

Policy/No of Responses	Key Issues / Comments
Policy L.H1: Suitability of Development Sites Responses: 90	Protection of Green Belt
	Concern over Ribbon Development linking Villages together and to local Towns
	Sustainability of Sites, specifically TFM and Garlick’s Arch, ie public transport, schools, infrastructure, medical facilities, flooding, suitability of lanes and roads for more traffic
	Needs of elderly downsizers to be addressed when new developments occur; ie garages and size
	Suggest that in Para 1 the word 'wider' is replaced by 'adjacent' to try to limit future argument about what constitutes the wider area and development creep from more modern development into the more historical areas.
Changes to Plan Policy L.H1: Suitability of Development Sites	<p><i>Policy L.H1 is renamed as Policy LNPH1.</i></p> <p><i>The relevant policies and adjustments in the plan have been amended to reflect the community concerns.</i></p>
Policy L.H2: Housing Mix Responses: 102	Affordable, Genuinely Affordable, For Local Connection, not to forget Social too
	Already contributed ‘Fair Share’ over 100 in area already – unfair proportion in area, housing numbers from GBC wrong
	More Retirement type dwellings / downsizing potential to free up homes for younger families
	Key worker homes
	No conflict of character or overcrowding
	Mix of housing to maintain sense of community
	‘with the probability of that figure being exceeded’ – should be removed from the policy
	Infrastructure important, not enough schools and Ripley too congested already
	‘the disabled’ should be replaced with ‘disabled people’ Self-build, sustainable and environmentally friendly should be included
Changes to Plan Policy L.H2: Housing Mix	<p><i>Policy L.H2 is renamed as Policy LNPH2.</i></p> <p><i>The relevant policies and adjustments in the plan have been amended to reflect the community concerns.</i></p>
Policy L.H3: Housing Design and Density	Enhance area and reflect local character of Lovelace, for example bricks
	Not cheap but should be sustainable and in keeping with listed buildings and conservation areas.
	Density per hectare too high
	Houses not into roof spaces
	‘Forced’ to include traveller sites when not in keeping with design of area
	Energy saving design and materials essential, more emphasis on environmental impact, infrastructure, green roofs etc.

<p>Responses: 63</p>	<p>Density should be in keeping with current density of homes</p> <p>Hedging and tree heights should be considered to not annoy neighbours</p> <p>Wildlife corridors / corridors between gardens</p> <p>Conservation area respect within design and build</p> <p>Suggest, 'respects and complements' in last paragraph</p> <p>Density less of an issue than volume</p> <p>Design policy nonsense as doesn't include detailed list</p> <p>Modern buildings can be ground breaking</p> <p>TFM not well designed or sustainable</p>
<p>Changes to Plan</p> <p>Policy L.H3: Housing Design and Density</p>	<p><i>Policy L.H3 is renamed as Policy LNPH3.</i></p> <p><i>The policy and justification have been amended and include the requirement for design and density to be appropriate to the character of the area, although modern design is not discouraged, where appropriate. Density is expected to reflect the density of the surrounding area.</i></p>
<p>Policy L.EN1: Local Green Spaces and Local Views</p> <p>Responses: 74</p>	<p>Ripley Village Green – need to ensure this is completely protected</p> <p>Ripley Rocks Field and Village Hall Field – what is proposed?</p> <p>'Ripley Rocks Field' should be referred to same as SCC – 'Playing Field opposite Ripley Court School'</p> <p>Wisley Airfield / TFM also a green space that needs to be protected</p> <p>Ripley School Playing Fields – green Space or not? Needs protection as does school site</p> <p>Village Green Spaces need to be retained to preserve rural aspect of area</p> <p>Green Space should include walking paths that link the spaces</p> <p>Land between Grandis Cottages and Old Kennels needs to be included</p> <p>Lovelace Green spaces essential to be maintained</p> <p>Missed out – Papercourt Lake, Bouldermerre Lake, more areas of Ockham including Semaphore need to be considered, area by river, Wisley Cricket and Archery Fields</p> <p>Vista and open-ness of countryside needs protection; all views need protecting</p> <p>Disagree Ripley Village Hall as may preclude the redevelopment</p> <p>All green belt needs protection</p> <p>Greenspace must be protected as greenbelt</p> <p>Brexit – all farmland needed so should be protected</p>
<p>Changes to Plan</p> <p>Policy L.EN1: Local Green Spaces and Local Views</p>	<p><i>Policy L.EN1 renamed as Policy LNPEN1.</i></p> <p><i>Ripley Green is designated a Site of Nature Importance (SNCI) and all the school playing fields are protected by Green Belt regulations. The area around the airstrip at the former Wisley Airfield/Three Farm Meadows (FWA/TFM) is also an</i></p>

	<p>SNCI. <i>SNCI's are local protections and can be amended by the Local Authority (Guildford Borough Council) and have been for the land around the airfield.</i></p> <p><i>Papercourt Lake is designated a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a conservation area. Boulder Mere is located in Ockham Common, which together Wisley Commons are designated Thames Basin Heath Special Protections Areas (TBH SPA) and also SSSI. These are national protections. The RHS Cricket Ground and Archery Fields are covered by Green Belt protection. Land may only be removed from the Green Belt when a Local Authority (Guildford Borough Council) prepare a new Local Plan.</i></p> <p>Local Green Spaces (LGS) can be so named where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</i> • <i>the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</i> • <i>the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</i> <p>Following representations from the Village Hall, Ripley Court School and Ockham Park, the owner of the Bowling Club, (See Appendix C – CS Statutory Consultees) Ripley Parish Council agreed to remove those sites from the LGS list.</p>
<p>Policy L.EN2: Biodiversity and Natural Habitats</p>	<p>Very important on TFM / Wisley Airfield – policy needs to be consistent and remove TFM or any new town from document</p> <p>It is illegal to develop adjacent to these sites; adjoining must be defined as 'not within 500 metres'</p> <p>Once gone, cannot be replaced – ancient woodland and fields</p> <p>Development will not encourage wildlife and landscape, the evidence points to the opposite effect.</p> <p>Protect wildlife and biodiversity for future generations</p> <p>In addition to wildlife, dog walking space needs to be protected all contribute to health and welfare of society and the community</p> <p>Ockham has crested newts, Dartford warblers, deer, badgers, rare flora and Fauna, butterflies, moths and snakes. Lovelace has good mix of wildlife, land-based and aquatic.</p> <p>Hedgehog Highways?</p> <p>Entertainment spaces too</p>
<p>Responses: 42</p> <p>Changes to Plan</p> <p>Policy L.EN2: Biodiversity and Natural Habitats</p>	<p>Policy L.EN2 renamed as Policy LNPEN2.</p> <p>Guildford Borough Council (GBC) have designated the airfield a “strategic site” in the GBC emerging Local Plan. Neighbourhood Plans (NPs) cannot object to a strategic site.</p> <p>Based on comments from the statutory consultees the policy has been amended to provide as much protection as possible. The justification has been amended to include information from Surrey Wildlife Trust and The Woodland Trust.</p>
<p>Policy L.EN3: Flooding</p>	<p>Lovelace area has high water table and extensive development will increase greatly risk of flooding.</p> <p>'Grampian Clause' should be included in policy, include words 'commencement of' in front of 'development', and improve policy to describe different types of flooding, shouldn't it say, 'all developments must ensure that water management AND flood risk HAVE BEEN addressed prior to development'</p>

