

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
297	Herbert	Abela	GB12	Concerned about release of GB at Pyrford for 423 homes. Highlights the function of the GB including the management of sprawl and coalescence of settlements. Suggests that the GB will be lost in the future through the gradual removal of parts of the GB.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 15.0 and 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
297	Herbert	Abela	GB13	Concerned about release of GB at Pyrford for 423 homes. Highlights the function of the GB including the management of sprawl and coalescence of settlements. Suggests that the GB will be lost in the future through the gradual removal of parts of the GB.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 15.0 and 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
297	Herbert	Abela	GB12	The character of Pyrford will be eroded if plans go ahead	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 7.0 In addition, the Council acknowledges the individual character of Pyrford. This is noted in several Council documents including the Heritage of Woking (2000) and the Woking Character Study (2010).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
297	Herbert	Abela	GB13	The character of Pyrford will be eroded if plans go ahead	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 7.0 In addition, the Council acknowledges the individual character of Pyrford. This is noted in several Council documents including the Heritage of Woking (2000) and the Woking Character Study (2010).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
297	Herbert	Abela	GB12	Not enough has been done to seek alternative solutions	Seek alternative solutions to meet housing need	This is an incorrect statement. Central Government and the Council itself affords great importance to the Green Belt, however in order to meet a significant housing need the Council is required to identify some land within the Green Belt. The Council did not arrive at this approach without reason. It undertook a thorough assessment of the previously developed land (through the SHLAA) which indicated that there would be a shortfall of PDL to deliver all the identified housing need during the plan period. Therefore it had to concede to identifying alternative land within the Green Belt. The Inspector agreed that the Council should undertake a Green Belt Boundary Review to identify areas which may be appropriate for release from the Green Belt for Housing purposes This is explained more fully in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, Section 11.0, Section 9.0, and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
297	Herbert	Abela	GB13	Not enough has been done to seek alternative solutions	Seek alternative solutions to meet housing need	This is an incorrect statement. Central Government and the Council itself affords great importance to the Green Belt, however in order to meet a significant housing need the Council is required to identify some land within the Green Belt. The Council did not arrive at this approach without reason. It undertook a thorough assessment of the previously developed land (through the SHLAA) which indicated that there would be a shortfall of PDL to deliver all the identified housing need during the plan period. Therefore it had to concede to identifying alternative land within the Green Belt. The Inspector agreed that the Council should undertake a Green Belt Boundary Review to identify areas which may be appropriate for release from the Green Belt for Housing purposes This is explained more fully in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, Section 11.0, Section 9.0, and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
297	Herbert	Abela	GB13	The GBBR didn't recommend GB13 so questions why it is still being considered	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
297	Herbert	Abela	GB12	The supporting infrastructure including schools and facilities for the elderly are at capacity, the proposals will increase the pressure on these.	None stated.	This representation regarding infrastructure, particularly schools has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8 The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0 The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate elderly housing provision in the borough. However, it should be noted that downsizing options for the elderly to free up family homes will not be a panacea to meet housing need, it will not diminish amount of land needed to meet the overall housing need within the borough. The housing need has been calculated taking into account the current housing stock that is currently occupied.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						There are also sufficient and robust policies to ensure that proposals seek to address this particular need, including Core Strategy policy CS11 which seeks for a mix of dwelling types and sizes to address local needs as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) including housing for the elderly and CS13 which supports the development of specialist accommodation for older people and seeks the protection of existing.	
297	Herbert	Abela	GB13	The supporting infrastructure including schools and facilities for the elderly are at capacity, the proposals will increase the pressure on these.	None stated.	<p>This representation regarding infrastructure, particularly schools has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate elderly housing provision in the borough. However, it should be noted that downsizing options for the elderly to free up family homes will not be a panacea to meet housing need, it will not diminish amount of land needed to meet the overall housing need within the borough. The housing need has been calculated taking into account the current housing stock that is currently occupied.</p> <p>There are also sufficient and robust policies to ensure that proposals seek to address this particular need, including Core Strategy policy CS11 which seeks for a mix of dwelling types and sizes to address local needs as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) including housing for the elderly and CS13 which supports the development of specialist accommodation for older people and seeks the protection of existing.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
297	Herbert	Abela	GB12	The size of the development will change Pyrford for the worse and is unacceptable.	None stated.	<p>The Council acknowledges the individual character of Pyrford. This is noted in several Council documents including the Heritage of Woking (2000) and the Woking Character Study (2010). It is acknowledged that there will be an increase in population however the Council is satisfied that the character of the area will not be undermined.</p> <p>Also, please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
297	Herbert	Abela	GB13	The size of the development will change Pyrford for the worse and is unacceptable.	None stated.	<p>The Council acknowledges the individual character of Pyrford. This is noted in several Council documents including the Heritage of Woking (2000) and the Woking Character Study (2010). It is acknowledged that there will be an increase in population however the Council is satisfied that the character of the area will not be undermined.</p> <p>Also, please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
297	Herbert	Abela	GB12	Pyrford roads already congested and the proposals will exacerbate this, particularly along Upshot land and the B367. Development proposals at Wisley Airfield will also have an impact. Remedial action would require the widening of roads, new pavements and removal of trees/bushes. Which will in turn lead to congestion, pollution and safety hazard.	None stated.	<p>Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5</p> <p>The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway.</p> <p>In addition, a Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
297	Herbert	Abela	GB13	Pyrford roads already congested and the proposals will exacerbate this, particularly along Upshot land and the B367. Development proposals at Wisley Airfield will also have an impact. Remedial action would require the widening of roads, new pavements and removal of trees/bushes. Which will in turn lead to congestion, pollution and safety hazard.	None stated.	<p>Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5</p> <p>The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway.</p> <p>In addition, a Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
546	Anne	Adam	GB12	Fails to see how the proposed development meets the requirements for the Green Belt as set out in national planning policy.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
546	Anne	Adam	GB13	Fails to see how the proposed development meets the requirements for the Green Belt as set out in national planning policy.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
546	Anne	Adam	GB12	Highly concerned about the impact of development on road traffic congestion in the area. The Council's own transport assessment recognises that at peak times congestion on Old Woking Road is an issue. It is irresponsible of the Council to proposed development while being fully aware of the immense traffic problems that it will cause.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
546	Anne	Adam	GB13	Highly concerned about the impact of development on road traffic congestion in the area. The Council's own transport	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				assessment recognises that at peak times congestion on Old Woking Road is an issue. It is irresponsible of the Council to proposed development while being fully aware of the immense traffic problems that it will cause.			of this representation
546	Anne	Adam	GB12	The Council has not shown 'exceptional circumstances' necessary to release these sites from the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0, in particular paragraph 1.9.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
546	Anne	Adam	GB13	The Council has not shown 'exceptional circumstances' necessary to release these sites from the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0, in particular paragraph 1.9.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
546	Anne	Adam	GB12	Objects to the proposal. The sites fall into Parcel 9 of the Green Belt review and were not recommended for release from the Green Belt.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review recommended that site GB12 is suitable for development and the Council has chosen to follow this recommendation. Site GB13 was contained within Parcel 9 of the Green Belt boundary review and was not considered to be suitable based on landscape grounds. However it should be noted that the Site Allocations DPD is based on a range of evidence documents and not entirely on the Green Belt boundary review. These other documents include the Landscape Character Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. The full list can be found in Appendix 1 of the DPD. Overall the Council is satisfied that these two sites are suitable for development post 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
546	Anne	Adam	GB13	Objects to the proposal. The sites fall into Parcel 9 of the Green Belt review and were not recommended for release from the Green Belt.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review recommended that site GB12 is suitable for development and the Council has chosen to follow this recommendation. Site GB13 was contained within Parcel 9 of the Green Belt boundary review and was not considered to be suitable based on landscape grounds. However it should be noted that the Site Allocations DPD is based on a range of evidence documents and not entirely on the Green Belt boundary review. These other documents include the Landscape Character Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. The full list can be found in Appendix 1 of the DPD. Overall the Council is satisfied that these two sites are suitable for development post 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
546	Anne	Adam	GB12	It is of utmost importance to take environmental responsibilities seriously and protect the ambiance of the area for future generations to enjoy.	Reconsider the plan.	The environmental impact of the proposed allocation has been carefully considered by the Council. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process has been used to appraise sites for development, taking into account a wide range of environmental indicators. The appraisal alongside the other documents within the Council's evidence base indicate that the site is suitable for development whilst making sure that the Green Belt is not undermined in its overall purpose and integrity. The representation regarding the character of the area has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 as well as 7.0 regarding landscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
546	Anne	Adam	GB13	It is of utmost importance to take environmental responsibilities seriously and protect the ambiance of the area for future generations to enjoy.	Reconsider the plan.	The environmental impact of the proposed allocation has been carefully considered by the Council. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process has been used to appraise sites for development, taking into account a wide range of environmental indicators. The appraisal alongside the other documents within the Council's evidence base indicate that the site is suitable for development whilst making sure that the Green Belt is not undermined in its overall purpose and integrity. The representation regarding the character of the area has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 as well as 7.0 regarding landscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
546	Anne	Adam	GB12	Local infrastructure (schools, nurseries and health care) is already overstretched, and there is not capacity to cater to increased demand from development, resulting in intolerable strain on services and decline in standards of health care.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in terms of school places in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8. In terms of health services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
546	Anne	Adam	GB13	Local infrastructure (schools, nurseries and health care) is already overstretched, and there is not capacity to cater to increased demand from development, resulting in intolerable strain on services and decline in standards of health care.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in terms of school places in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8. In terms of health services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB8	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
348	Wendy	Adams	GB9	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB10	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB11	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB7	Inappropriate Development in Green Belt - The proposal is, by definition, inappropriate development in the Green Belt contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS6 (Green Belt) and Section 9 (Protecting Green Belt Land) of the National Planning Policy Framework, which set out limited circumstances where development is appropriate within the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 4.0, particularly paragraph 4.2 and 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB7	Other potential sites - the GBR included as options to meet future need for pitches WOK001 land south of Murrays Lane, West Byfleet (4 pitches) and WOK006 land off New Lane, Sutton Green (3 pitches). There are also sites adjacent to the urban area outside of the Green Belt with capacity to deliver 15 pitches and a mixed and balanced community, land west of West Hall, West Byfleet WGB004a (SHLAABW019b) and land south of High Road, Byfleet (WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These options have been omitted from the DPD with no explanation other than "it is easier to expand existing sites in the Green Belt", as stated publicly by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on Monday 6 July 2015.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB7	Flood risk - the Council will not allocate sites or grant planning permission for Traveller pitches in the functional floodplain or Flood Zone 3a (DPD). The TAA states this site and its immediate surrounding could be explored for potential for expansion for additional pitches. 10% at the rear of the site is Flood Zone 3, a further 15% is Flood Zone 2. This will push the site closer to the road frontage, with unacceptable adverse impacts on visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB7	Accessibility - Core Strategy and SHLAA state that Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not currently close to schools and it does not have easy access to local facilities. The SHLAA states Ten Acre Farm has average accessibility to key local services (schools, GP surgeries and to Woking Town Centre). Accessibility to the nearest village centre by bike and foot is good/average." In reality Mayford has no supporting infrastructure (shops, doctors, dentists, schools, employment opportunities) and poor public transport system (infrequent limited bus services, residents are isolated without a vehicle). For isolated sites, a communal building is also recommended (Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites). If located at the front of the site as recommended this WILL NOT positively enhance the environment or increase its openness, respect the street scene or character of the area.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>With respect to concerns about the character of the area, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0. Other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
348	Wendy	Adams	GB7	Infrastructure, services and cost - allocated sites must be deliverable (including affordable to intended occupiers) so needs are met. Policy CS14 states "the site should have adequate infrastructure and on-site utilities to service the number of pitches proposed". There is little existing infrastructure at Ten Acre Farm, no surface water or storm water drainage, no main sewer, driveway that does not meet emergency vehicle requirements, no water hydrant, no site lighting, no mains gas, and minimal connection to water and electricity services. It is adjacent to the main railway line, requiring significant acoustic barriers and would have to be raised clear of flood risk at great cost.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB7	Special Circumstances - In the absence of Very Special Circumstances justifying an exception, there is a presumption against such development. Unmet demand does not constitute 'very special circumstances' and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute very special circumstance justifying inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The previous Government (Brandon Lewis MP Statements) made this clear. The Secretary of State has re-emphasised this to local planning authorities and planning inspectors as a material consideration in their planning decisions. Even if the Council is unable to show a five year supply of Traveller sites, this would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9 and Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB7	Additional Health and Safety considerations - Traveller Sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy and be sympathetic to the local environment. When selecting locations for permanent sites, consideration is to be given to the relatively high density of children likely to be on the site. When considering sites adjacent to main roads and railway lines, careful regard must be given to the health and safety of children and others who will live on the site. There is greater noise transference through the walls of trailers and caravans than in conventional housing and need for design measures (for instance noise barriers) to abate impact on quality of life and health. Public use of Smarts Heath Common means no visual privacy on the site. The proximity of the main railway line means is unlikely acoustic barriers would alleviate the noise of trains. The road that borders the site is the B380, the local approved 'lorry' route. There is no footpath on one side so children would have to cross the road to reach one.	None stated.	The Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to ensure that sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment and to the amenity of residents. The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution including noise. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by relevant technical studies. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB7	Impact on Visual Amenity, Character and Local Environment - Core Strategy Policy CS14 states "The site should not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment". Policy H, paragraph 24b, of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPFTS) requires sites to 'positively enhance the environment and increase its openness'. Policy CS21 states that the new development 'should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area in which they are situated'. Policy CS24 requires any development proposal should conserve and where possible enhance existing character. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road, including two 16th Century Grade II listed buildings close to Ten Acre Farm, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common onto open countryside. This private Traveller site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987 (PLAN/1987/0282). It was never envisaged that this would be expanded outside the occupier's	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. With respect to reference to heritage assets, see Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. With respect to the representation regarding the identification of the site to meet future Traveller needs. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				immediate family, who have lived on site and in Smarts Heath Road for many years. Additional pitches will comply with the design principles set out by Government practice guidance, currently 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites'. Up to twelve pitches each needing an amenity building, hard standing for a large trailer and touring caravan and two vehicles WILL have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment and WILL NOT positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural street scene." This will have an adverse impact on the openness, character and appearance of the area, dominating the settled community and reducing the amenity value, contrary to Policies CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.			
