable location, ecology, biodiversity net gain, tree protection, and the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. We also raise serious concerns about the appellant's reliance on the new "Grey Belt" policy and the selective interpretation of national guidance.

1. Inappropriate Development in the Green Belt

The appellant argues that the site qualifies as "Grey Belt" and therefore benefits from the exception under NPPF paragraph 155. The Parish Council strongly disagrees.

- The site is open countryside, visually and functionally part of the wider rural landscape.
- The development introduces residential occupation, a static caravan, touring caravan, field shelter, fencing, and domestic paraphernalia—all of which constitute encroachment.
- The appellant's Statement of Case acknowledges that the site lies within the Green Belt, yet attempts to minimise its contribution to Green Belt purposes. This is not accepted.

The proposal fails to preserve openness and directly conflicts with NPPF paragraphs 142–154 and Local Plan Policy P2. No very special circumstances exist.

2. Harm to the Surrey Hills National Landscape and AGLV

The appellant claims that views are "limited" and harm is not significant. This is contradicted by:

- The LPA's detailed landscape assessment.
- The site's position within the setting of the Surrey Hills National Landscape. The site is expected to be included within the National Landscape when the Boundary Changes are confirmed later this year/early 2027.
- The Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV), which is explicitly protected under Policy P1.

The Statement of Case attempts to downplay landscape sensitivity, but the Inspector must note that:

- The development introduces built form into an otherwise open field.
- The cumulative impact of multiple unauthorised works at Berry Farm has already eroded landscape character.
- The proposal fails to conserve or enhance scenic qualities.

Great weight must be given to landscape protection.

3. Character and Appearance

The appellant asserts that the development is modest and screened. The Council disagrees.

- The site is part of a coherent agricultural field pattern.
- The introduction of residential structures, fencing, and hardstanding is incongruous.
- The proposal is obtrusive, as confirmed by the LPA's refusal reasons.

The Statement of Case does not overcome these concerns.

4. Unsustainable Location

The appellant argues that traveller sites have different sustainability requirements. While PPTS paragraph 13 recognises certain differences, it does **not** exempt sites from basic sustainability principles.

- The site is remote from services.
- Access is via narrow rural lanes.
- All trips require private vehicle use.
- There is no safe pedestrian access to schools, shops, or healthcare.

The appellant's interpretation of PPTS is selective and does not reflect the full policy context.

5. Ecology and Protected Species

The Statement of Case provides no ecological evidence to demonstrate:

- Absence of protected species
- Avoidance of harm
- Compliance with Policy ID4 and P6

The Inspector cannot rely on unsupported assertions. The LPA was correct to refuse the application on this basis.

6. Biodiversity Net Gain

The appellant has not demonstrated:

- Exemption from mandatory BNG
- Ability to achieve the required 20% net gain

This is a statutory requirement. The appeal cannot succeed without clear evidence.

7. Harm to Trees

The appellant dismisses tree impacts, yet:

- The proposed field shelter lies within root protection areas.
- No arboricultural assessment has been provided.
- The risk to mature trees is significant.

This omission is fatal to the appeal.

8. Thames Basin Heaths SPA

The appellant suggests that contributions could resolve SPA concerns. However:

- No SANG or SAMM mitigation has been secured.
- No Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken.
- The LPA cannot lawfully grant permission without certainty of no adverse effect.

The Inspector must uphold refusal on this ground.

9. Planning History and Cumulative Harm

The Statement of Case lists numerous enforcement notices. The appellant argues these should not influence the planning merits. The Parish Council disagrees.

- The site has a long history of unauthorised development.
- The cumulative effect has already harmed the landscape and rural character.
- Granting permission would undermine enforcement and encourage further breaches.

This is a material consideration.

Conclusion

Wanborough Parish Council respectfully requests that the Planning Inspector dismiss the appeal. The appellant's Statement of Case does not overcome the substantial harms identified by the Local Planning Authority. The proposal conflicts with:

- The NPPF (2024)
- PPTS (2024)
- Guildford Local Plan: Strategy and Sites
- Guildford Development Management Policies
- Surrey Hills National Landscape Management Plan
- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations

The development is inappropriate, harmful, unsustainable, and unsupported by evidence.

Yours faithfully

Beverley Weddell
Clerk to Wanborough Council

Wanborough Parish Council

Clerk: Mrs Beverley Weddell. Tel: 07752062215
The Great Barn, Wanborough GU3 2JR
Email: Wanborough_pc@outlook.com
Chairman: Mr James Henry

30 July 2026

Katie Williams
Planning Officer
Guildford Borough Council
Millmead House
Millmead
Guildford GU2 4BB

Dear Katie Williams,

Planning Application: 26/D/00103|Discharge of conditions 2 (visibility splays) and 3 (surfacing improvements to Pilgrims Way) of planning permission 23/P/01598 approved 18/6/2026|Puttenham Golf Club, The Heath, Puttenham, Guildford, GU3 1AL

Wanborough Parish Council has considered this application for Discharge of conditions, and make the following observations.

1. As conditions 2 (visibility splays) and 3 (surfacing improvements to Pilgrims Way) require maintenance in perpetuity, the parish council does not believe these conditions can be fully discharged.
2. The parish council notes that the applicant appears to be seeking to share responsibility for the maintenance of the surfacing to Pilgrims Way with residents. There is no agreement to this effect and this arrangement cannot be relied upon in the future. The parish council believes that responsibility for fulfilling the ongoing requirements of condition 3 should lie solely with the applicant.

Yours sincerely

Beverley Weddell
Clerk to Wanborough Parish Council