Responses: 55	Flood plains exist for good reason, building on Green Belt means water has to go somewhere. Water meadows essential.
	Roads and drains in Ockham, Ripley and Horsley flood already, as does TFM
	Garlick's Arch unsuitable in this regard
	Already an insurance company flood area and with land registry
	Current combined surface water and sewage system not fit for purpose, drainage ditches not kept clear.
	Suitable drainage becomes unsuitable once gardens are paved over – should have restriction on this within policy
	'mitigation' and 'drainage systems being sustainable' are fine words but pretty empty as goals are unachievable
Changes to Plan	<i>Policy L.EN3 renamed as Policy ILNPEN3.</i>
Policy L.EN3: Flooding	<i>The policy has been amended to require a Flood Risk Assessment for major (10+ dwellings) developments. Information from the Woodland Trust on how planting trees can help with flooding has been included.</i>
Policy L.EN4: Light Pollution	No more artificial light, already too much light pollution, mainly from M25 / A3
	Ockham not an area for artificial light , 2000 houses at Wisley means policy not possible to achieve
	Light pollution will endanger wildlife and create problems for them with regard to sustaining biodiversity
	Policy must stop bright PIR lighting
	Rural area and street lighting not a feature
	Policy must ensure safe environment for residents whilst still allowing businesses to comply with H&S
	Need pavements to be lit too, to encourage walking
Responses: 26	
Changes to Plan	<i>Policy L.EN4 renamed as Policy LNPEN4.</i>
Policy L.EN4: Light Pollution	<i>The policy has been amended to provide a balance between the need for street lighting for safety and environmentally friendly lighting to limit visible light on rural areas.</i>
Policy L.EN5: Air Quality and Traffic Pollution	More rigorous standards should be applied. Consider the approach GBC and inspectorate appeals as inadequate. A proper cost benefit analysis model is appropriate to measure actual net economic cost as well as carbon audit WRT pollution. Any air quality control should be independent of GBC
	I would take out the word 'major', strengthen 'need to' to 'must' and take out 'relevant' and 'where appropriate' leaving " All developments must provide assessment and mitigation including a Construction and Environmental Plan and a Green Travel Plan to provide sustainable transport to local centres. " Again why not simply prohibit all construction traffic from Ripley High Street.
	Infrastructure should be in place prior to any development of considerable size
	Local roads are stretched to the limit already any additional traffic will cause hardship Air pollution is already higher than it should be
	Don't restrict this to Ripley High street - what about Rose Lane and Newark Lane? Both roads suffer from traffic issues.
	Needs a reference to 7.5T limits on a) Guileshill Lane b) Ockham Lane c) Old Lane d) Newark Lane

Responses: 77	Notice should be taken of the totally unacceptable levels of pollution recorded at Junction10 M25. Air quality locally already been proved to be poor too.
	Does policy take into account proposed road changes? Ockham roundabout etc?
	Ripley High Street is at breaking point in 2018 and needs more robust traffic calming schemes than it currently has, including measure like these to reduce increased traffic. Most importantly the A3 needs north and south access points at each end of the village.
	The area is already above the legal limit for pollution. Any development will make this worse no matter what the safeguards. the area around the high street and Newark Lane is already heavily congested and even a small number of homes would make the situation worse.
	The variants between acceptable and dangerously high emissions raise uncomfortable questions about the different formats for testing Air Quality and how the results will be used.
	Traffic is going to be the biggest issue for me for the proposed developments. With Ripley High Street, Newark Lane and the surrounding rural lanes being used as a cut through for many. if the building works in the local plan were to go ahead, the unsustainable increase in traffic will cause large areas of the Lovelace Ward to be at a standstill. The small roads are not made for this amount of traffic, Polesdon Lane is a prime example. Significant improvements to the road network to discourage people from using the rural lanes will need to be implemented for any future developments.
	The impact of AQ on the SPA needs to be accessed with an AA and HRA in advance of any development within 5 kms of the SPA as it is a stricter measure than for humans. This included streets Elm Corner, Wisley Lane, Old Lane, A3, M25. Also impact of the recent Kolkott case needs to be built into the Lovelace Neighbourhood Plan
	Green Credentials integrated into any new development.
Area of family, young and old; air quality at critical pollution levels already – choked by fumes at rush hour	
<p>Changes to Plan</p> <p>Policy L.EN5: Air Quality and Traffic Pollution</p>	<p><i>Policy L.EN5 renamed as Policy LNPEN5.</i></p> <p><i>The policy and justification have been amended and strengthened to address the current air quality in Ripley and at Ockham, both above legal limits. Traffic and air quality have consistently been shown in LNP surveys to be a very important issue for residents in both areas.</i></p> <p><i>Previous drafts of the LNP included a Construction and Environmental Plan (CEMP) which seemed most appropriate for the LNP. GBC suggested a Construction Transport Management Plan (CTMP) instead. Both have been included as the CEMP takes account of sensitive environmental areas and the CTMP looks at construction traffic. ch assessments should be included.</i></p> <p><i>Ripley and Ockham Parish Councils arranged for independent air quality monitoring over a four month period and the reports show current air quality levels to be above legal limits (Appendix). Cost was a restriction in longer or alternative monitoring. Ripley Parish Council will ask GBC to designate Ripley an “Air Quality Management Area” as the air quality emissions are above legal limits. (As a local council, we have a duty to monitor air quality in the borough, as set out by the Environment Act 1995, European Union Directives and the UK's Air Quality Strategy. If air quality in the borough does not meet the national standard, we will draw up an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and draft an</i></p>

