



**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**JOINT COMMITTEE (WOKING)**

**DATE: 13 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**LEAD OFFICER: DEBBIE PRISMALL, SENIOR COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS OFFICER**

**SUBJECT: ALLEGED PUBLIC FOOTPATH BETWEEN PYRFORD COMMON AND UPSHOT LANE, PYRFORD**

**DIVISION: WOKING SOUTH EAST**

**1 SUMMARY OF ISSUE**

1.1 The County Council has a duty under Section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (WCA1981) to modify the Definitive Map and Statement (DMS) if it discovers evidence which can be reasonably alleged to support a modification. An application has been received for a Map Modification Order (MMO) to add a public footpath on land between Pyrford Common and Upshot Lane, Pyrford to the Surrey County Council DMS as shown on the attached drawing 3/1/79/H66 (**Annex A**)

1.2 It is considered that the evidence is sufficient to allege that a public footpath subsists over the claimed route. As such a legal order to modify the DMS should be made.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1.3 **The Joint Committee (Woking) is asked to agree that:**

- i) Public Footpath rights are recognised over the route shown on drawing no. 3/1/79/H66 as Alleged Public Footpath no. 422, Woking between points A – B – C – D – E and that a MMO under sections 53 and 57 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 be made to modify the Definitive Map and Statement for Surrey.
- ii) In the event of the County Council being directed to make a MMO by the Secretary of State following an appeal by the claimant, the County Council as surveying authority will adopt a neutral stance at any Public Inquiry or Hearing, making all the evidence available to help the inspector determine the case.

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1.4 The County Council has a duty under Section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (WCA1981) to modify the Definitive Map and Statement (DMS) if it discovers evidence which on balance supports a modification.

1.5 In this instance the evidence submitted in support of the application is considered sufficient to establish that public footpath rights are reasonably alleged to subsist over the claimed route, having been acquired by virtue of use by the public on foot under statutory deemed dedication (under s.31(1)) of the Highways Act 1980). Evidence suggests that landowners have not sufficiently challenged users or taken sufficient actions to demonstrate their lack of intention to dedicate

during the relevant period.

## **2. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The County Council received an application, dated 4 July 2016, under the provisions of the WCA 1981 for a Map Modification Order (MMO) to modify the DMS by the addition of a public footpath on land between Pyrford Common and Upshot Lane, Pyrford. The application was supported by 33 user evidence forms (UEFs). One of the claimants (UEF 14) also used the path on bicycle. This use is not considered sufficient to acquire any higher right than footpath. The footpath claimed is shown between points A – B – C – D – E on drawing no. 3/1/79/H66 at **Annex A**.
- 2.2 The path commences at point A at Pyrford Common, just north of Pyrford Common Road and runs through a woodland strip in a northerly direction to point B, it then turns easterly to point C, then northerly to point D and then easterly to point E, its junction with Upshot Lane. The total distance A – B – C – D – E is 535 metres.
- 2.3 The land in question between Pyrford Common Road and point A has not been included in the application because it is registered as Common Land. The public already has a right of access over it under the 1965 Commons Registration Act.

## **3. ANALYSIS**

- 3.1 Section 31 of the Highways Act 1980 provides that the claimant's evidence must show that the route has been enjoyed by the public for a 20-year period, calculated retrospectively from the point at which that use was first challenged. The use must have been without force, secrecy or permission. Public use can also lead to the acquisition of public rights at common law. For a public right of way to become established at common law it is necessary for there to have been a dedication by the landowner and acceptance by the public. A dedication may be inferred if either: a) landowners show acquiescence by knowing about and ignoring use by the public or b) the use is so great that the landowners (whoever they are) must have known and taken no action. There is no minimum time period over which use must have occurred for rights to be established at common law. Alternatively, documentary or historical sources may be sufficient evidence to show that the map should be modified.
- 3.2 The majority of the claimants refer to the erection of notices and fences in 2014/15. Some also refer to trees/ saplings being felled at that time across the path. This has been taken as the first point of challenge and therefore the relevant 20-year period for the purposes of the Act is 1994 – 2014.
- 3.3 Section 31 provides no minimum level of user for the establishment of a public right of way. Instead a route must have been used by a "sufficient number of people who together may sensibly be taken to represent the people as a whole/ the community in general". The House of Lords has ruled that the amount of user must be such as might have been reasonably expected if the route in dispute was an undoubted public highway. The necessary level of use must therefore be considered on a case by case basis. In this instance the people that have completed UEFs and given evidence are residents from the local area and it is appropriate therefore to consider that they represent the people as a whole/the community in general. The background to the legislation relating to Map Modification Orders is attached at **Annex B**.