348	Wendy	Adams	GB7	4.Environmentally sensitive Sites - proposals that will adversely impact environmentally sensitive sites and cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. Ten Acre Farm has four boundaries to Smarts Heath Common, the Hoe Stream (with railway line behind), B380 road, 1 Smarts Heath Road and adjacent nursery land. Smarts Heath Common is a Special Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSI) designated by Bird Life International as an "Important Bird Area". The Hoe Stream is a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI), a valuable link and habitat corridor for other SNCI sites in the Hoe Valley. Extending this site WOULD adversely impact these sensitive sites.	None stated.	The Council agrees, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB7	Business Use - Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential, those living there are entitled to a peaceful and enjoyable environment. Government guidance on site management proposes that working from residential pitches should be discouraged and that residents should not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site (Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites, 2008). Yet the DPD states "Potential for inclusion of an element of business use, where this would support residents living and working on site." Core Strategy (policies CS21 and CS24) and PPFTS require sites to 'positively enhance the environment and increase its openness', respect and make positively contribute to the street scene and character of the area, conserve and enhance existing character. Business use would inflict a small-scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic, nuisance which is out of keeping with the amenity and character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB8	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB9	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB10	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB11	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB7	IMPACT - Site Concentration. ALL of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough - Ten Acre Farm, Mayford; Hatchington, Burdenshott Road (one mile from Ten Acre Farm); and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye (three miles from Ten Acre Farm). Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller Community, further expansion is not justified.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB7	Successive planning inspectors have refused residential applications on this site as it would reduce the openness of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB9	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB10	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB11	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.			
348	Wendy	Adams	GB8	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB9	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB10	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB11	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.		<p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	
348	Wendy	Adams	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB8	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper deals with instances where site based Flood Risk Assessment is required. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the Site Allocations DPD. GB8 is in Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged. GB8 also has the provision of SU as a key requirement, which will help address the concerns made by the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB9	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper deals with instances where site based Flood Risk Assessment is required. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the Site Allocations DPD. GB8 is in Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged. GB8 also has the provision of SU as a key requirement, which will help address the concerns made by the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB10	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB11	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB8	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
348	Wendy	Adams	GB9	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB10	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB11	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB8	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB9	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB10	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB11	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB7	No independently verified evidence produced to demonstrate the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller site development or why sites identified in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres) are the ONLY sites put forward.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB7	SITE IS NOT SUITABLE - SHLAA noted a number of physical and environmental problems with this site: 1. Contaminated Land - in the GBR sites (such as Ten Acre Farm) were REJECTED as a Traveller site due to concerns over land contamination. Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites says sites must not be located on contaminated land. Land must be decontaminated by approved contractors to ensure housing development could take place. This can be prohibitively expensive and should be considered only where financially viable from the outset. Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable for expansion for this reason.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated in the rep.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB7	SITE SELECTION - A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with sites in the urban area being considered before those in the Green Belt. The GBR (Green Belt Review) recommend a priority order. The Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states "the site and its immediate surrounding could be explored for its potential for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches". The DPD uses the term from the GBR of 'intensification' of Ten Acre Farm which is incorrect. The TAA term of 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD proposal. It was never envisaged that this Traveller site would be expanded outside the occupier's immediate family. The Council has chosen to set aside the GBR recommendations, selecting the lowest priority rating when proposing to expand	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches.			
348	Wendy	Adams	GB8	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB9	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB10	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB10	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB11	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						19.0 and Section 23.0	
348	Wendy	Adams	GB8	Raises the issue that residential development on Egley Road will hinder the Green Belt Review's finding that a school would maintain openness of the area	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB9	Raises the issue that residential development on Egley Road will hinder the Green Belt Review's finding that a school would maintain openness of the area	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB10	Raises the issue that residential development on Egley Road will hinder the Green Belt Review's finding that a school would maintain openness of the area	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB11	Raises the issue that residential development on Egley Road will hinder the Green Belt Review's finding that a school would maintain openness of the area	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB8	There is a lack of supporting local infrastructure in terms of shops, health facilities and schools in Mayford. Residents in any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 should not be removed from the Green Belt. Development here would fundamentally and irrevocably change Mayford and its community, creating new traffic flows that would effectively put an end to the horse riding, cycling and jogging currently enjoyed by residents from the whole borough of Woking, as well as people in Mayford itself.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB9	There is a lack of supporting local infrastructure in terms of shops, health facilities and schools in Mayford. Residents in any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 should not be removed from the Green Belt. Development here would fundamentally and	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					irrevocably change Mayford and its community, creating new traffic flows that would effectively put an end to the horse riding, cycling and jogging currently enjoyed by residents from the whole borough of Woking, as well as people in Mayford itself.	of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0	
348	Wendy	Adams	GB10	There is a lack of supporting local infrastructure in terms of shops, health facilities and schools in Mayford. Residents in any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 should not be removed from the Green Belt. Development here would fundamentally and irrevocably change Mayford and its community, creating new traffic flows that would effectively put an end to the horse riding, cycling and jogging currently enjoyed by residents from the whole borough of Woking, as well as people in Mayford itself.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB11	There is a lack of supporting local infrastructure in terms of shops, health facilities and schools in Mayford. Residents in any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 should not be removed from the Green Belt.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					Development here would fundamentally and irrevocably change Mayford and its community, creating new traffic flows that would effectively put an end to the horse riding, cycling and jogging currently enjoyed by residents from the whole borough of Woking, as well as people in Mayford itself.	<p>travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	
348	Wendy	Adams	GB8	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential.</p> <p>Any proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB9	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential.</p> <p>Any proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.</p>	
348	Wendy	Adams	GB10	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential.</p> <p>Any proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB11	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over 30 minutes. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential.</p> <p>Any proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
348	Wendy	Adams	GB8	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB9	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB10	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB11	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB7	Object to expansion of Ten Acre Farm by up to 12 Traveller pitches as the site not currently deliverable. If letters sent to confirm availability with landowners have not established them as available, they have not been included in the assessment. If the landowner identified a site as not available, then the site is not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use (WBC Green Belt Review 2014 - GBR). Woking Borough Council (WBC) approached Mr Lee, owner/occupier of Ten Acre Farm to ask if the site was available. Residents understand that the site is not available and that Mr Lee has not, to date, confirmed availability. With no written confirmation of availability, the site must be removed from the DPD. The owner/occupier continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use. The site has a low existing use value and residential development is likely to be economically viable at a low density (GBR). The Council is acting contrary to its own Strategic Land Accommodation Assessment 2014 (SHLAA) by including Ten Acre Farm as an extended Traveller site. The site should not be included in the DPD.	Do not include this site in the DPD.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB8	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB9	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB10	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB11	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB8	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB9	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
348	Wendy	Adams	GB10	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
348	Wendy	Adams	GB11	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
450	Michael	Adams	UA32	The proposal goes wholly against the strategic objectives of the Core Strategy. Questions the Council's motive for developing the land. CS17 is very clear about open space and its preservation. Does not understand why this has been proposed when it is identified in the Core Strategy for protection.	None stated.	The key requirements require compliance with core strategy CS17, which require the enhancement of public open space and that any loss of open space should be justified.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
450	Michael	Adams	UA32	Redevelop will also have an impact on the Basingstoke Canal and will have an impact on the wildlife corridor.	None stated.	<p>during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. The Key Requirements also require mitigation measures for noise and light pollution particularly along the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area and SSSI. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
450	Michael	Adams	UA32	<p>Strongly objects to the identification of the site for development. The Core Strategy identifies an area of 7.3ha in Sheerwater as urban open space.</p> <p>This is the only public open space within Sheerwater/Woodham that provides the facilities including athletics track, football pitches, recreation ground. The space is integral to the local community and accommodates a range of uses.</p> <p>The land was transferred to Woking Council with covenants on the land for it to remain as open space. If the athletics track and football pitches are relocated then the land should revert back to a public open area.</p> <p>Sheerwater is one of the most populated areas in Woking, the loss of green space to development will increase the density further and will have an adverse effect on the environment</p>	None stated.	<p>Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns, the site is identified to be within a Priority Place in the Core Strategy CS5. This identifies the area to benefit from and undergo significant regeneration to contribute to future development needs, in particular housing. The area has been identified to provide a net addition of 250 houses.</p> <p>The key requirements require compliance with core strategy CS17, which require the enhancement of public open space and that any loss of open space should be justified. It also requires the retention or relocation of the Athletics Track. A comprehensive masterplan should ensure that proposals integrate well with the surrounding area, including improved connectivity between open spaces and footpaths and cycle networks.</p> <p>The exact nature of these measures and any other detailed matters will be addressed at the planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