	<p>action plan to improve the air quality in that area. - https://www.guildford.gov.uk/article/21335/Air-Quality-Management-Area)</p> <p><i>The policy has been amended to ‘Ripley village centre’ rather than specific roads. Banning or restricting HGV’s from Ripley and the local road network was advised to be unrealistic and unenforceable. The requirement for a Full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan have been included in the policy and restriction of HGV traffic on the local network included as an aspiration.</i></p> <p><i>Junction 10 is outside Lovelace and the polices can only relate to Lovelace.</i></p> <p><i>The changes to the A3 junction at Burnt Common by GBC in the emerging LP are proposed as mitigation of traffic from the RHS and any airfield traffic. Residents know this will inevitably bring more traffic through Ripley from the RHS and any airfield traffic and is addressed in the amended justification.</i></p> <p><i>Highways England (HE) have reportedly advised it is not possible to make Ockham Roundabout a 4-way junction as the southern slips are too close to the A3 service station (approximately 1 mile distant, despite the recently opened Starbucks Drive-Thru on the northbound carriageway having virtually no slip road and almost alongside the A245 Webyridge/Cobham slip roads.</i></p> <p><i>Highways England and GBC LP policies are beyond the remit of the LNP.</i></p> <p><i>“Major” is the planning term for all developments of more than 10, but there is no planning term for very large developments.</i></p> <p><i>Traffic calming would be implemented by Highways England, so can only be an “aspiration” in the LNP.</i></p>
<p>Policy L.I.1: Infrastructure</p>	<p>Such developments assume provision of essential services to such infrastructure. Can these be described in planning applications to secure developers commitment to them</p> <p>Ockham is especially lacking in facilities within walking distance; The Wisley plan creates a ghetto of housing with hopeless transport links</p> <p>There should not be developments of 1000 homes and infrastructure has to be improved first</p> <p>It is difficult now to get an appointment at the Villages GP surgery - extra houses will make that worse. More GP capacity needed.</p> <p>Reopen Village School. Selling of the site will threaten future generations</p> <p>Pavements should be on both sides of the road</p> <p>Great idea but never enforced. Build promised infrastructure before houses</p> <p>It should not be when first needed but infrastructure should be delivered when development is built and prior to anyone moving in</p>

	CIL contributions to relevant parish council
	Development exceeding 1000 should be excluded
	Train Stations at capacity
	No school capacity; Ripley with 910 homes and growing has now no state primary school and no doctors surgery
	I agree with the sentiment not sure about the wording, how about all 'strategic developments' or all 'developments more than 400 homes' for the second paragraph (to include Garlick's Arch).
	All developments should ensure that separate cycle lanes are provided within them, which could feed into national cycle routes.
	Any new developments should have an infrastructure viability test and any failings should be addressed before work can commence.
	Ripley High Street seizes up at rush hour - too much traffic
	I agree with the first paragraph. However, I would have thought it obvious that "social infrastructure facilities" such as GP surgeries and schools are already stretched and would require improvements on developments well below 1000 homes. Even 50 homes would add considerable pressure in my view.
	I do not agree to development that will alter the fundamental structure of the area as the villages' integrity should be preserved. I do not agree to the provision of large volume housing anywhere in the Lovelace area
	If we are to have a development of over a 1000 homes that in itself would destroy the special qualities of each area and cannot be sympathetic to local character and history. The two things are mutually exclusive.
	Pavements for safe walking also require SAFE LIGHTING but in some areas, such as Ockham, additional lighting and pavements will ruin the rural nature of residents' current communities.
	Pedestrian and road user (car and bike) safety is paramount.
	Ripley has a clear need to have its pavements improved; the pavement from Burnt Common into Ripley needs urgent attention, also there is NO street lighting in this area. There is no pavement on south side of Portsmouth Road from the Grove Heath North bus stop into Ripley High street, people have to cross the busy Portsmouth Road to walk in to Ripley & this is very dangerous as the traffic speed is atrocious and the 30mph needs to be moved further up Portsmouth Road or a pedestrian cross supplied for people to cross this road safely
	Without suitable infrastructure the proposed developments will not be sustainable at all. It is also very important to ensure that the sewage infrastructure is improved before any developments can be made. As I have personally been affected by sewage flooding, caused by old pipes I know first hand where all the sewage will end up if there is a problem with the pumps at Ripley Sewage works.
	https://www.futurecommunities.net/socialdesign/190/cambourne-cambridgeshire - major issue of social design
Responses: 97	This Policy sounds good but means nothing and will be impossible to implement against any of the major developers likely to be involved with the major development schemes. The Policy should include a comprehensive shopping list of infrastructure requirements, to be secured by a S106 or other legal agreement, including the new road junctions (eg on/off slips), traffic management in Ripley, air and noise quality improvements, public transport provision to Woking, Guildford and other railway stations, and how about adding a new footbridge at Pidgeon House Lane (adjacent to Wisley Golf Course) to the shopping list.
Changes to Plan	<i>Policy L.I.1 is renamed as Policy LNPI1</i>
Policy L.I.1:	<i>The policy has been amended to require infrastructure prior to occupation.</i>