## PUBLIC USER EVIDENCE FOR THE ROUTE

3.4 Thirty-three user evidence forms have been completed showing use of the route on foot between 1968 and 2014. Seven of the claimants have used the route for the full 20-year period (1994 – 2014). A bar chart showing a summary of the years of use is attached at **Annex C**.

3.5 Frequency of use and reason for use

Use by walkers varies from twice a year to every day. By using the actual numbers stated in the UEFs it is possible to quantify the number of times the path has been walked. The total use in a year adds up to 3213 with an average of 97 times a year. Sixteen users walk the path fifty or more times a year. The reasons for using the alleged footpath have been stated as: dog walking, committee meetings at the village hall, exercise, studying wildlife, shopping, recreational walk, walking children to playgroup & primary school, leisure and social.

3.6 Notices and fences

The users who mention seeing fences state that these have only been there since 2014/15. UEF 5 states there were no notices “with the exception of notices which appeared when the path was blocked”. UEF 6 states “there is now a barbed wire fence across the start of the pathway – erected I think in 2015... there were notices put up at the beginning of the pathway being blocked”. UEF 9 who claims to have used the path between 2009 -14 says there were not any notices when they were using the path. UEF 26 states that a fence was erected in 2014 near Pyrford Common Road (point A) and that trees and bushes were placed at various points in the same year. Ten users refer to trees being cut down across the path in 2014/15, which had the effect of obstructing it.

3.7 Width of alleged path

The width described in the UEFs ranges between 1 – 3 metres. The majority of users have described a 1 – 2 metre width. Alleged paths will have differing widths depending on whether they are enclosed by boundaries, run across open land or along field edges. This path is an unenclosed earth route through woodland. In this instance, from the widths stated it is considered appropriate to record a width of 1.5 metres.

### User Interviews

3.8 Some of the users, generally those that had used the paths for the greatest number of years, were contacted and offered the opportunity to take part in an interview to learn more about their knowledge and use of the claimed paths. Ten of those users that responded and have been interviewed providing more detailed evidence:

3.9 (UEF 2): “I saw the entrance to the path one day whilst exploring Pyrford Common and just decided to go down it to see where it went. It led to the village hall.....In the early days, the alleged footpath was reasonably accessible with no fences across it. I wouldn't have gone down it if there had been any “Private” signs up. There were concrete posts to show where the field/wood boundary was. I always thought it was a public footpath .....A lot of houses had gates onto the land from their back gardens. Why would they have had gates onto private land if they weren't allowed to use them?...Historically I wonder whether it would have been part of a linking road. I am almost certain it would have been used as a walkway to the school.”