450	Michael	Adams	UA32	<p>CS7 will have a severe impact on SANG because the loss of the space will have a knock on effect on the nearest SANG-increasing the use there.</p> <p>The Basingstoke Canal SSSI,</p>	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper paragraph 3.3 and 3.7. It is correct that due to the vicinity of the site to the SPA, any new residential development is required to demonstrate adequate mitigation measures to avoid any adverse effects. Mitigation is through the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space SANG. Provision can be in the form of on-site provision (which meets the criteria set by Natural England) or contribution towards existing SANG in the vicinity.</p> <p>The site falls within the Heather Farm SANG catchment area which has sufficient capacity to accommodate the level of growth in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
450	Michael	Adams	UA32	The site is within flood zone 2 and has potential to suffer from a breach of the embankment of the Basingstoke Canal. CS9 states that development should not take place there if there are alternatives.	None stated.	The Core Strategy, policy CS5, designates the area as Priority Places and identifies the area for 250 new homes to be delivered through the redevelopment of Council owned land. The Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper explains how the Council has a significant unmet housing need in the Borough and the strategic approach the Council is adopting to address the need . This is fully explained in Section 1.0. Please also see Section 8.0, 9.0, 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS6 and section 9 of the NPPF. These set out limited circumstances where development is considered appropriate in the Green Belt.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	Questions why several sites identified to meet future need for pitches in the Green Belt Review (Murrays Lane, W. Byfleet; Land off New Lane, Sutton Green; land to the west of West Hall, W. Byfleet; and land south of High Street, Byfleet) have been omitted from the DPD with no explanation other than "it is easier to expand existing sites in the Green Belt" as stated by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on 6 July 2015.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated, and alternative sites identified in the Green Belt Review (Murrays Lane, W. Byfleet; Land off New Lane, Sutton Green; land to the west of West Hall, W. Byfleet; and land south of High Street, Byfleet) explored.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	Risk of flooding: The Council states in the DPD that it will not allocate sites or grant planning permission for additional pitches in the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3a). The Traveller Accommodation Assessment states that future expansion could be explored subject to overcoming any flooding issues. As 10% of the rear of the site is in Flood Zone 3 and a further 15% in Flood Zone 2, proposed pitches would be pushed closer to the road frontage, with unacceptable adverse impacts on visual amenity, openness and character.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	The site does not have the supporting infrastructure, particularly easy access to schools and local facilities (shops, medical facilities and employment) to support a Traveller site, with regard to the Core Strategy and SHLAA.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. In addition, the general approach to providing local infrastructure to support development is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. On health services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	Infrastructure, Services and Cost: the site does not have adequate infrastructure in line with Policy CS14, as it has no surface water or storm water drainage, no main sewer, a driveway that does not conform to current 'emergency vehicle' requirements, no water hydrant, site lighting, mains gas and minimal connection to water and electricity.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	There is a presumption against such development unless very special circumstances are demonstrated. Unmet demand does not constitute very special circumstances and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt, re-emphasised by the Secretary of State. Therefore even if the Council can not demonstrate a five year supply of Traveller sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9 -1.12 and Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	Any proposal that will have an adverse impact on environmentally sensitive sites that cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. The site has a boundary with a SSSI at Smarts Heath Common and Hoe Stream SNCI. An extended Traveller site would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council agrees with this comment, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	Outlines the positive contribution to visual amenity, character and local environments and that sites should not have unacceptable adverse impact on these set out in the Core Strategy Policies CS14, 21 and 24. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road of 22 houses including two 16th century Grade Two listed buildings, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common to open countryside.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	Traveller sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy, and characteristics sympathetic to the local environment. Due to public use of Smarts Heath Common there is no visual privacy, the proximity of the main railway line means it is unlikely that acoustic barriers would alleviate noise pollution, and the approved 'lorry route' on the B380 would add to this. There is no footpath of the ten Acre Farm side of the road, so children would have to cross the road to reach a footpath.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable. It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review. The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential and those living there are entitled to a peaceful and enjoyable environment. Draft DCLG guidance on site management	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12. It is not intended that the site should be allocated for a business use. The site is allocated as a Traveller site to meet the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				states that residents should be discouraged from working from their residential pitches and not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site. Working Core Strategy outlines that sites should positively enhance the environment and increase openness. Inclusion of business use would inflict a small scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic and nuisance to residents in the road, and is out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.		accommodation needs of Travellers. However, any proposal should take into account the traditional way of life of Travellers. This matter has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic paper and the DPD will clarify this issue.	
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	The owner/ occupier continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use. The Green Belt Review states the site's low existing use value means it is likely to be economic viable at a low density.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	Where a site is isolated from local facilities and is large enough to contain a diverse community of residents rather than one extended family, provision of a communal building is recommended. Such a building, if located towards the front of the site as recommended, will not positively enhance the environment, increase its openness or respect or make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in Section 3.0 of this paper. In addition the Council's Core Strategy contains policies (including CS21) ensure that development is of a high quality of design that contributes positively to the street scene and local character.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3, and for further background, Section 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12. The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and current supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	Outlines an extract from the Green Belt Review 2014 stating that if availability has not been established with landowners, that sites are not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use. Residents understand that Mr Lee, the owner/ occupier of Ten Acre Farm has not confirmed availability and therefore the site should be removed from the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	Pitches would have to be raised clear of any flood risk. Quotes cost of similar sites. The costs of preparation of Ten Acre Farm as a Traveller site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	The Green Belt Review rejected the site due to concerns over contamination, also detailed in the DPD. Contamination can be prohibitively expensive to remedy and should only be considered where financially viable. In its current potentially contaminated state Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable as an expanded traveller site. Only where land has been properly decontaminated should development be considered.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable. In some cases the proposed development would also offer a means to address the historic contamination issues on the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify sites for allocation, and the Green Belt Review sets out the order, as stated in the response. The Council's Traveller	The site should be removed from	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0 and 9.0. The part of the representation objecting to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification' and suggesting 'expansion' as the correct term to use, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states the site and immediate surroundings could be explored for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches, and states that 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD due to the intention of the site to be used for the current occupier's family. Objects to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification'.	the DPD for the reasons stated.		
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	The Council has set aside the Green Belt Review's recommendations by selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b in proposing the expansion of the site by up to 12 additional pitches. No independently verified evidence shows the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development, nor why sites identified as available and viable in the Green Belt Review have not been included, whilst sites excluded (this site and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	The site's inclusion as an extended Traveller site is contrary to the Council's own Strategic Land Accommodation Assessment. The site should not be included in the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	The site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987. It was never envisaged that the site would be expanded outside of the current occupier's immediate family. For twelve new pitches meeting the government practice guidance on designing Gypsy and Traveller sites, there will be unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness, character and appearance of the area, and the local environment, and will not positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural streetscene.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
551	Neil	Adcock	GB7	The site is adjacent to the main railway line so would require significant acoustic barriers.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters such as the need for acoustic barriers, will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
558	Amanda	Adcock	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS6 and section 9 of the NPPF. These set out limited circumstances where development is considered appropriate in the Green Belt.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
558	Amanda	Adcock	GB7	Questions why several sites identified to meet future need for pitches in the Green Belt Review (Murrays Lane, W. Byfleet; Land off New Lane, Sutton Green; land to the west of West Hall, W. Byfleet; and land south of High Street, Byfleet) have been omitted from the DPD with no explanation other than "it is easier to expand existing sites in the Green Belt" as stated by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on 6 July 2015.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated, and alternative sites identified in the Green Belt Review (Murrays Lane, W. Byfleet; Land off New Lane, Sutton Green; land to the west of West Hall, W. Byfleet; and land south of High Street, Byfleet) explored.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
558	Amanda	Adcock	GB7	The site does not have the supporting infrastructure, particularly easy access to schools and local facilities (shops, medical facilities and employment) to support a Traveller site, with regard to the Core Strategy and SHLAA.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. In addition, the general approach to providing local infrastructure to support development is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. On health services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
558	Amanda	Adcock	GB7	There is a presumption against such development unless very special circumstances are demonstrated. Unmet demand does not constitute very special circumstances and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt, re-emphasised by the Secretary of State. Therefore even if the Council can not demonstrate a five year supply of Traveller sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9 -1.12 and Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
558	Amanda	Adcock	GB7	Any proposal that will have an adverse impact on environmentally sensitive sites that cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. The site has a boundary with a SSSI at Smarts Heath Common and Hoe Stream SNCI. An extended Traveller site would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council agrees with this comment, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.	