<p>Infrastructure</p>	<p><i>The numerous comments evidence lack of infrastructure for more than 50-100 houses is considered vital to be in place before occupation.</i></p>
<p>Policy L.I.2: Public Transport and Green Travel</p>	<p>Public transport should be improved and reliability is a must or people will revert to own transport. More buses outside rush hour; more buses to Kingston and Guildford; Present public transport is unreliable</p> <p>Public transport is being reduced. Car use will never decrease; Nice idea but unrealistic</p> <p>Public transport will be difficult in Ockham; Won't work - people will not give up their cars. Public transport in Ockham won't work - it was tried many years ago; In a place like Ockham, establishing sustainable public transport would be very difficult.</p> <p>It is unlikely developments in Lovelace could ever meet this requirement; This is unrealistic; Impossible;</p> <p>I have been without a car for 4 weeks - public transport to Woking and Guildford has been excellent - will use it more in future</p> <p>Consideration to the access of public transport must also be given - not just provision e.g. pathways to rail links</p> <p>Should also increase parking facilities and bike racks at the stations</p> <p>Those without flexi time will still have to use own cars except there will be more of us</p> <p>Electric commuter buses should be considered</p> <p>Travel to rail station necessitates cars</p> <p>More development of brownfield sites in Guildford needed</p> <p>But cars and vans are vital in a village without a train station</p> <p>A great objective, but no developer will sign up to providing sustainable transport in perpetuity. If the policy is to have any meaning it should include more detail and a means to secure the necessary provision from the developer.</p> <p>Also consider that public transport often suffers cuts in services so this policy could be a short-lived dream. In addition, we must realise that it is a human need to be independent so even if car use is reduced, cycling will increase which on the surface is more desirable but large increases in cycling are already causing terrible traffic congestion.</p> <p>And so build where these links are already present and not force them into the rural areas where these transport links simply do not exist and the villages could not cope with their small railway stations already at capacity, and winding narrow lanes which are already busy at the weekends with cyclists</p> <p>Development at Wisley/Ockham will lead to much greater car use. There are no footpaths the roads are narrow and people could not walk or cycle safely to stations, or schools</p> <p>The negative wording must be changed to read "No developments will be supported which increase the need for car use and do not offer sustainable public transport choices and that do not increase, or otherwise support, the delivery of public transport services in perpetuity. The existing wording is developer speak!</p> <p>If any development on green field sites should happen, it makes sense that these sites are within walking distance of a railway station.</p> <p>If train use is to be increased at Clendon, the junction must be improved to make it safer.</p> <p>Sustainable public transport should be innovative and not just a few buses. Any large developments should be linked to railway stations by non-carbon producing transport. If developments are built within easy distance of large railway stations trams should be used for access instead of buses that can be cancelled/changed in the future.</p>

<p>Responses: 70</p>	<p>The proposed developments are not concentrated in one location in the Lovelace area but at several potential sites. The fact that there is no railway station in or immediately adjacent to the local settlements means that people have to travel (normally by car) to neighbouring towns, principally Woking with many commuting to London by there. The Neighbourhood Plan does not appear to have taken full account of the existing hourly bus service from Guildford to Woking (462/463) which appears on the Surrey County Council website, it is suggested that developer funding is sought to enhance the frequency to 30 minutes. The local authority should work closely with bus and train operators to investigate what service would provide the greater chance of modal shift from private car to public transport. Network Rail is working with Woking Borough Council on a land strategy that seeks to understand the development opportunities around Woking Station. A part of this strategy is looking at how car parking can be consolidated and improved at the station to release land for development; this would provide potential benefits to Lovelace residents who are parking at the station. There are also aspirations for a new rail link to London Heathrow Airport from Woking and Guildford that Network Rail is investigating.</p> <p>There must be car charging points to each property as a requirement. With a visitor or 'spares' - at least two. We need to keep all the buses, and it may require an extra route to be implemented. Car Pool or Share to be encouraged/provided.</p> <p>The wording of this is deeply ambiguous. WIPL would argue that this policy would require Lovelace to support its plan to develop TFM. The meaning of the words, 'offer sustainable public transport choices' is not defined. The basic problem is that most of Lovelace does not have sustainable access by foot or bicycle to mass transit systems (excluding roads/cars) ie the railway stations are not within a reasonable walking or cycling distance along safe routes</p> <p>Delete the word perpetuity it is too onerous / unachievable</p>
<p>Changes to Plan</p> <p>Policy L.I.2: Infrastructure Public Transport and Green Travel</p>	<p><i>Policy L.I.2 is renamed as Policy LNPI2.</i></p> <p><i>The policy has been amended to include a regular bus service to Woking, particularly during rush hours, to encourage a reduction in car use. The justification has been strengthened and includes Network Rail Regulation 14 public consultation responses. Network Rail anticipate extra passengers from new Lovelace developments.</i></p> <p><i>The community are clear that public transport is currently inadequate and that car use is essential for most. Bus services would need to be significantly increased to both Guildford and Woking as well as nearby towns, before public transport provide a realistic transport option. Easy access to public transport is also important.</i></p> <p><i>As Lovelace does not have a railway station, good, regular, bus services need to be in place before the community will reduce car usage, currently considered a necessity. They acknowledge any development will increase vehicle numbers.</i></p>
<p>Policy L.I.3: Cycle Lanes and Public Footpaths</p>	<p>Separate off-road cycle paths needed - lanes are too narrow</p> <p>Narrow footpaths and unlit lanes are very dangerous</p> <p>Cycle lanes should not make traffic congestion worse - do not narrow existing roads</p> <p>Not feasible on narrow lanes</p> <p>Only cycle lanes through Ripley - cycle lanes cannot be added to small lanes</p>

<p>Responses: 69</p>	<p>A sound objective, but difficult to implement. Traffic calming (speed bumps, speed limits and enforcement and shorter waiting time at pedestrian crossing lights on Ripley High Street) would achieve this objective, as would pavements at White Hart Meadows (where traffic accessing the car park conflicts with pedestrians accessing Ripley Court School).</p> <p>A specialist cycle lane or pedestrian pathway would be good. A cycle lane that is just white lines painted on existing tarmac would be unacceptable.</p> <p>Equestrian Lanes & Paths</p> <p>Anything that gets the cycles off and away from the country lanes is to be applauded. It is very dangerous having cyclists and motor cars and lorries all trying to squeeze down the country lanes that were designed for one-way traffic of ox carts.</p> <p>I believe given the current significant concern for warming and the latest IPCC findings that creation of and/or contribution to safe cycling infrastructure should be requirement.</p> <p>Cycle racks to be provided to each new home.</p> <p>New sites should be easily accessible by foot and bike</p> <p>Send Parish Council are looking at the possibility of an off route cycle lane from Ripley to Woking via the tow path along the river then accords the flood plain next to Send Business Centre.</p>
<p>Changes to Plan</p> <p>Policy L.I.3: Cycle Lanes and Public Footpaths</p>	<p><i>Policy L.I.3 is renamed as Policy LNPI3.</i></p> <p><i>The policy and justification have been amended.</i></p> <p><i>Whilst the aim of the policy is to encourage cycling and walking, the community know that in reality, cycling on the local road network is dangerous and cannot see how that can be changed.</i></p> <p><i>They would like to encourage cycling if good, safe, facilities to link communities were provided but do not believe this is feasible or realistic.</i></p>
<p>Policy L.I.4: Parking</p>	<p>Parking already a problem, too few spaces already.</p> <p>Most important - hazardous illegal on pavement and grandpa rights should be stopped</p> <p>Roads at present time cannot take more traffic</p> <p>Need to stop dumping of cars (long term parking)</p> <p>Given that the listed green spaces are to be retained and that the entire area of Ripley Green is to be kept as is any likely sites for parking are limited</p> <p>There should be at least 2 car parking spaces each</p> <p>There will never be enough parking spaces especially at 40 homes per hectare</p> <p>Consideration should be given to resident permits in certain areas e.g. the Green where parking provision is tight</p> <p>Local business needs more street parking. If it was either end of the High Street it would also slow speeding traffic</p> <p>Elderly residential parking must be raised to 1 car space per unit. The elderly rely on their cars to keep some independence even in sheltered housing. The Clockhouse in Guildford is an example with little residential or visitor parking by MCarthy & Stone.</p> <p>Car parks are full at railway stations.</p>