- 3.10 (UEF 15): "I was born in Pyrford....a good friend lived in Manor Close and we would regularly play in the woods and use the alleged footpath. I don't ever remember having to climb over any fences and the woodland felt to me like an extension of the Common. It never felt as if I shouldn't be there...I have walked the alleged footpath to the Arbor onto the road hundreds of times. It was genuinely a path that people used regularly. On one section someone put silver birch trunks either side of the path to delineate it. It was always a very distinctive path which was even easy to navigate in the dark....I estimate about 6 years ago Burhill Estates wrote to all the residents backing on the woodland saying they were going to put a fence up along the boundary (despite not being able to confirm what type). We currently have a chain link fence on the boundary. About a year later they put up wooden posts with strands of barbed wire blocking off our access. At the same time they fenced off every point where there was evidence of access and put up signs. The only signs I have ever seen up there have been in recent times."
- 3.11 (UEFs 16 & 17): "We used the alleged footpath as part of a local circular walk once or twice a week. We found out about the footpath by talking to other dog walkers. We would walk down Lovelace Drive and then onto the path on the common through to the wood. The path always stayed on the same route. We used to see other people using the footpath and lots of people had access gates onto it from their properties. It was a nice walk where we would see birds, foxes, deer etc. It was an alternative to walking down Upshot Lane, which is too dangerous to walk down...There was fencing alongside Upshot Lane but there was a clear opening next to the Arbor, which we went through to the road/bus stop....We never saw any signs or fences across the path until the current signs and fences were erected in 2014. At that time a big sign saying 'Burhill Keep Out' was put up...We wouldn't have damaged anything to be able to walk the footpath. People treated the land with respect and there was never any rubbish. Nobody who walks there would do any damage as they walk out of pleasure."
- 3.12 (UEF 20): "It was a well-trodden, clear footpath, which was always pleasant to walk along. When I first started using it there were no fences or signs on it and if there had been I wouldn't have used it. I never really knew whether it was a recognised path; everyone just knew about it. I think it was one of my neighbours who first told me about it. I would cross over the road (*Pyrford Common Road*) from my house onto the Common and then follow the footpath. There are not many properties along this road and there are a limited number of footpaths in the immediate vicinity. I can't walk up Upshot Lane as it is too narrow and dangerous, so for me and my neighbours the shortest and most pleasant way to get to the village was to use the footpath....I remember walking through a gap by the Centre, by the bus stop, onto Upshot Lane."
- 3.13 (UEF 8): "I found out about the alleged footpath by following someone onto the path through Nicholas Gardens, onto the Common and then onto the alleged footpath one day. I used the path approximately 3 -4 times a year. It was a lovely walk especially in the summer. I always met lots of people mainly dog walking in the woods....There were never any fences across or notices up and I have never been challenged when using the path. The landowners started putting fences across the path a couple of years ago. They also cut trees down across the path. There is no way the signs have been up for 15 years. I have noticed the fences have been cut now. In the past I would never have walked over any broken down fencing....The alleged footpath was used as a cut through for a lot of people to the Arbor youth club. Lots of children used it from the estate."

- 3.14 (UEFs 3 & 4) have used the alleged footpath since March 1999 “When going past one day we could see it was a well-used path and followed it all the way through. We have used it for dog walking, just for going for a walk and for walking with the children when they were younger. We would walk either direction as a circular route; along Nicholas Way, through the alley ways to the Common and along the path to Teggs Lane and back or vice-versa. It was easily feasible and a good route for the children as it was mainly off-road. We walked through the trees and not around the field. The trees were well established and we always followed the same route through...Burhill Estates didn't maintain the fences until the 2027 – 2040 Development Plan was coming up for discussion...Burhill then cut some trees down across the path and erected fences and signs in about 2014/15. The previous tenant had, for most years, grown crops but it was virtually derelict when the current tenant, Conisbee's took over the land on a long lease. They have cleared the land and maintained it properly.”
- 3.15 (UEFs 11 & 12) have stated “The path was always well used and one we could easily get down...Access to the path was from the common. There was an old barbed wire fence to the side but no notices. We remember clearly that we didn't have to clamber over any wire fencing and could easily traverse the path. Any existing fencing did not touch the corner of John Carolin's property, which is the corner property off Lovelace Drive....If there had been any notices we wouldn't have used the path and just used other footpaths instead. There were notices on the common on the other side of the road, which we adhered to. There was never a feeling that we were trespassing in the wood because of the way it was used by everyone. In 2014/15 trees were cut down across the path and then notices and fences erected and we stopped using the path.”