558	Amanda	Adcock	GB7	Outlines the positive contribution to visual amenity, character and local environments and that sites should not have unacceptable adverse impact on these set out in the Core Strategy Policies CS14, 21 and 24. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road of 22 houses including two 16th century Grade Two listed buildings, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common to open countryside.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 (paragraph 7.4), 19.0, 21.0 and 23.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
558	Amanda	Adcock	GB7	Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential and those living there are entitled to a peaceful and enjoyable environment. Draft DCLG guidance on site management states that residents should be discouraged from working from their residential pitches and not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site. Woking Core Strategy outlines that sites should positively enhance the environment and increase openness. Inclusion of business use would inflict a small scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic and nuisance to residents in the road, and is out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12. It is not intended that the site should be allocated for a business use. The site is allocated as a Traveller site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. However, any proposal should take into account the traditional way of life of Travellers. This matter has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic paper and the DPD will clarify this issue.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
558	Amanda	Adcock	GB7	The owner/ occupier continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use. The Green Belt Review states the site's low existing use value means it is likely to be economic viable at a low density.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
558	Amanda	Adcock	GB7	Where a site is isolated from local facilities and is large enough to contain a diverse community of residents rather than one extended family, provision of a communal building is recommended. Such a building, if located towards the front of the site as recommended, will not positively enhance the environment, increase its openness or respect or make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in Section 3.0 of this paper. In addition the Council's Core Strategy contains policies (including CS21) ensure that development is of a high quality of design that contributes positively to the street scene and local character.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
558	Amanda	Adcock	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
558	Amanda	Adcock	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3, and for further background, Section 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12. The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and current supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
558	Amanda	Adcock	GB7	Outlines an extract from the Green Belt Review 2014 stating that if availability has not been established with landowners, that sites are not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use. Residents understand that Mr Lee, the owner/ occupier of Ten Acre Farm has not confirmed availability and therefore the site should be removed from the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
558	Amanda	Adcock	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify sites for allocation, and the Green Belt Review sets out the order, as stated in the response. The Council's Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states the site and immediate surroundings could be explored for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches, and states that 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD due to the intention of the site to be used for the current occupier's family. Objects to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification'.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0 and 9.0. The part of the representation objecting to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification' and suggesting 'expansion' as the correct term to use, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
558	Amanda	Adcock	GB7	The Council has set aside the Green Belt Review's recommendations by selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b in proposing the expansion of the site by up to 12 additional pitches. No independently verified evidence shows the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development, nor why sites identified as available and viable in the Green Belt Review have not been included, whilst sites excluded (this site and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
558	Amanda	Adcock	GB7	The site's inclusion as an extended Traveller site is contrary to the Council's own Strategic Land Accommodation Assessment. The site should not be included in the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
558	Amanda	Adcock	GB7	The site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987. It was never envisaged that the site would be expanded outside of the current occupier's immediate family. For twelve new pitches meeting the government practice guidance on designing Gypsy and Traveller sites, there will be unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness, character and appearance of the area, and the local environment, and will not positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural streetscene.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
738	J	Addison	GB4	The A245 is constantly gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
738	J	Addison	GB5	The A245 is constantly gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
738	J	Addison	GB4	Concern for proposed Green Belt development in Byfleet. It will remove almost all Green Belt land in the area and will have a significant impact on the local community.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	
738	J	Addison	GB5	Concern for proposed Green Belt development in Byfleet. It will remove almost all Green Belt land in the area and will have a significant impact on the local community.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
738	J	Addison	General	We ask you to reconsider these proposals and look for alternative sites that would not cause such a significant impact on the community.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
587	Nicholas J	Aiken	GB12	The village does not have the infrastructure, including school places (ref to letter from Chairman of Governors, rep 169) to cope with over 400 new houses. Hopes the Council will see sense and maintain the fields as Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
587	Nicholas J	Aiken	GB13	The village does not have the infrastructure, including school places (ref to letter from Chairman of Governors, rep 169) to cope with over 400 new houses. Hopes the Council will see sense and maintain the fields as Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
587	Nicholas J	Aiken	GB12	Objects to the proposals. The Green Belt is essential to preserve the character and nature of Pyrford Village.	None stated.	<p>The principle of Green Belt development as well as the need to safeguard land for future development needs has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
587	Nicholas J	Aiken	GB13	Objects to the proposals. The Green Belt is essential to preserve the character and nature of Pyrford Village.	None stated.	<p>The principle of Green Belt development as well as the need to safeguard land for future development needs has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB8	Although aware of the need for 'affordable housing' in the Woking area, we vehemently oppose the use of Green Belt land. The school and homes proposals will seriously affect transport infrastructure, already stretched at peak points. We cannot think of another mile area in Woking and Guildford with three schools; located on or near Egley Road – Freemantles, Barnsbury and proposed secondary school. Inconceivable that Mayford and Egley Road could accommodate this school traffic at peak times.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2, 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	Although aware of the need for 'affordable housing' in the Woking area, we vehemently oppose the use of Green Belt land. The school and homes proposals will seriously affect transport infrastructure, already stretched at peak points. We cannot think of another mile area in Woking and Guildford with three schools; located on or near Egley Road – Freemantles, Barnsbury and proposed secondary school. Inconceivable that Mayford and Egley Road could accommodate this school traffic at peak times.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1, 3 and 4. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issue and Matters Topic Paper in Section 3. The traffic impacts of the proposals is address in Section 20 of the Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	Although aware of the need for 'affordable housing' in the Woking area, we vehemently oppose the use of Green Belt land. The school and homes proposals will seriously affect transport infrastructure, already stretched at peak points. We cannot think of another mile area in Woking and Guildford with three schools; located on or near Egley Road – Freemantles, Barnsbury and proposed secondary school. Inconceivable that Mayford and Egley Road could accommodate this school traffic at peak times.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	Although aware of the need for 'affordable housing' in the Woking area, we vehemently oppose the use of Green Belt	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				land. The school and homes proposals will seriously affect transport infrastructure, already stretched at peak points. We cannot think of another mile area in Woking and Guildford with three schools; located on or near Egley Road – Freemantles, Barnsbury and proposed secondary school. Inconceivable that Mayford and Egley Road could accommodate this school traffic at peak times.		<p>Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2</p>	of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	Concern that sites would contain a business. Already affected by Martlands Industrial Estate, by buses, skip lorries and vans speeding along Smarts Heath Road at all times of day. This makes the road unsafe for families with children and pets, and for cyclists as there are no cycle lanes. The state of the road is also cause for concern as heavy duty vehicles are churning up the road surface.	None stated.	The site is not allocated for a business use. The reference in the policy is intended to reflect the traditional needs of Travellers at any given site. The Proposal will be amended to clarify this point.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" – this has not been proved by Woking Council, especially as "housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development."	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB8	No independently verified evidence to show Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for development in its Plan.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity brownfield sites to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the development needs of the entire plan period. Brownfield can only be identified to meet development needs up until 2022. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Evidence of assessment of brownfield land in in the SHLAA and the Sustainability Appraisal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB8	Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose "To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns" stating that "Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character" – Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" – this has not been proved by Woking Council, especially as "housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development."	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB8	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford – this is incorrectly classified only as "important"	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB8	There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield, which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further	None stated	The landscape sensitivity of the sites to accommodate the proposals has been fully assessed. This is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. One of the purposes of the Green Belt that was assessed as part of the Green Belt boundary review is the impact of the proposals in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. The evidence demonstrates that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be significantly undermined. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB8	Woking Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) as more "viable" for removal from the Green Belt – the ownership status of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated	land ownership has not influence the selection of sites. This matter has been addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	No independently verified evidence to show Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for development in its Plan.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity brownfield sites to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the development needs of the entire plan period. Brownfield can only be identified to meet development needs up until 2022. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Evidence of assessment of brownfield land in in the SHLAA and the Sustainability Appraisal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose "To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns" stating that "Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character" – Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford – this is incorrectly classified only as "important"	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield, which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further	None stated.	The landscape sensitivity of the sites to accommodate the proposals has been fully assessed. This is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. One of the purposes of the Green Belt that was assessed as part of the Green Belt boundary review is the impact of the proposals in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. The evidence demonstrates that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be significantly undermined. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	Woking Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) as more "viable" for removal from the Green Belt – the ownership status of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	Ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This matter is comprehensively addressed in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" – this has not been proved by Woking Council, especially as "housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2, 4. The Council is satisfied that the proposals can come forward without undermining the general character of the area. Policy CS6 provides a strong policy basis to protect the character of Mayford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.”			
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	No independently verified evidence to show Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for development in its Plan.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity brownfield sites to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the development needs of the entire plan period. Brownfield can only be identified to meet development needs up until 2022. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Evidence of assessment of brownfield land in in the SHLAA and the Sustainability Appraisal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose “To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns” stating that “Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character” – Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	A clear explanation of why the purpose of preserving the setting and special character of historic towns was not included in the Green Belt boundary review is explained in the Green Belt boundary review report. By definition, Woking does not have a historic town. This does not in any way imply that it does not have a strong history.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford – this is incorrectly classified only as “important”	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2, 4. The Council is satisfied that the proposals can come forward without undermining the general character of the area. Policy CS6 provides a strong policy basis to protect the character of Mayford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield, which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further	None stated.	The landscape sensitivity of the sites to accommodate the proposals has been fully assessed. This is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. One of the purposes of the Green Belt that was assessed as part of the Green Belt boundary review is the impact of the proposals in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. The evidence demonstrates that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be significantly undermined. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	Woking Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) as more “viable” for removal from the Green Belt – the ownership status of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	The ownership status of land has not influenced the allocation of sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in “exceptional circumstances” – this has not been proved by Woking Council, especially as “housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.”	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	No independently verified evidence to show Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for development in its Plan.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity brownfield sites to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the development needs of the entire plan period. Brownfield can only be identified to meet development needs up until 2022. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Evidence of assessment of brownfield land in in the SHLAA and the Sustainability Appraisal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose “To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns” stating that “Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character” – Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford – this is incorrectly classified only as “important”	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield, which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further	None stated.	The landscape sensitivity of the sites to accommodate the proposals has been fully assessed. This is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. One of the purposes of the Green Belt that was assessed as part of the Green Belt boundary review is the impact of the proposals in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. The evidence demonstrates that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						be significantly undermined. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	Woking Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) as more "viable" for removal from the Green Belt – the ownership status of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" – this has not been proved by Woking Council, especially as "housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development."	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	No independently verified evidence to show Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for development in its Plan.	None stated	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity brownfield sites to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the development needs of the entire plan period. Brownfield can only be identified to meet development needs up until 2022. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Evidence of assessment of brownfield land in in the SHLAA and the Sustainability Appraisal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose "To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns" stating that "Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character" – Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford – this is incorrectly classified only as "important"	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield, which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further	None stated.	The landscape sensitivity of the sites to accommodate the proposals has been fully assessed. This is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. One of the purposes of the Green Belt that was assessed as part of the Green Belt boundary review is the impact of the proposals in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. The evidence demonstrates that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be significantly undermined. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	Woking Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) as more "viable" for removal from the Green Belt – the ownership status of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. This matter is addressed in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent as it identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints), then proceeded to recommend land that contained these constraints (Mayford included). The Report rejected the 10 Acre Site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and consistently applied. The Council has used a range of evidence base including the Sustainability Appraisal to inform the DPD. The collectively justify the allocation of the proposals	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	Special Protection Areas land (including 400m buffer) was excluded from consideration of the Green Belt Review to protect endangered birds. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are Special Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSI) designated as "Important Bird Areas", therefore should also have buffers for the same reason. Mayford Village Society is pursuing inclusion of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath into the Thames	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Basin Heaths SPA (Special Protection Area). If successful this will result in a 400m development buffer zone in which development is not allowed.			