<p>Responses: 49</p>	<p>How do we find additional parking in Ripley without eating into green belt. I would support resident permits in order to ensure adequate parking adjacent to properties, for those with walking difficulties (as currently our population is aging) and with no village school, and prohibitive housing costs it is likely to remain so.</p> <p>This is critical for Ripley. If local businesses are to survive we must have more parking. What about "resident parking permits" for Rose Lane to stop long stay commuter parking?</p> <p>To accommodate two cars per household plus visitor parking, requires much planning and space, and adequate numbers, as we are a car driven society, whether they are used for jobs, to travel to a station, to take children to school, parking is always a problem</p>
<p>Changes to Plan</p> <p>Policy L.I.4: Parking</p>	<p><i>Policy L.I.4 is renamed as Policy LNPI4.</i></p> <p><i>The parking policy has had little change as it is such an important issue. The justification has been amended.</i></p> <p><i>The community know car usage will remain the main method for the foreseeable future. Whilst the LNP aims to promote sustainable travel, it reflects the community recognition that sufficient parking must be available for any new homes.</i></p> <p><i>Businesses also require sufficient parking for customers and employees.</i></p> <p><i>The dilemma is whether Green Belt can be used for additional parking or not.</i></p>
<p>Policy L.I.5: Provision of Community Facilities</p>	<p>It is not in place now so why do you think it will be</p> <p>Any payment for these provided by residents by a parish council should be democratically voted on</p> <p>Subject to them being appropriately sited</p> <p>New village hall (Ripley) urgently required. GBC planning should encourage project rather than stalling it</p> <p>But this will increase the number of dwellings. Are these facilities included in the planning application?</p> <p>Closing school in Ripley is a big issue for young families and goes against social demographics in the village</p> <p>Actually I think this village is well served in this area</p> <p>Without a car I have done all my shopping locally and will continue to do so</p> <p>Vital to sustain a healthy population</p> <p>Footpaths in the village are really bad - no dropped kerbs for older people using mobility scooters</p> <p>Agree in principle but these provisions should be on a needs basis where there is a demand. Placing community facilities, particularly outdoor ones, close to high pollution areas is irresponsible and dangerous to health, especially for young people.</p> <p>But we must not destroy essential green spaces to accommodate these facilities.</p> <p>Contributions towards improved sports facilities and the Village Hall redevelopment should be sought from developers.</p> <p>Encouraged via reduced business rates.</p> <p>One cannot build new developments without thought for all who may live or visit there, and this requires sympathetic design, space, green spaces, much parking spaces, to make a site sustainable and a joy to live in or visit</p>

<p>Responses: 37</p>	<p>Surely you mean "less ABLE" - not "less ABLED".</p> <p>The local towns provide these facilities and money should be put there to improve them. Having to build these in a new development is like building a whole new town and is totally unnecessary and defeats the object of adding to the area- it is making whole new areas!</p> <p>There should be no major development of up to 100 homes, to be able to claim that they are sustainable by including these facilities. Development should be of a size that fits with the local communities and would therefore not need extra provision but maybe and expansion of existing buildings.</p> <p>There should be no major development of up to 100 homes, to be able to claim that they are sustainable by including these facilities. Development should be of a size that fits with the local communities and would therefore not need extra provision but maybe an expansion of existing buildings.</p> <p>Surgeries and Schools to be considered</p>
<p>Changes to Plan</p> <p>Policy L.I.5: Provision of Community Facilities</p>	<p><i>Policy L.I.5 is renamed as Policy LNPI5</i></p> <p><i>The policy has amended slightly.</i> <i>The community view is for smaller developments situated close to current facilities, which could be expanded, rather than new developments which would have insufficient community facilities.</i></p> <p><i>Community facilities are important for social infrastructure. Social facilities with a range shops, pubs, restaurants, etc., encourage social integration and development. Without these people will use their cars to travel to locations where they are available.</i></p> <p><i>Community centres provide only limited facilities.</i></p>
<p>Policy L.I.6: Healthcare and Education</p>	<p>So much development but we now have no primary school</p> <p>The Villages Health Centre is at or beyond capacity</p> <p>Healthcare and educational demand most important</p> <p>Not forgetting the additional heavy burden this will place on our already over stretched and under-funded police fire and ambulance services</p> <p>But I don't think that Ripley has need of major development hence no additional health care or schools. We need just to support what we have already</p> <p>These infrastructures should be a top priority in considering any future development</p> <p>Ripley School should be reopened</p> <p>We are already having difficulties with local facilities, we shouldn't wait for it to be addressed only by larger developments. It needs to be looked at with each development of approximately 30 houses or more</p> <p>Already, surgeries and hospitals are at capacity and local medical centres are important to take the burden from them, and to avoid people having to drive a long way for treatment, causing traffic and pollution and burdening car parks at hospitals. Much</p>