#### LANDOWNERS' EVIDENCE

- 3.23 The land affected by the application is registered as owned by Burhill Developments Limited and Randalls Field Limited of Burhill, Hersham, Walton on Thames KT12 4BX and Upshot Lane Jersey Limited of 39 – 41 Broad Street, St Helier, Jersey JE4 8PU under one title.
- 3.24 Mike Fletcher, Head of Property for the BGL Group, on behalf of the landowners, has produced a list of works carried out on the land. This lists removing trees and erecting/replacing fencing during the period 7.5.14 – 22.8.16. He has also forwarded an email from Tony Perez of Burhill Estates who wrote in an email dated 8 November 2017 “Regarding repair works to the boundary fence to Teggs Lane. I remember within my first year of starting with Burhill, doing repairs and boundary checks with my predecessor Wally Keet. I started in November of 2009, mostly we would make repairs to the fence from doing boundary checks but I am sure on a couple of occasions the Arbour youth club reported damage to the boundary where members of the public cut the wire to the fence of which we made the repairs to stop people accessing the fields.”
- 3.25 Mr Fletcher has completed a Landowner/Occupier Evidence Form on behalf of the company and it states that “there is no entrance or exit. Fences have been maintained. Private land signs installed. Repairs made regularly. Use as a footpath on the route claimed is not physically feasible.....I have stopped people on our land who were walking on it, although they were not following this route. The route suggested is not feasible....There is a fence across the claimed entry marked 'A' on the plan attached. There is a fence and thick hedging and no means of entry or exit at the point 'B' on the plan attached. The intervening woodland contains no pathway.” Mr Fletcher maintains in the form that fences

## ITEM 10

have been in situ for several decades since purchase of the land by Burhill Estate Company Limited in the 1920's. He also says that 'Private Woods – Keep Out' signs were erected over 15 years ago at point A and maintained, although dates unknown, and that there is an old sign in the undergrowth on site. He states "No one uses this path due to there being no entrance or exit. NB fences do get cut by local vandals from time to time."

### ADJOINING LANDOWNER

3.26 At point A on the plan the alleged footpath meets Pyrford Common, which is owned and managed by the Horsell Common Preservation Society (HCPS). Mr P Rimmer the Estate Manager, has confirmed that they purchased it on 31 August 2006 with the specific intention of retaining it as a Public Open Space for informal recreation and enjoyment by local residents. In January 2009, HCPS submitted a successful application to the County Council's Commons Registration Officer to register the land as a Village Green in a voluntary declaration under the S.15(8) The Commons Act 2006. HCPS supports the proposed MMO and welcomes any measures that would make the common more accessible to local residents. They have no knowledge of the landowner attempting to prevent access along the proposed route and Mr Rimmer says that he personally walked the route of the claim, unchallenged, on many occasions since 2006.

3.27 Mr David Robbins was a Trustee of HCPS when the Common was purchased and acted as solicitor for the transaction. He states "The Common was owned by the Henry Smith Charity and the Poor Allotment Charity under Charity Commission Schemes of 4<sup>th</sup> May 1909 and 17<sup>th</sup> November 1983. The title was held by the official Custodian for Charities by virtue of those Schemes. We completed the purchase on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2006...When dealing with the transaction, I certainly walked the route of the alleged footpath on a couple of occasions. I do not remember any obstructions to the route but I have no knowledge of the use of that path by other members of the public. Certainly I used it without any consent without force and without hindrance but only twice". Mr Robbins has confirmed that he doesn't "remember the details but I came out at the Arbor without difficulty."

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

3.28 Mr Vincent Withers sent an email dated 10 July 2019 saying "I am aware that Pyrford Woods Estate may have had a footpath a very very long time ago. I looked yesterday to see the current status of E – D. There still remains no access and so cannot use E to A. This has been the case for as long as I was aware of its presence. The paths may have existed a very long time before. I looked at A. You have to go through trees to find A. There is a fence but a walkers could try to go through? There was a time, say 20 years ago, that some people from Teggs Lane close to were using the Arbor Centre private field following the Lovelace Drive back gardens (some of which may have come via back gardens) and then to B and then to A. This was because the Arbor Centre field may have had a hole in fences on the Teggs Lane side. This was again a long time ago. I believe there are now no gaps off Teggs Lane now to Arbor Centre private field."

## DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

3.29 *Definitive Map*: No public rights appear on the Definitive Map or in the Definitive Statement. It does not appear on any earlier versions of the Definitive Map dating back to 1952 nor has it ever been put forward for inclusion on any of these maps.

3.30 The path is not indicated on any ordnance survey maps nor is apparent on any aerial photos. The latter may be due to the amount of tree cover on the land over which the route passes.