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7, Policy CS24 in Woking 2027 submission), therefore should not be considered for development. The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment – this questions the validity of the Review and suggests why areas of landscape importance NE7/CS24 have been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	Green Belt Review indicates a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area, this is misleading if the school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing on fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The Council has always been clear the Egley Road site GB8 is allocated for a school and residential development. The school now has the benefit of planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption to alleviate flooding. Developing the land will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	Flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB8	Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent as it identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints), then proceeded to recommend land that contained these constraints (Mayford included). The Report rejected the 10 Acre Site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied in the review. The Council does not think its decisions has also been inconsistency. The Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD. Collectively, the justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB8	Special Protection Areas land (including 400m buffer) was excluded from consideration of the Green Belt Review to protect endangered birds. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are Special Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSI) designated as "Important Bird Areas", therefore should also have buffers for the same reason. Mayford Village Society is pursuing inclusion of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath into the Thames Basin Heaths SPA (Special Protection Area). If successful this will result in a 400m development buffer zone in which development is not allowed.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7, Policy CS24 in Woking 2027 submission), therefore should not be considered for development. The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment – this questions the validity of the Review and suggests why areas of landscape importance NE7/CS24 have been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				changes would make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.		there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB8	Green Belt Review indicates a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area, this is misleading if the school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing on fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The school has planning permission. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption to alleviate flooding. Developing the land will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	Flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent as it identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints), then proceeded to recommend land that contained these constraints (Mayford included). The Report rejected the 10 Acre Site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied in the review. The Council does not think its decisions has also been inconsistency. The Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD. Collectively they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	Special Protection Areas land (including 400m buffer) was excluded from consideration of the Green Belt Review to protect endangered birds. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are Special Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSI) designated as "Important Bird Areas", therefore should also have buffers for the same reason. Mayford Village Society is pursuing inclusion of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath into the Thames Basin Heaths SPA (Special Protection Area). If successful this will result in a 400m development buffer zone in which development is not allowed.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7, Policy CS24 in Woking 2027 submission), therefore should not be considered for development. The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment – this questions the validity of the Review and suggests why areas of landscape importance NE7/CS24 have been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	Green Belt Review indicates a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area, this is misleading if the school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing on fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The school has planning permission. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption to alleviate flooding. Developing the land will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	Flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent as it identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints), then proceeded to recommend land that contained these constraints (Mayford included). The Report rejected the 10 Acre Site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently. The Council does not think that it has been inconsistent in its decisions either. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	Special Protection Areas land (including 400m buffer) was excluded from consideration of the Green Belt Review to protect endangered birds. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are Special Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSI) designated as "Important Bird Areas", therefore should also have buffers for the same reason. Mayford Village Society is pursuing inclusion of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath into the Thames Basin Heaths SPA (Special Protection Area). If successful this will result in a 400m development buffer zone in which development is not allowed.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7, Policy CS24 in Woking 2027 submission), therefore should not be considered for development. The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment – this questions the validity of the Review and suggests why areas of landscape importance NE7/CS24 have been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	Green Belt Review indicates a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area, this is misleading if the school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing on fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road is allocated for a school and residential development. There is no ambiguity in the allocation regarding the proposed uses. The school application now has the benefit of planning approval. The Council is satisfied that the entire site can be developed without undermining the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption to alleviate flooding. Developing the land will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	Flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent as it identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints), then proceeded to recommend land that contained these constraints (Mayford included). The Report rejected the 10 Acre Site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	The methodology for carrying the review is considered sufficiently robust and consistently applied. This issues has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	Special Protection Areas land (including 400m buffer) was excluded from consideration of the Green Belt Review to protect endangered birds. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are Special Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSI) designated as "Important Bird Areas", therefore should also have buffers for the same reason. Mayford Village Society is pursuing inclusion of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath into the Thames Basin Heaths SPA (Special Protection Area). If successful this will result in a 400m development buffer zone in which development is not allowed.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7, Policy CS24 in Woking 2027 submission), therefore should not be considered for development. The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment – this questions the validity of the Review and suggests why areas of landscape importance NE7/CS24 have been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	Green Belt Review indicates a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area, this is misleading if the school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing on fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential development. The school now has the benefit of planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption to alleviate flooding. Developing the land will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	Flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel from Mayford to Woking. This was estimated using Google Maps timings. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	Mayford has a very poor road network. Roads are narrow, most are unlit at night with few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours. This will be further adversely affected by traffic from 550 new homes being built on Mayford's boundary at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park. The proposed school for Egley Road will further exacerbate this situation.	None stated.	The proposed has planning permission. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	The general provision of infrastructure to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths to the station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage	
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	There are three single line bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. Those on Smarts Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane service the area proposed to be developed - neither could handle additional traffic. The third services Worplesdon Network Rail station which would notice a major increase in congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The proposals also include site specific requirements to make sure that detail site specific impacts are fully assessed to determine any appropriate mitigation measures. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a "Local Centre", other than Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure in the form of shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities, or schools. Residents of on any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel from Mayford to Woking. This was estimated using Google Maps timings. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network. Roads are narrow, most are unlit at night with few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours. This will be further adversely affected by traffic from 550 new homes being built on Mayford's boundary at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park. The proposed school for Egley Road will further exacerbate this situation.	None stated.	The proposed has planning permission. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	The general provision of infrastructure to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB8	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths to the station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB8	There are three single line bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. Those on Smarts Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane service the area proposed to be developed - neither could handle additional traffic. The third services Worplesdon Network Rail station which would notice a major increase in congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The proposals also include site specific requirements to make sure that detail site specific impacts are fully assessed to determine any appropriate mitigation measures. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB8	Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a "Local Centre", other than Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure in the form of shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities, or schools.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Residents of on any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.		<p>Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel from Mayford to Woking. This was estimated using Google Maps timings. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network. Roads are narrow, most are unlit at night with few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours. This will be further adversely affected by traffic from 550 new homes being built on Mayford's boundary at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park. The proposed school for Egley Road will further exacerbate this situation.	None stated.	The proposed has planning permission. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	The general provision of infrastructure to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths to the station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	There are three single line bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. Those on Smarts Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane service the area proposed to be developed - neither could handle additional traffic. The third services Worplesdon Network Rail station which would notice a major increase in congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The proposals also include site specific requirements to make sure that detail site specific impacts are fully assessed to determine any appropriate mitigation measures. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB9	Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a “Local Centre”, other than Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure in the form of shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities, or schools. Residents of on any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as ‘Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)’. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel from Mayford to Woking. This was estimated using Google Maps timings. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network. Roads are narrow, most are unlit at night with few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours. This will be further adversely affected by traffic from 550 new homes being built on Mayford's boundary at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park. The proposed school for Egley Road will further exacerbate this situation.	None stated.	The proposed has planning permission. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	The general provision of infrastructure to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths to the station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	There are three single line bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. Those on Smarts Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane service the area proposed to be developed - neither could handle additional traffic. The third services Worplesdon Network Rail station which would notice a major increase in congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The proposals also include site specific requirements to make sure that detail site specific impacts are fully assessed to determine any appropriate mitigation measures. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB10	Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a "Local Centre", other than Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure in the form of shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities, or schools. Residents of on any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel from Mayford to Woking. This was estimated using Google Maps timings. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network. Roads are narrow, most are unlit at night with few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours. This will be further adversely affected by traffic from 550 new homes being built on Mayford's boundary at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park. The proposed school for Egley Road will further exacerbate this situation.	None stated.	The proposed has planning permission. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	The general provision of infrastructure to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths to the station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	There are three single line bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. Those on Smarts Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane service the area proposed to be developed - neither could handle additional traffic. The third services Worplesdon Network Rail station which would notice a major increase in congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The proposals also	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						include site specific requirements to make sure that detail site specific impacts are fully assessed to determine any appropriate mitigation measures. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB11	Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a "Local Centre", other than Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure in the form of shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities, or schools. Residents of on any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with urban area sites considered before those in the Green Belt. However no urban sites appear to have been considered - there must be doubt as to the validity of no other sites across the whole of the Borough being identified or suitable. Where no sites are available in the urban area, priority will be given to sites on the edge of the urban area that benefit from good access to jobs, shops and other infrastructure and services. Mayford does not satisfy any of these criteria.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough - Burdenshott Road (one mile from Ten Acre Farm), Ten Acre Farm, Mayford, and Brookwood Lye (three miles from Ten Acre Farm). Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller Community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate amenity for its occupiers, including space for related business activities. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road of 25 houses, with two Grade Two listed buildings near Ten Acre Farm. Travellers related business activities are out of keeping in such a road.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	Traveller sites should not have unacceptable adverse impact on visual amenity and character. The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath SSSI.	None stated.	<p>The allocation of Ten Acres to provide pitches is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity	
43	Linda M	Aitchison	GB7	Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not currently close to schools. It does not have easy access to local facilities.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
143	M H	Alder	General	Can the Inspector please take into account my earlier 2010 comments regarding population forecasts (attached). This shows the housing requirement should cater for population growth of only 2288 by 2026. The proposal is to provide housing for 10474 by 2026. Why is Woking/Byfleet having to cater for such a massive increase, imposed by the Government, with no explanation or calculations?	None stated.	The Council has an adopted Core Strategy that was considered by the Inspector of the Secretary of State at an Examination in 2012. It has a housing requirement of 292 dwellings per year. The Core Strategy was informed by a Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The Council has a responsibility to identify sufficient land to enable the delivery of the requirement. The proposals in the Site Allocations DPD will enable this to be achieved.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
143	M H	Alder	General	No limits are proposed to restrict the numbers of single parent families being allocated affordable housing. I endorse the comments of Byfleet Resident's Neighbourhood Forum.	None stated.	The planning system could not be used to restrict the number of single parents in the area that are allocated affordable housing. The Council has an adopted Core Strategy that was considered by the Inspector of the Secretary of State at an Examination in 2012. It has a housing requirement of 292 dwellings per year. The Core Strategy was informed by a Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The Council has a responsibility to identify sufficient land to enable the delivery of the requirement. The proposals in the Site Allocations DPD will enable this to be achieved.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
143	M H	Alder	General	The 2008 population of Woking was 92200, the population forecast for 2026 is 94488, an increase of 2288. The proposal is to provide housing for 10,474 Why is there such a massive discrepancy? Housing should be provided for 2288 persons. No account taken of government proposal to restrict the numbers of single parent families allocated affordable housing.	None stated.	The planning system could not be used to restrict the number of single parents in the area that are allocated affordable housing. The Council has an adopted Core Strategy that was considered by the Inspector of the Secretary of State at an Examination in 2012. It has a housing requirement of 292 dwellings per year. The Core Strategy was informed by a Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The Council has a responsibility to identify sufficient land to enable the delivery of the requirement. The proposals in the Site Allocations DPD will enable this to be achieved.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
387	Richard	Alder	GB4	Object to proposals for new development on large remaining greenspace in Byfleet. Does not believe that any consideration has been given to SANG provision. Highlights that SANG needs to meet a certain criteria	Consideration given to SANG provision	The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate a number of future uses including land for Green Infrastructure and SANG uses- this is set out in Section C of the DPD. Site GB17 in Byfleet has been identified to accommodate SANG use. It sets out key requirements that should be met including the need to fulfil the criteria set by Natural England guidelines and also requires flood issues to be appropriately addressed with early engagement with the Environment Agency. Please also see t Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0 and 3.0- particularly paragraph 3.3 and 3.7	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
387	Richard	Alder	GB5	Object to proposals for new development on large remaining greenspace in Byfleet. Does not believe that any consideration has been given to SANG provision. Highlights that SANG needs to meet a certain criteria	Consideration given to SANG provision	The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate a number of future uses including land for Green Infrastructure and SANG uses- this is set out in Section C of the DPD. Site GB17 in Byfleet has been identified to accommodate SANG use. It sets out key requirements that should be met including the need to fulfil the criteria set by Natural England guidelines and also requires flood issues to be appropriately addressed with early engagement with the Environment Agency. Please also see t Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0 and 3.0- particularly paragraph 3.3 and 3.7	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
975	J	Alderton	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The school causes parking problems.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Parking for local business is not adequate. Footpaths are narrow and in disrepair.		<p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding speeding and the maintenance of the existing footpaths should be highlighted to the County Highways Authority who are responsible for highways safety in the Borough. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.</p>	
975	J	Alderton	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The school causes parking problems. Parking for local business is not adequate. Footpaths are narrow and in disrepair.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding speeding and the maintenance of the existing footpaths should be highlighted to the County Highways Authority who are responsible for highways safety in the Borough. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.	