<p>Responses: 54</p>	<p>thought and planning needs to be given to the siting of any new developments to ensure they are appropriate, sensitive, sustainable and do not threaten to destroy our precious historic green belt villages set in conservation areas</p> <p>Our village is becoming a town.... The march of time cannot be stopped, so it is obvious that further development must include suitable infrastructure to accommodate the needs of new residents</p> <p>This would rule out any development on Three Farms Meadow as it is next to a recognised pollution hotspot at the junction of the M25 and A3.</p> <p>No. We all know that if you build a development with a green space, in 20 years the developers will be back to "in-fill" it in with more development. I agree that provision for education and healthcare must be made BEFORE increasing population - these are already overloaded in Lovelace</p> <p>There should be no 'Major' developments. Surrey is a Rural county and should remain so.</p> <p>There should not be any major development in the Lovelace area. The current transport links to towns like Guildford and Woking are adequate enough to enable children to go to school in those areas. Small developments would not impact greatly on these transport facilities. Large developments will and so are not suitable for village areas.</p> <p>You can't just provide health care and meet educational demand. You need to provide mental health support, community worker infrastructure, special needs schools, cultural integration facilities, language support, you need to police the playgrounds and the streets for knife crime and grooming threats in new un integrated communities without work provision without leisure and recreation facilities for teenagers and without the ability to escape on foot to an urban well provisioned familiar location. Ockham provides none of this.</p>
<p>Changes to Plan</p> <p>Policy L.I.6: Healthcare and Education</p>	<p><i>Policy L.I.6 is renamed as Policy LNPI6.</i></p> <p><i>The policy and justification reflect the requirement for sufficient healthcare and education facilities to be in place prior to occupation.</i></p> <p><i>The community know that current healthcare and education facilities are already inadequate. They do not expect new developments to utilise current facilities which are currently insufficient.</i></p> <p><i>They require such facilities to be improved now, with large developments to be self-sufficient and provide these facilities prior to occupation.</i></p> <p><i>The final point above notes that healthcare and education need to provide far-reaching objectives. Is this likely?</i></p>
<p>Policy L.BE1: Change of Use from Commercial to Non-Commercial</p>	<p>Small businesses are an integral part of the community</p> <p>The villages simply cannot support further HGV traffic</p> <p>I would suggest smaller scaled employment facilities and not the huge new Burnt Common industrial site</p> <p>Ripley is great because it is not only a dormitory town - we need a thriving commercial sector within the village - too many buildings have already been lost</p> <p>Shops particularly must be protected</p>

<p>Re HGV traffic but agreed with reservations on commercial to residential change of use. A high proportion of jobs in local offices are taken by people outside of Lovelace. We cannot mitigate traffic and parking whilst encouraging the current influx of day time workers Also where business move away surely an occupied house is better than an empty office</p>
<p>Two large business premises in Ripley High Street has changed from business to Residential in the last year</p>
<p>Business premises generally lack garden space so don't make ideal houses</p>
<p>3 NPPF pillars need to be respected. if the area is good at agriculture the neighbourhood plan needs to support that. If the area is good at national infrastructure provision, the neighbourhood plan needs to support that. if the area is good at biodiversity and culture, the neighbourhood plan needs to support that. If the area is going to be appallingly ill-equipped and severely unsuited to hosting a new town the neighbourhood plan needs to condemn that use of the land in the strongest terms. I don't feel the neighbourhood plan takes its responsibilities seriously enough in preventing the creation of a remote isolated and expensive sink estate at the cost of high quality national and international biodiversity and the smooth running of nationally and internationally significant road infrastructure. A new town in Ockham is the LEAST SUSTAINABLE USE OF THE LAND, THE MOST DESTRUCTIVE TO THE EXISTING USES OF THE LAND AND EXISTING COMMUNITY WAY OF LIVE, THE LEAST COMPLIANT WITH ALL 3 PILLARS OF THE NPPF THE LEAST COMPLIANT WITH THE SURREY NATURE PARTNERSHIP CLASSIFICATION OF THE LAND.</p>
<p>Again the decision should be in the hands of the Parish Council after consultation with the villagers.</p>
<p>Agree up to a point. The proposal, for example, for a huge increase in industrial space in the Burnt Common area is likely to suck in more traffic and put more pressure on the demand for housing, medical facilities etc</p>
<p>But don't overlook the fact that the creation of developments of any scale ALWAYS results in significant HGV traffic through villages and it sometimes last YEARS.</p>
<p>I believe that the commercial and entertainment facilities in ripley should not be decreased</p>
<p>I think this should also include PREVENT the Change of Use from Agricultural to residential dwelling. Barn and chicken shed conversions especially! Prevention of agricultural land to "brown field sites" for the intention of building on them.</p>
<p>Knowing the village when the main Portsmouth Road ran through it.. the reappearance of HGVs would be unwelcome in every way, not least the safety aspect and of course the damage to the ancient buildings through pollution and vibration. However as I have said elsewhere supporting further development that would require parking (For obvious reasons) seems like no choice either!</p>
<p>Ockham Village is blighted by 30 tonne lorries feeding the illegal waste treatment site. This must be stopped. Lorries of this size are illegal but not prosecuted by police.</p>
<p>Presumably this will actually be enforced unlike already allowing HGVs to travel on Old Lane to an illegal dump site and Brick Kiln Farm.</p>
<p>Provided this is in already built up areas NOT on current Green Belt. There are ample buildings currently that can be provided for this purpose</p>
<p>Significant needs to be defined</p>
<p>There is already a significant HGV traffic in the area. The country lanes are not suitable for any of this. I know HGVs are not supposed to drive on certain narrow roads but they do.</p>
<p>We must support small and rural businesses into the future for general economic prosperity to the area</p>