**4. OPTIONS:**

4.1 The Committee may agree or disagree with the officer's recommendation that footpath rights have been acquired. Alternatively, they may decide that the evidence submitted shows that the routes should be of different status to that recommended or along different lines. Decisions can only be made on the basis of the evidence available. The recommendation is based upon the evidence discovered and interpreted under the current legislation. Matters such as convenience, amenity, security or safety are irrelevant (see **Annex B**)

4.2 Where the County Council decides not to make an order, the decision can be appealed to the Secretary of State. If such an appeal resulted in a Public Inquiry or Hearing the County Council would normally take a neutral stance.

**5. CONSULTATIONS:**

5.1 Woking Borough Council, the Open Spaces Society, Cycling UK, the British Horse Society, British Driving Society, Liz Bowes County Councillor, Byfleet, West Byfleet & Pyrford Residents' Association and the Ramblers.

5.2 Woking Borough Councillor, Ashley Bowes responded saying he had no evidence of the use of the way and supported the addition to the rights of way network. No other responses to the claim have been received. SCC Legal Services have been consulted and commented on this report.

**6. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 The cost of making an order is not a relevant factor in this decision. The County Council is under a duty to make a MMO to add a route to the DMS where evidence is discovered which, taken as a whole, is sufficient to reasonably allege the existence of a right of way.

6.2 The cost of advertising a Map Modification Order would be approximately £1200, which would be met from the County Council's Countryside Access budget. If objections are received and a Public Inquiry held, additional costs of around £4000 will also be met from the same budget. Most costs are fixed by our duties under Schedule 15 of the WCA 1981.

**7. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 There are no equalities and diversity implications. In any event these are irrelevant factors under the current legislation.

**8. LOCALISM**

8.1 This issue is not relevant and cannot be considered under the current legislation.

**9. OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	None of these are relevant considerations under the current legislation
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	
Public Health	

**10. HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1988**

10.1 Local Authorities are required to act to uphold European Convention rights which are now enforceable in British courts as a result of the Human Rights Act 1988. Primary legislation, of which the WCA 1981 is an example, may require the County Council to act in a different way. While the Council must interpret primary legislation in a way that is compatible with Convention rights that duty does not apply if the County Council could not have acted differently. In this instance it is first necessary to consider whether the action recommended to members touches on a Convention right. The making of this order may affect the rights of the landowner/ occupier under Article 8 of the Convention, the right to a peaceful enjoyment of one’s possessions. The Act makes it clear that such rights may only be interfered with in a way that is in accordance with the law. Here the action by the County Council as surveying authority is prescribed by law as described in Annex C of this report. As such the recommendation to Members is not considered to be in breach of the Act.

**11. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 11.1 Any decision must be made on the legal basis set out in **Annex B** to this report. The only relevant consideration is whether the evidence is sufficient to raise a presumption that a public right of way exists. Other issues such as security, privacy, safety or convenience are irrelevant.
- 11.2 Under Section 53 of the WCA 1981 the “authority shall make such modifications to the Definitive Map and Statement as appear to them to be requisite in consequence of the discovery of evidence which (when considered with all other relevant evidence available to them) shows that a right of way not shown on the DMS subsists or is reasonably alleged to subsist over land in the area to which the map relates”.

**STATUTORY TEST**

- 11.3 Section 31 of the Highways Act 1980 states that “Where a way over any land other than a way of such character that use of it by the public could not give rise at common law to any presumption of dedication has actually been enjoyed by the public as of right and without interruption for a full period of 20 years, the way is deemed to have been dedicated as a highway unless there is sufficient evidence that there was no intention during that period to dedicate it. The period of 20 years referred to in sub-section (1) above is to be calculated retrospectively from the date when the right of the public to use the way is brought into question whether by a notice...or otherwise”.
- 11.4 Calling into question: It is necessary to establish under Section 31 when the public’s use was first brought into question and whether sufficient time has passed (20 years) since any previous challenge. In this instance, the majority

of the users refer to the cutting down of trees and the reception of fences and notices in 2014/15 as the first time they encountered any challenge to their use of the path. The relevant 20-year period has therefore been calculated as 1994 – 2014.