48	David	Aldous	GB7	The Green Belts are historically created to keep conurbations separated so that residents and visitors felt part of an ecologically balanced place to Live ,work and play.	None stated.	It is not envisage that the proposals will compromise this objective.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB7	All Brownfield land and infill opportunities should be reconsidered before the Green Belt Housing need has to be for the current local population and not to meet a wider catchment (other parts of UK, Europe and the World)	None stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The evidence to support the housing need in the area is contained in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The identified need is to meet the needs of the local area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB7	Mayford roads are narrow and are limited in use by narrow bridges over the railway and local stream. The Roads are already congested and are stationary at peak times. Additional traffic will be impossible to absorb. A new proposed school of 400 pupils could add another 200 cars at peak time on to the Egley road. Housing to be built on any of the referenced sites (GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11) will add to traffic and grid lock the area At the moment a great number of vehicles use the roads around Mayford as "rat runs" to avoid Woking and surrounds to get to the A3 road etc.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposal for the school and the leisure centre now has planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB7	There are limited local services and facilities. The doctor surgeries are at capacity and its difficult to get appointments There are no local dentist, shops and other amenities which would be required for an influx of residents	None stated.	The infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB7	Mayford has a number of traveller sites in the area and it seems that creating another site in the Green Belt will attract more travellers to the area. A more urban area would be more suitable, if it is proven there is a need, as it would benefit from access to jobs, shops and other services.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB7	Woking and the surrounding villages cannot accept more development unless it is in place of other existing commercial and private properties.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield land to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period from 2022 to 2027. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for future development is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
48	David	Aldous	GB7	<p>The land is currently used for leisure/recreation</p> <p>e.g. The Land North of Saunders Lane is used for dog walking and family walks in a rural area.</p> <p>E.g. The field to the side of the village hall is I understand owned by the council and includes a small children's play area</p>	<p>I would like to suggest that in this consultation, housing is ruled out, and that all the green belt land north Saunders lane is turned into a park where Woking people can enjoy family outings. It would link perfectly with Smarts Heath and Prey Heath SSSI's both for wild life and human life. The Village Hall, bowling green and Emanuel Church add to the enjoyment of the area for visitors</p>	<p>The Council's collective evidence as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper justifies the allocation of sites along Saunders Lane. The justification for the release of the sites from the Green Belt to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular matters is addressed in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The capacity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals is addressed comprehensively in Sections 7 and 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the character of the area will be significantly undermined by the proposals. Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. this matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p>	<p>No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation</p>
48	David	Aldous	GB7	The GB Review is misguided	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is set out in comprehensive detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB8	The Green Belts are historically created to keep conurbations separated so that residents and visitors felt part of an ecologically balanced place to Live ,work and play.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB8	<p>All Brownfield land and infill opportunities should be reconsidered before the Green Belt</p> <p>Housing need has to be for the current local population and not to meet a wider catchment (other parts of UK, Europe and the World)</p>	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB8	<p>Mayford roads are narrow and are limited in use by narrow bridges over the railway and local stream. The Roads are already congested and are stationary at peak times. Additional traffic will be impossible to absorb.</p> <p>A new proposed school of 400 pupils could add another 200 cars at peak time on to the Egley road. Housing to be built on any of the referenced sites (GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11) will add to traffic and grid lock the area</p>	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposal for the school and the leisure centre now has planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				At the moment a great number of vehicles use the roads around Mayford as "rat runs" to avoid Woking and surround to get to the A3 road etc.			
48	David	Aldous	GB8	<p>There are limited local services and facilities. The doctor surgeries are at capacity and its difficult to get appointments</p> <p>There are no local dentist, shops and other amenities which would be required for an influx of residents</p>	None stated.	<p>The infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB8	<p>Mayford has a number of traveller sites in the area and it seems that creating another site in the Green Belt will attract more travellers to the area.</p> <p>A more urban area would be more suitable, if it is proven there is a need, as it would benefit from access to jobs, shops and other services.</p>	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB8	Woking and the surrounding villages cannot accept more development unless it is in place of other existing commercial and private properties.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield land to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period from 2022 to 2027. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for future development is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB8	<p>The land is currently used for leisure/recreation</p> <p>e.g. The Land North of Saunders Lane is used for dog walking and family walks in a rural area.</p> <p>E.g. The field to the side of the village hall is I understand owned by the council and includes a small children's play area</p>	I would like to suggest that in this consultation, housing is ruled out, and that all the green belt land north Saunders lane is turned into a park where Woking people can enjoy family outings. It would link perfectly with Smarts Heath and Prey Heath SSSI's both for wild life and human life. The Village Hall,	The Council's collective evidence as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper justifies the allocation of sites along Saunders Lane. The justification for the release of the sites from the Green Belt to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular matters is addressed in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The capacity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals is addressed comprehensively in Sections 7 and 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the character of the area will be significantly undermined by the proposals. Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. this matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					bowling green and Emanuel Church add to the enjoyment of the area for visitors		
48	David	Aldous	GB8	The GB Review is misguided	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is set out in comprehensive detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB9	The Green Belts are historically created to keep conurbations separated so that residents and visitors felt part of an ecologically balanced place to Live ,work and play.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB9	All Brownfield land and infill opportunities should be reconsidered before the Green Belt Housing need has to be for the current local population and not to meet a wider catchment (other parts of UK, Europe and the World)	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The evidence setting out the housing need for the area is the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The identified need is to meet the need of the local area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB9	Mayford roads are narrow and are limited in use by narrow bridges over the railway and local stream. The Roads are already congested and are stationary at peak times. Additional traffic will be impossible to absorb. A new proposed school of 400 pupils could add another 200 cars at peak time on to the Egley road. Housing to be built on any of the referenced sites (GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11) will add to traffic and grid lock the area At the moment a great number of vehicles use the roads around Mayford as "rat runs" to avoid Woking and surround to get to the A3 road etc.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposal for the school and the leisure centre now has planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB9	There are limited local services and facilities. The doctor surgeries are at capacity and its difficult to get appointments There are no local dentist, shops and other amenities which would be required for an influx of residents	None stated.	The infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB9	Mayford has a number of traveller sites in the area and it seems that creating another site in the Green Belt will attract more travellers to the area.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				A more urban area would be more suitable, if it is proven there is a need, as it would benefit from access to jobs, shops and other services.			
48	David	Aldous	GB9	Woking and the surrounding villages cannot accept more development unless it is in place of other existing commercial and private properties.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield land to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period from 2022 to 2027. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for future development is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB9	The land is currently used for leisure/recreation e.g. The Land North of Saunders Lane is used for dog walking and family walks in a rural area. E.g. The field to the side of the village hall is I understand owned by the council and includes a small children's play area	I would like to suggest that in this consultation, housing is ruled out, and that all the green belt land north Saunders lane is turned into a park where Woking people can enjoy family outings. It would link perfectly with Smarts Heath and Prey Heath SSSI's both for wild life and human life. The Village Hall, bowling green and Emanuel Church add to the enjoyment of the area for visitors	The Council's collective evidence as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper justifies the allocation of sites along Saunders Lane. The justification for the release of the sites from the Green Belt to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular matters is addressed in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The capacity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals is addressed comprehensively in Sections 7 and 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the character of the area will be significantly undermined by the proposals. Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. this matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB9	The GB Review is misguided	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is set out in comprehensive detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB10	The Green Belts are historically created to keep conurbations separated so that residents and visitors felt part of an ecologically balanced place to Live ,work and play.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2, 4. The Council is satisfied that the proposals can come forward without undermining the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB10	All Brownfield land and infill opportunities should be reconsidered before the Green Belt Housing need has to be for the current local population and not to meet a wider catchment (other parts of UK, Europe and the World)	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2, 4. The Council is satisfied that the proposals can come forward without undermining the general character of the area. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. The evidence demonstrate that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB10	Mayford roads are narrow and are limited in use by narrow bridges over the railway and local stream. The Roads are already congested and are stationary at peak times. Additional traffic will be impossible to absorb.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposal for the school and the leisure centre now has planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>A new proposed school of 400 pupils could add another 200 cars at peak time on to the Egley road. Housing to be built on any of the referenced sites (GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11) will add to traffic and grid lock the area</p> <p>At the moment a great number of vehicles use the roads around Mayford as "rat runs" to avoid Woking and surround to get to the A3 road etc.</p>			
48	David	Aldous	GB10	<p>There are limited local services and facilities. The doctor surgeries are at capacity and its difficult to get appointments</p> <p>There are no local dentist, shops and other amenities which would be required for an influx of residents</p>	None stated.	<p>The infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB10	<p>Mayford has a number of traveller sites in the area and it seems that creating another site in the Green Belt will attract more travellers to the area.</p> <p>A more urban area would be more suitable, if it is proven there is a need, as it would benefit from access to jobs, shops and other services.</p>	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB10	Woking and the surrounding villages cannot accept more development unless it is in place of other existing commercial and private properties.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield land to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period from 2022 to 2027. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for future development is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB10	<p>The land is currently used for leisure/recreation</p> <p>e.g. The Land North of Saunders Lane is used for dog walking and family walks in a rural area.</p> <p>E.g. The field to the side of the village hall is I understand owned by the council and includes a small children's play area</p>	I would like to suggest that in this consultation, housing is ruled out, and that all the green belt land north Saunders lane is turned into a park where Woking people can enjoy family outings. It would link perfectly with	The Council's collective evidence as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper justifies the allocation of sites along Saunders Lane. The justification for the release of the sites from the Green Belt to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular matters is addressed in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The capacity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals is addressed comprehensively in Sections 7 and 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the character of the area will be significantly undermined by the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					Smarts Heath and Prey Heath SSSI's both for wild life and human life. The Village Hall, bowling green and Emanuel Church add to the enjoyment of the area for visitors		
48	David	Aldous	GB10	The GB Review is misguided	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is set out in comprehensive detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB11	The Green Belts are historically created to keep conurbations separated so that residents and visitors felt part of an ecologically balanced place to Live ,work and play.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB11	All Brownfield land and infill opportunities should be reconsidered before the Green Belt Housing need has to be for the current local population and not to meet a wider catchment (other parts of UK, Europe and the World)	None stated.	The evidence base to justify the housing need for the area is set out in the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The need is mainly locally driven. The Council has adopted a spatial strategy that seeks to concentrate most new development on previously developed land in the main urban areas. This is a key reason why Green Belt land is proposed to be released from 2022. Before that, it is expected that development will be mainly on brownfield land. The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield land. There is not sufficient brownfield land in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB11	Mayford roads are narrow and are limited in use by narrow bridges over the railway and local stream. The Roads are already congested and are stationary at peak times. Additional traffic will be impossible to absorb. A new proposed school of 400 pupils could add another 200 cars at peak time on to the Egley road. Housing to be built on any of the referenced sites (GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11) will add to traffic and grid lock the area At the moment a great number of vehicles use the roads around Mayford as "rat runs" to avoid Woking and surround to get to the A3 road etc.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposal for the school and the leisure centre now has planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB11	There are limited local services and facilities. The doctor surgeries are at capacity and its difficult to get appointments There are no local dentist, shops and other amenities which would be required for an influx of residents	None stated.	The infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area	
48	David	Aldous	GB11	<p>Mayford has a number of traveller sites in the area and it seems that creating another site in the Green Belt will attract more travellers to the area.</p> <p>A more urban area would be more suitable, if it is proven there is a need, as it would benefit from access to jobs, shops and other services.</p>	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB11	Woking and the surrounding villages cannot accept more development unless it is in place of other existing commercial and private properties.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield land to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period from 2022 to 2027. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for future development is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB11	<p>The land is currently used for leisure/recreation</p> <p>e.g. The Land North of Saunders Lane is used for dog walking and family walks in a rural area.</p> <p>E.g. The field to the side of the village hall is I understand owned by the council and includes a small children's play area</p>	<p>I would like to suggest that in this consultation, housing is ruled out, and that all the green belt land north Saunders lane is turned into a park where Woking people can enjoy family outings. It would link perfectly with Smarts Heath and Prey Heath SSSI's both for wild life and human life. The Village Hall, bowling green and Emanuel Church add to the enjoyment of the area for visitors</p>	The Council's collective evidence as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper justifies the allocation of sites along Saunders Lane. The justification for the release of the sites from the Green Belt to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular matters is addressed in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The capacity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals is addressed comprehensively in Sections 7 and 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the character of the area will be significantly undermined by the proposals. Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. this matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
48	David	Aldous	GB11	The GB Review is misguided	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is set out in comprehensive detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
149	W	Aldous	General	The Woking 2027 planning proposals will have a devastating effect on Mayford. We are a village. You are clearly endeavouring to change our environment and make it an urban sprawl to join up with Woking. I strongly oppose any housing developments at the cost of losing very precious Green Belt land. Planners of years ago had the intelligence	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1. The character of Mayford is already protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The Council is satisfied by the evidence and policies it has that the identity of Mayford and its character will not be undermined by the proposals. The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield land to meet developments. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet future needs. This matter has been address by the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				and foresight to realise the importance of green space to all people, creatures and vegetation. Once the Green Belt is eroded we shall not get it back. You still have brownfield areas if extra housing is really necessary.			