<p>Responses: 56</p>	<p>Commercial changing to residential should be continued to increase homes as the government and builders have not succeeded between themselves in the past! Also retail is now in decline due to excessive rate rises and the internet over the last 10 years.</p> <p>The policy is wrong in that it will encourage the ingress of businesses and workers from afar clogging up the road network and marring the environment visually, noisily and in all probability chemically. These are quiet residential villages and must remain so.</p> <p>Unclear - There is no one single minded position to agree or disagree here.</p>
<p>Changes to Plan</p> <p>Policy L.BE1: Change of Use from Commercial to Non-Commercial</p>	<p><i>Policy L.BE1 is renamed to Policy LNPBE1.</i></p> <p><i>The policy and justification have been amended.</i></p> <p><i>The community wants to retain, if not expand, small commercial premises. They are unhappy with the lose of such premises through permitted development.</i></p> <p><i>They do not support any business that increases HGV and other traffic on the local roads.</i></p>
<p>Policy L.BE2: Agricultural and Horticultural Land Use</p>	<p>Is Valentines farm a farm - it used to be</p> <p>Very important we have to stop large lorries damaging the roads and verges</p> <p>Contradicts removal of green belt status as farmland - what nonsense</p> <p>It will be hard to maintain the LNP rural feel with so much increased housing</p> <p>This is already happening with HGVs in Rose Lane & Newark Lane</p> <p>Providing that this is not encroachment onto Ripley Green - existing units near Dunsborough are already doing this</p> <p>But no more equestrian</p> <p>Agriculture expected to become even more important post Brexit</p> <p>Page 11 of the NP refers to some built up areas - this hardly applies to Ockham which has no real built up areas. "Moderate good agricultural land - Ockham and possibly the other parishes also have grade 2 agricultural land including on TFM</p> <p>Use brownfield sites - the developers must not be given free reign of our green belt</p> <p>Farming, particularly with local sale of produce, is becoming more VITAL in controlling air pollution and global climate change.</p> <p>I Agree, Surrey Nature Partnership have maps of the whole of Surrey. Ockham doesn't feature in LEP planning as meeting any of the following criteria: rural economic hub or a semi rural economic hub or an urban economic hub. it is just not seen as a place for economic growth, nor are any of the surrounding villages. Why is the 3rd largest town in Guildford being planned here - people dumping????</p> <p>Not only must the size/weight of vehicles be controlled but also the regularity of their use of roads and lanes.</p> <p>Strongly agree. Well managed and appropriately scaled development can enhance the rural character of the area. Cottage industries benefit all.</p> <p>The policy should not only protect but also encourage the growth of farming.</p> <p>These activities are all part of rural life and Ockham has many farms in its small village, made up of a number of hamlets, connected by footpaths over Three Farm Meadows This is the nature of this area, it is mainly farmland a rural setting and full of</p>

<p>Responses: 34</p>	<p>character and small cottages, housing about 400 people in under 200 homes Long may it stay this way, as a place for people to enjoy the green belt, the footpaths, the Church, and the pub</p> <p>Very important to retain the rural character of this lovely part of the country</p> <p>Vital to ensure the fertile land is put to good use for growing crops, etc., as well as providing opportunities for local people to work at or near their home.</p> <p>We need to support agriculture and make our country as sustainable on domestic products as possible</p>
<p>Changes to Plan</p> <p>Policy L.BE2: Agricultural and Horticultural Land Use</p>	<p><i>Policy L.BE2 is renamed as Policy LNPBE2.</i></p> <p><i>The policy and justification remain much the same in that agricultural and horticultural use, appropriate to the rural nature of the area, is supported.</i></p> <p><i>The community views are that green field land should remain farmland and farming should be encouraged and increased.</i></p> <p><i>Where permitted development allows business use, this is encouraging some additional HGVs use on the local road network.</i></p>
<p>General Comments – nor policy related</p>	<p>The area has not enough infrastructure. Air pollution worries, congestion on A3 and M25 already, St Peters and Royal Surrey hospitals already at capacity, If problem on A3 roads round Ripley come to a stop, too many large lorries already using B roads, any new developments should not be in one small area in Surrey</p> <p>As on other occasions whilst the stated objectives may be well intentioned much is unachievable and contradictory of other statements. Just another costly consultation to satisfy political PR purposes. The outcome will no doubt be ignored if inconvenient as on so many other occasions.</p> <p>Hope comments are not too cynical - regard actions of GBC as self-serving, short sighted and compliant to a wider faux policy being driven by central government. This policy rests on faith and market force to cure the housing shortage created by the previous governments. They destroyed the abilities of local authorities to meet their statutory obligations for housing needs. To follow blindly (which the N Plan does not thank goodness) the unbridled excesses of forced speculative housing approvals ie appeasing them, will result in further lowering of standards in every way experienced by the average resident. It is clear that the NPPF is not good enough because GBC manipulate or override it in order to facilitate developers who provide extra finance for the LA. WE need good quality appropriate builds via municipal development on brownfield sites. Ring fenced expressly to predatory developers. We need to challenge GBC whenever they threaten GB or open public space, woods, agricultural land etc. With proper economic stats C-B analysis, air pollution etc</p> <p>Many people work hard to stop these developments and wish to say thank you very much for all you do for Ockham. I am one of the last few Ockham born and bred residents and I would like to stay here until I join the 3 generations of my family who have lived, worked and died in Ockham. What I am trying to say is that when a decision is made by GBC or Surrey County Council no matter how hard any of you work it will happen.</p>

	<p>For as long as Newark Lane remains the main outlet from Ripley towards Woking and the rest, the village will experience high pollution rates and major traffic control problems. This LNP deserves our full support.</p>
	<p>Ripley resident concerned about how extra houses can be reconciled with (a) a rural village (b) no school (c) an already busy road network unsuitable for heavy traffic (Newark Lane) (d) an already high level of toxic air quality. The balance has to take into account the protection of village status not a huge sprawled town which encompasses Woking, Guildford, Send etc. The preservation of surrounding ancient woodland and green spaces and the restriction as far as possible of heavy goods / industrial traffic. Good luck.</p>
	<p>It is clear that the proponents of this plan have the villages interests at heart. It is also very difficult to be looking in all directions at once and I feel the plan has an excellent balance of promoting development and preserving the future of our unique environment with only a few codicils and clarifications I commend this plan.</p>
	<p>I do believe that the retention of the Green Belt is a vital necessity. Resistance to any change must be vigorously maintained.</p>
	<p>Extra housing means more children needing a school locally otherwise it will mean more traffic taking children to school further afield.</p>
	<p>There is no mention of the crucial issue of schools. Ripley Village School has been closed. There are no local school places to support housing development. This has to be addressed within the vision - Ripley needs a school.</p>
	<p>Ripley Village is unusual in that it is a rural community within a short distance of the capital city. The village plan takes into consideration that while it is important to provide additional housing, expand retail and business organisations, this must be implemented in a way that maintains its unique character. It is for this reason that as a resident I fully support the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan 2019 to 2034.</p>
	<p>Closing primary school and nursery in Ripley is a huge negative to young families. The village is losing its attractiveness for young people and young families. The sports field at primary school must be protected and not developed into housing. Tennis courts could be added at village hall or primary school. Shuttle buses to stations at commuter times would be good especially for new developments. Cycle lane through West Clandon to connect with cycle lane though Ripley could make riding to station safer. More bike storage at Clandon Station. 3 way lights would be installed at Clandon Station parking . Zebra crossing should be installed Newark Lane to join Ripley village together safely for pedestrians.</p>
	<p>If local plan is approved we are taking more than our fair share of development and the whole character of the neighbourhood would be destroyed. It will become a ribbon of housing with more congestion on the roads and pressure on already stretched facilities, ie. schools, railways and medical centres. Thank you for your hard work.</p>
	<p>I compliment all those who have produced this NLP but I still feel Lovelace should not take much development when the borough has so many other areas which are more suited such as near Guildford which can provide the necessary infrastructure for access to rail, shops and schools. Surely a much better solution ad will prevent Lovelace becoming a small town rather than an attractive village.</p>
	<p>Thank you for giving us the opportunity to express our views. We have to stand up to our bullying borough council, the integrity of which must be seriously questioned. Green Belt land lost in Lovelace and substituted by new Green Belt land near where quay GBC councillors live. Yes the headline.....an abuse of power.</p>
	<p>Removing Lovelace from the greenbelt will be an invitation to despoil the very important lowland heath habitat, which is rare in the UK. I cannot see how any large scale development can fail to have a major impact on its surroundings</p>