- 11.5 Public Use: Section 31 provides no minimum level of user for the establishment of a public right of way. Instead a route must have been used by a sufficient “number of people who together may sensibly be taken to represent the people as a whole/the community in general”. It is not necessary for all, or indeed any, of the claimants to have used the route for the whole 20-year period but the cumulative effect must be considered. All of the claimants live in the Pyrford area and it is appropriate therefore to consider that they represent the people as a whole/ the community in general.
- 11.6 Use ‘As of Right’: Under the legislation use of the way must have been ‘as of right’, which means without force, secrecy or permission. It is not necessary for the user to have a belief that their use is ‘as of right’. The landowner claims that fences have been maintained and private land signs installed with repairs made regularly. If this was the case at either end of the claimed footpath it could indicate that there has been an element of force used in order to use the claimed paths. However, this contrasts with all of the users stating there were never any fences or notices on the path. Users indicated that they were doing so openly. Furthermore, neither the landowner nor any user have stated that anybody was individually granted specific permission to use the claimed path. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that use of the path was with force, secrecy or permission.
- 11.7 Lack of intention to dedicate: A landowner wanting to rebut a claim for a public right of way through long use must be able to demonstrate that they have done something that has brought their lack of intention to dedicate home to the users. It appears that whatever action was taken on the land with the erection of fences and notices was outside of the relevant 20-year period or on parts of the land not subject to the claim. On the evidence in the UEFs and from interviewing a number of users, there does not appear to have been any action that would have made it clear to the public that the landowner was taking steps to prevent public access.
- 11.8 In answer to question 8(c) on the UEF “Did you ever meet the “landowner, his employees or family while you were using the way?” all of the users (apart from 2) have answered “No” or “N/A”. (UEF 6) mentions that he “saw somebody cutting down the trees to block the pathway – he did not speak to me as I walked past”. (UEF 15) has answered “Yes, they were clearing some trees, didn’t question why I was there”. From this it appears that no verbal challenge has ever been made to users of the path. None of the users mention being restricted in any way. Therefore, it is concluded that the landowners have not demonstrated a sufficient lack of intention to dedicate to negate the use made by the public of the claimed paths over the relevant 20-year period.
- 11.9 Sufficiency of use: statutory deemed dedication. It is considered that there is sufficient evidence of the volume and frequency of use during the relevant 20 year period to reasonably allege that there has been a deemed dedication of the alleged footpaths.
- 11.10 Common law: An inference that a way has been dedicated for public use may also be drawn at common law where the actions (or lack of) by the landowner indicate they intended a way to be dedicated as a highway and where the

## ITEM 10

public have accepted it. Dedication may be express or implied from evidence of use by the public and of acquiescence to that use by the landowner. The period of use required to give rise to dedication at common law has never been defined and will depend upon its own facts.

- 11.11 Notwithstanding the view that rights have been acquired under section 31 of the Highways Act 1980, due to the period and frequency of use officers would also submit that the facts imply that the landowner has dedicated the route as a public footpath under common law.

### **12. CONCLUSION**

- 12.1 In light of the above, it is the Officer's view that public footpath rights have been acquired over the route under section 31 of the Highways Act 1980. Notwithstanding this it is also argued that rights have also been acquired at common law.
- 12.2 This being the case the Officer would submit that it can be reasonably alleged that rights have been acquired and that the route should be recorded on the Definitive Map and Statement for Surrey as a public footpath.

### **13. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

- 13.1 If Committee decide that an order should be made and objections are maintained to that order, it will be submitted to the Secretary of State for confirmation.
- 13.2 If Committee decides that no order be made, the applicant will have the opportunity to appeal to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs against this decision.
- 13.3 If the Committee resolution is different to the officer's recommendation the reasons and evidence for the decision should be recorded. This will explain the Council's actions should the matter proceed to Public Inquiry or appeal.
- 13.4 All interested parties will be informed about the decision.

#### **Lead & Contact Officer:**

Debbie Prismall, Senior Countryside Access Officer, Tel. 020 8541 9343

#### **Consulted:**

See Section 5

#### **Annexes:**

- A Drawing No. 3/1/79/H66
- B DMMO Background information
- C UEF bar chart

#### **Sources/background papers:**

File 'CP 577 Woking' including all relevant correspondence and documents can be viewed by appointment at SCC Countryside Access Mellow Office



This page is intentionally left blank