149	W	Aldous	GB7	Mayford has three sites in a small area, if more space is needed for these people then they should be allocated another area, nearer to a town with more facilities.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
149	W	Aldous	GB8	Oppose housing being erected on these sites. Already congestion on Egley Road with much through traffic. You have recently agreed to more housing in Westfield, that should be our quota for the area to ensure that we do not become over populated. We are a village and want to stay that way. The school planned for Egley Road site is for 400 students, indicating another 200 cars to add to the congestion.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future housing needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The general approach to dealing with the traffic implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The school now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
149	W	Aldous	GB9	Oppose housing being erected on these sites. Already congestion on Egley Road with much through traffic. You have recently agreed to more housing in Westfield, that should be our quota for the area to ensure that we do not become over populated. We are a village and want to stay that way. The school planned for Egley Road site is for 400 students, indicating another 200 cars to add to the congestion.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
149	W	Aldous	GB10	This area should not have been recommended as suitable for housing. It is green, rural, a recreational area enjoyed by many people for relaxation. Your planners may be fulfilling their brief to find a space to build a housing estate but it does not mean that you or we should accept their recommendations. It is the wrong suggestion for the wrong place. We choose to live here because of its character, openness, narrow roads, few pavements and even less street lights. Access is over narrow bridges, we have no doctors surgery, one shop, two pubs; we are not complaining, this is what we like. We want to keep our village and its rural identity, not become part of Woking. If we do not have adequate housing, people will have to go where they can be accommodated.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and is satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
149	W	Aldous	GB11	This area should not have been recommended as suitable for housing. It is green, rural, a recreational area enjoyed by many people for relaxation. Your planners may be fulfilling their brief to find a space to build a housing estate but it does not mean that you or we should accept their recommendations. It is the wrong suggestion for the wrong place. We choose to live here because of its character, openness, narrow roads, few pavements and even less street lights. Access is over narrow bridges, we have no	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				doctors surgery, one shop, two pubs; we are not complaining, this is what we like. We want to keep our village and its rural identity, not become part of Woking. If we do not have adequate housing, people will have to go where they can be accommodated.		assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and is satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area.	
149	W	Aldous	General	Look to the future - preserve our Green Belt. Maintain the vision of your predecessors and preserve the open Green Belt spaces for the health of all. Cities, towns and villages are necessary but all should be kept separated with open, green, spaces. The Mayford Village Society response also represent my views.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1. The character of Mayford is already protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The Council is satisfied by the evidence and policies it has that the identity of Mayford and its character will not be undermined by the proposals. The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield land to meet developments. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet future needs. This matter has been address by the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
41	Martyn	Aldridge	GB12	Confusion why new housing needs to go on the GB and agricultural land when there are alternative sites Redevelopment will ruin the character of the area Redevelopment of this scale could mean 800 additional cars and more children needing school places	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. Details of the evidence base are in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied that the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of brownfield land to meet the identified needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the need over the entire plan period. Green Belt land will still be needed to meet need from 2022.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
41	Martyn	Aldridge	GB12	Confusion why new housing needs to go on the GB and agricultural land when there are alternative sites Redevelopment will ruin the character of the area Redevelopment of this scale could mean 800 additional cars and more children needing school places	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. Details of the evidence base are in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied that the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of brownfield land to meet the identified needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the need over the entire plan period. Green Belt land will still be needed to meet need from 2022.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
392	Robert	Alexander	GB7	Development of this area will exacerbate traffic problems in the area, which is often gridlocked	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
392	Robert	Alexander	GB8	Development of this area will exacerbate traffic problems in the area, which is often gridlocked	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A320. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
392	Robert	Alexander	GB9	Development of this area will exacerbate traffic problems in the area, which is often gridlocked	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A320. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
392	Robert	Alexander	GB10	Development of this area will exacerbate traffic problems in the area, which is often gridlocked	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Saunders Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
392	Robert	Alexander	GB11	Development of this area will exacerbate traffic problems in the area, which is often gridlocked	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Saunders Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
392	Robert	Alexander	GB14	Development of this area will exacerbate traffic problems in the area, which is often gridlocked	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
392	Robert	Alexander	GB7	Object to proposals in the GB. Development of these areas will set a precedent and Mayford will gradually become a suburb of Woking and then gradually, Woking to Guildford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
392	Robert	Alexander	GB8	Object to proposals in the GB. Development of these areas will set a precedent and Mayford will gradually become a suburb of Woking and then gradually, Woking to Guildford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
392	Robert	Alexander	GB9	Object to proposals in the GB. Development of these areas will set a precedent and Mayford will gradually become a suburb of Woking and then gradually, Woking to Guildford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
392	Robert	Alexander	GB10	Object to proposals in the GB. Development of these areas will set a precedent and Mayford will gradually become a suburb of Woking and then gradually, Woking to Guildford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
392	Robert	Alexander	GB11	Object to proposals in the GB. Development of these areas will set a precedent and Mayford will gradually become a suburb of Woking and then gradually, Woking to Guildford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
392	Robert	Alexander	GB14	Object to proposals in the GB. Development of these areas will set a precedent and Mayford will gradually become a suburb of Woking and then gradually, Woking to Guildford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
392	Robert	Alexander	GB7	The area is used for recreational purposes and is therefore important open space important for health and well being.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
392	Robert	Alexander	GB8	The area is used for recreational purposes and is therefore important open space important for health and well being.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
392	Robert	Alexander	GB9	The area is used for recreational purposes and is therefore important open space important for health and well being.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
392	Robert	Alexander	GB10	The area is used for recreational purposes and is therefore important open space important for health and well being.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
392	Robert	Alexander	GB11	The area is used for recreational purposes and is therefore important open space important for health and well being.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
392	Robert	Alexander	GB14	The area is used for recreational purposes and is therefore important open space important for health and well being.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
395	Kate	Alexander	GB10	The purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and coalescence. The proposals will do the opposite. Merging Hook Heath, Mayford and the rest of Woking. One of attractions of living in the area is that the countryside is within walking distance	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
395	Kate	Alexander	GB11	The purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and coalescence. The proposals will do the opposite. Merging	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Hook Heath, Mayford and the rest of Woking. One of attractions of living in the area is that the countryside is within walking distance			of this representation
395	Kate	Alexander	GB14	The purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and coalescence. The proposals will do the opposite. Merging Hook Heath, Mayford and the rest of Woking. One of attractions of living in the area is that the countryside is within walking distance	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
395	Kate	Alexander	GB10	No consideration has been given to the Council's own CS policies. CS24 requires development proposals to conserve and enhance the landscape and townscapes of the area, including conserving landscape and valued features e.g. escarpments etc. The proposals will destroy landscape features and be out of character with the existing character of the area	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 7.0. Any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Landscape and Townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
395	Kate	Alexander	GB11	No consideration has been given to the Council's own CS policies. CS24 requires development proposals to conserve and enhance the landscape and townscapes of the area, including conserving landscape and valued features e.g. escarpments etc. The proposals will destroy landscape features and be out of character with the existing character of the area	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 7.0. Any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Landscape and Townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
395	Kate	Alexander	GB14	No consideration has been given to the Council's own CS policies. CS24 requires development proposals to conserve and enhance the landscape and townscapes of the area, including conserving landscape and valued features e.g. escarpments etc. The proposals will destroy landscape features and be out of character with the existing character of the area	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 7.0. Any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Landscape and Townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
395	Kate	Alexander	GB10	The GBBR was not consulted on and contains many flaws. The sites were recommended for their proximity to the local centre however there is no supporting infrastructure (doctors, dentists, schools etc) except a Post Office and Barber. It is claimed the sites are sustainable on the basis of travel times- this does not take in traffic into consideration.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
395	Kate	Alexander	GB11	The GBBR was not consulted on and contains many flaws. The sites were recommended for their proximity to the local centre however there is no supporting infrastructure (doctors, dentists, schools etc) except a Post Office and Barber. It is claimed the sites are sustainable on the basis of travel times- this does not take in traffic into consideration.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p>	
395	Kate	Alexander	GB14	<p>The GBBR was not consulted on and contains many flaws. The sites were recommended for their proximity to the local centre however there is no supporting infrastructure (doctors, dentists, schools etc) except a Post Office and Barber. It is claimed the sites are sustainable on the basis of travel times- this does not take in traffic into consideration.</p>	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
395	Kate	Alexander	GB10	The proposed housing density is not in keeping with the local area, which is an average of 5.5 dph and even less within Fisher Hill Conservation area	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
395	Kate	Alexander	GB11	The proposed housing density is not in keeping with the local area, which is an average of 5.5 dph and even less within Fisher Hill Conservation area	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
395	Kate	Alexander	GB14	The proposed housing density is not in keeping with the local area, which is an average of 5.5 dph and even less within Fisher Hill Conservation area	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
395	Kate	Alexander	GB14	<p>It is not necessary to remove GB14 from the GB for GI as there is no change of use.</p> <p>Also, exceptional circumstances has not been demonstrated</p>	None stated.	<p>The site formed part of a wider parcel in the Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR). The GBBR concluded that the sites within the parcel should be comprehensively planned to include various uses including green infrastructure. This site was considered suitable for green infrastructure only due to its more prominent position at a higher point on the Escarpment of rising ground.</p> <p>Taking into account the wider parcel and the proposed site allocations, alongside the need to ensure a clear well defined boundary. It is considered that GB14 should be removed from the GB boundary and allocated for Green Infrastructure.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
395	Kate	Alexander	GB10	<p>Object to proposals GB10, GB11 and GB14. Exceptional circumstances has not been demonstrated for release of GB for 1200 dwellings between 2027-2040. The Core Strategy only identifies the requirement of 550 homes in the GB between 2022-2027.</p> <p>No evidence has been provided to demonstrate all brownfield sites have been exhausted first</p> <p>The ownership and viability of a site should not be reason for removal from GB. Exceptional circumstances should still be demonstrated.</p>	Evidence should be available to demonstrate all brownfield sites have been considered first.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12, Section 2.0, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
395	Kate	Alexander	GB11	<p>Object to proposals GB10, GB11 and GB14. Exceptional circumstances has not been demonstrated for release of GB for 1200 dwellings between 2027-2040. The Core Strategy only identifies the requirement of 550 homes in the GB between 2022-2027.</p> <p>No evidence has been provided to demonstrate all brownfield sites have been exhausted first</p> <p>The ownership and viability of a site should not be reason for removal from GB. Exceptional circumstances should still be demonstrated</p>	Evidence should be available to demonstrate all brownfield sites have been considered first.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 , Section 2.0, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
395	Kate	Alexander	GB14	<p>Object to proposals GB10, GB11 and GB14. Exceptional circumstances has not been demonstrated for release of GB for 1200 dwellings between 2027-2040. The Core Strategy only identifies the requirement of 550 homes in the GB between 2022-2027.</p> <p>No evidence has been provided to demonstrate all brownfield sites have been exhausted first</p> <p>The ownership and viability of a site should not be reason for removal from GB. Exceptional circumstances should still be demonstrated</p>	Evidence should be available to demonstrate all brownfield sites have been considered first.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 , Section 2.0, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