	<p>No mention here of A3 / M25 redesign. I had a letter from Highways Agency which they called a consultation. Obviously they don't know the meaning of the word. They say they proposed to take away hard shoulders, total madness in my view. I said if they has so much money they should fix the pot holes first. Cyclists - they for the most part never pay attention to anything and don't stick to cycle lanes. My brother lives in Holmbury and is housebound practically every weekend due to cyclists taking over the roads and never letting cars through. more cycle lanes, would cost more, for what? but if this is what the people want, so be it. though they should be identifiable.</p> <p>I do hope that the views of residents will be listened to and heard, not ignored, and ridden roughshod over as seems to be general practice when it comes to these matters. Despite thousands of voices, GBC has thus far ignored the common populace and kept on consulting - what is the point of this?</p> <p>I think you have done a really good job on this questionnaire. I do worry about more development. What we have already is not being maintained and I blame GBC. The rubbish is dreadful. The ditches and verges are not maintained resulting in the breakup of road surfaces and leading to flooding. Parking is dire - especially in Ripley. Public Transport is poor. Cyclists are hogging lanes and accidents are inevitable. we are overcrowded as it is and we must maintain greenbelt for future generations. it is a fact that being in the countryside is beneficial to health.</p> <p>Greenbelt - do not meddle</p> <p>The junction of Newark Lane with Ripley High Street frequently becomes grid locked. With more A3 north bound traffic destined to be re-routed through Ripley High Street plus additional traffic from future housing developments, the frequency of grid-locked traffic jams at this junction will worsen. serious consideration should be given to a three way traffic light system. Traffic lights would need to be situated near the Doctor's surgery to control traffic in and out of the narrowest section of Newark Lane. then traffic lights at the High Street end of Newark Lane and on the High Street would control traffic proceeding straight on along the High Street on entering Newark Lane.</p> <p>the Lovelace area is sought after because of its present mix. We have already expanded considerably, and other areas should take more of the burden. The GVG proposals should be implemented taking off the pressure on the greenbelt. We are the greenbelt for the London area surely there is a responsibility to maintain it for London let alone for Surrey</p>
<p>Add</p>	<p><i>The Lovelace community are clear they recognise the need for new housing for the local and wider area.</i></p> <p><i>They support small developments which are proportionate to the size of the settlement are and in keeping with the character of the area.</i></p> <p><i>They support expansion of local facilities to meet that proportionate development.</i></p> <p><i>They require a housing mix to meet local need.</i></p> <p><i>The community do not support any large development which increase the need for car use.</i></p> <p><i>They want design and density to reflect the surrounding areas.</i></p> <p><i>They consider any development over 100 homes and large employment areas to be disproportionate.</i></p> <p><i>They do not consider it appropriate to remove large areas of agricultural or rural land from the Green Belt.</i></p> <p><i>They consider a dormitory town on an isolated rural area inappropriate.</i></p> <p><i>They support the international, national and local designated areas of biodiversity importance to remain undisturbed.</i></p> <p><i>They are concerned about the effects of surface water flooding.</i></p> <p><i>They are concerned at the effects of lighting from large developments on biodiversity.</i></p>

They are extremely concerned about the current above legal limits air quality and do not believe this will be worsened by traffic travelling through Ripley village to access the Burnt Common slip roads.

They live in the area and know there will be a huge increase in traffic, both HGV and ongoing private, on the local roads.

They know people will use short-cuts to avoid traffic jams.

They recognise must be located close to good infrastructure, railway stations, good bus services, cycle lanes and pavements, existing schools and healthcare facilities, etc.

They consider Guildford town to have many areas of previously developed land, close to good infrastructure.

They consider small local developments will facilitate integration into the current social infrastructure.

They do not believe good, ongoing, public transport facilities will be implemented and retained.

They know that safe cycle lanes and pavements and pavements linking communities are unrealistic.

They are fully aware that current car usage is unlikely to decrease in the near future.

They currently feel the severe effects of insufficient parking.

They consider it unrealistic for new developments not to have adequate parking provided for each dwelling.

They know the current education and healthcare facilities need immediate upgrading.

They wish to retain and expand small retail and commercial facilities and keep a thriving commercial sector.

They are unhappy with the loss of commercial premises, particularly shops, due to permitted development.

They want the rural areas to retain and increase agricultural use.

They do not equate increased HGV traffic with agricultural use.

They want the countryside to remain countryside.

Additional:

Lovelace residents are not NIMBYs, but people who are realistic.

They know the Guildford does not include its numerous surface car parks in its Brownfield Register.

They have not been given a choice on development in Lovelace.

Their feel the 80,000 comments of objection to the GBC Local Plan and proposed sites have been disregarded.

They feel bullied at two large developments being 'dumped' on the area without LA discussion or local consultation.

They consider these to be disproportionate and huge overdevelopment of the area.

They cannot therefore support other, more suitable, sites.

They know the other projects, i.e. infrastructure, RHS, and other nearby developments outside Lovelace will have an on-going effect on the area.

They feel the policies are not strong enough.

They feel this Neighbourhood Plan is a waste of time as, despite the Localism Act allowing neighbourhoods to shape their future, this will be over-ridden in Lovelace.