623	Margaret	Alexander	GB7	Objects to the proposal to increase the number of Traveller pitches, which would spoil the character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
623	Margaret	Alexander	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common, a SSSI and an increase om domestic animals would affect wildlife.	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
623	Margaret	Alexander	GB10	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
623	Margaret	Alexander	GB11	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
623	Margaret	Alexander	GB14	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
623	Margaret	Alexander	GB10	Objects to the proposals. The sites should remain Green Belt.	The sites should remain Green Belt.	The Council notes the objection and proposed modification. The principle of Green Belt development and the Council's approach to safeguarding land for future development needs has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0. As set out in paragraph 1.14, each site will make a meaningful contribution to housing delivery in the Borough. Not allocating this or all of the sites would undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy. It should also be noted that site GB14 is not allocated for development but for green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
623	Margaret	Alexander	GB11	Objects to the proposals. The sites should remain Green Belt.	The sites should remain Green Belt.	The Council notes the objection and proposed modification. The principle of Green Belt development and the Council's approach to safeguarding land for future development needs has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0. As set out in paragraph 1.14, each site will make a meaningful contribution to housing delivery in the Borough. Not allocating this or all of the sites would undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy. It should also be noted that site GB14 is not allocated for development but for green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
623	Margaret	Alexander	GB14	Objects to the proposals. The sites should remain Green Belt.	The sites should remain Green Belt.	The Council notes the objection and proposed modification. The principle of Green Belt development and the Council's approach to safeguarding land for future development needs has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0. As set out in paragraph 1.14, each site will make a meaningful contribution to housing delivery in the Borough. Not allocating this or all of the sites would undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy. It should also be noted that site GB14 is not allocated for development but for green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
623	Margaret	Alexander	GB10	No consideration has been given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure. There are already traffic problems on the A320 and the school proposal will increase this. Increasing the width of Saunders Lane will only increase the volume of traffic and worsen the problem.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
623	Margaret	Alexander	GB11	No consideration has been given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure. There are already traffic problems on the A320 and the school proposal will increase this. Increasing the width of Saunders Lane will only increase the volume of traffic and worsen the problem.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
623	Margaret	Alexander	GB14	No consideration has been given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure. There are already traffic problems on the A320 and the school proposal will increase this. Increasing the width of Saunders Lane will only increase the volume of traffic and worsen the problem.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB7	A sequential approach must be undertaken to identify suitable sites. No urban sites have been considered and there is doubt to the validity of no other sites in the borough being identified or suitable. Mayford does not have good access to jobs, infrastructure or services and therefore does not satisfy the sequential approach criteria.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI which is used for leisure purposes. Development would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase the risk to wildlife by having more domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	
789	Paul	Allard	GB7	Insulting that WBC will gift the land to travellers when they worked hard to buy a house. Travelling is a lifestyle not compatible with modern life. If the Council has to provide land to Travellers, it should be far away from the rest of the community. The majority of people do not want travellers living anywhere near them. WBC should serve the wishes of the people that elected them.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council treats all people equally and has a responsibility to house all members of the community. As set out in Section 4.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Traveller sites should be located in areas with good access to services, including healthcare, education and leisure facilities. Travellers form part of the Woking Borough Community and it would be both discriminatory and legally incorrect to allocate a site for them away from these essential services.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB8	Walking is not possible around Mayford as the roads are not suitable for pedestrians and there are no amenities in the area. The majority of journeys are carried out by car.	None stated.	<p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation regarding footpaths. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB9	Walking is not possible around Mayford as the roads are not suitable for pedestrians and there are no amenities in the area. The majority of journeys are carried out by car.	None stated.	<p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation regarding footpaths. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB10	Walking is not possible around Mayford as the roads are not suitable for pedestrians and there are no amenities in the area. The majority of journeys are carried out by car.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation regarding footpaths. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	
789	Paul	Allard	GB11	Walking is not possible around Mayford as the roads are not suitable for pedestrians and there are no amenities in the area. The majority of journeys are carried out by car.	None stated.	<p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation regarding footpaths. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB14	Walking is not possible around Mayford as the roads are not suitable for pedestrians and there are no amenities in the area. The majority of journeys are carried out by car.	None stated.	<p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation regarding footpaths. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	General	Mayford has a perfect balance between town and country living. It is surrounded by open space, wildlife and greenery. These are priceless treasures. It offers a relief from the urban area and a general sense of wellbeing. Once it is removed there is no going back and the area will be irrecoverably destroyed.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>It is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	
789	Paul	Allard	GB8	The plans to develop a sports centre on the site will amplify the concerns raised due to the volume of people and traffic raised. Noise and light pollution will increase on the weekend and evenings and will impact the neighbouring areas. Has experience of flood light pollution from other sports facilities in the borough. The positive qualities of the local area will not be devoid of light pollution.	None stated.	<p>The key requirements for the allocation note a number of site specific infrastructure improvements that will need to be carried out before the site becomes operational. The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.</p> <p>As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission.</p> <p>The potential increase in noise and air pollution has been considered with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. This document is available for viewing online on the Council's website. Generally, the sites identified for allocation are not expected to have a significant impact on noise or air pollution as the sites are in close proximity to the existing urban areas, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths. This has the potential to reduce the reliance on the private car and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Council does not consider that the proposed allocation of this site will have an adverse impact on noise pollution. Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design states that proposals for new development must be designed to avoid significant harm to the environment and general amenity resulting from noise. In addition, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD has a specific policy relating to noise and light pollution (DM7). In combination with the existing and emerging policies, the proposed land use for the site is not expected to generate a significant amount of noise pollution above the existing baseline condition.</p> <p>The Council notes the representation regarding the benefits of the existing open space at night. Nevertheless taking into account the points raised above, the Council does not believe that the allocation of this site will have a significant negative impact on quality of life for local residents.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB8	Objects to housing on the site. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB9	Objects to housing on the site. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB10	Objects to housing on the site. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB11	Objects to housing on the site. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
789	Paul	Allard	GB14	Objects to housing on the site. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	General	One of the SA Impact Assessments stated that there will be no specific impact on Personal Safety and reduced fear of crime. This is completely flawed as an uninhabited area has no crime. Crime exists because of people and if you increase the number of people then you increase the probability of crime - fact! New dwellings on the proposed scale will increase the probability of crime and the fact that the official documents refuse to acknowledge this throws into question the accuracy of any of the other assessments made.	None stated.	It is factually incorrect to suggest that uninhabited areas have no crime. Nevertheless there is no evidence to suggest that the proposed land uses for the draft allocation will result in an increase in crime. In addition the Core Strategy states in CS21: Design that new development should create a safe and secure environment where the opportunities for crime are minimised. At the planning application stage, the Council may also consult with the Police Service (Crime Prevention Design Advisors (CPDA), Designing Out Crime Officers (DOCO) and Architectural Liaison Officers (ALO)) to make sure that any potential crime and safety issues are addressed. Whilst the Council sympathises with victims of crime and is working with the Police service where possible to reduce the amount of crime across the Borough, it believes that the proposed developments will not have a negative impact on crime or the fear of crime.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
789	Paul	Allard	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB14	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
789	Paul	Allard	GB7	Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	General	<p>Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.</p> <p>The plans will have a detrimental impact on the wider Woking community by negatively impacting quality of life through traffic, noise and light pollution as well as increased strain on amenities. The Council has a responsibility to maintain quality of life for existing residents and these plans are excessive and destroy a perfectly balanced area.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB8	Due to the high car usage in the area, traffic levels will significantly increase if the proposals are approved. This will increase pollution, the cost of maintaining the roads and the number of accident and road deaths. The existing roads are in a poor condition and can not cope with the existing traffic.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The current condition and maintenance of the road network is not a planning issue. Planning Policy would recommend highlighting this matter to the County Highways Authority.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The potential increase in pollution has been considered with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. This document is available for viewing online on the Council's website. Generally, the sites identified for allocation are not expected to have a significant impact on air pollution as the sites are in close proximity to the existing urban areas, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths. In combination this has the potential to reduce the reliance on the private car and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling.</p>	
789	Paul	Allard	GB9	Due to the high car usage in the area, traffic levels will significantly increase if the proposals are approved. This will increase pollution, the cost of maintaining the roads and the number of accident and road deaths. The existing roads are in a poor condition and can not cope with the existing traffic.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The current condition and maintenance of the road network is not a planning issue. Planning Policy would recommend highlighting this matter to the County Highways Authority.</p> <p>The potential increase in pollution has been considered with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. This document is available for viewing online on the Council's website. Generally, the sites identified for allocation are not expected to have a significant impact on air pollution as the sites are in close proximity to the existing urban areas, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths. In combination this has the potential to reduce the reliance on the private car and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB10	Due to the high car usage in the area, traffic levels will significantly increase if the proposals are approved. This will increase pollution, the cost of maintaining the roads and the number of accident and road deaths. The existing roads are in a poor condition and can not cope with the existing traffic.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The current condition and maintenance of the road network is not a planning issue. Planning Policy would recommend highlighting this matter to the County Highways Authority.</p> <p>The potential increase in pollution has been considered with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. This document is available for viewing online on the Council's website. Generally, the sites identified for allocation are not expected to have a significant impact on air pollution as the sites are in close proximity to the existing urban areas, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths. In combination this has the potential to reduce the reliance on the private car and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling.</p>	
789	Paul	Allard	GB11	Due to the high car usage in the area, traffic levels will significantly increase if the proposals are approved. This will increase pollution, the cost of maintaining the roads and the number of accident and road deaths. The existing roads are in a poor condition and can not cope with the existing traffic.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The current condition and maintenance of the road network is not a planning issue. Planning Policy would recommend highlighting this matter to the County Highways Authority.</p> <p>The potential increase in pollution has been considered with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. This document is available for viewing online on the Council's website. Generally, the sites identified for allocation are not expected to have a significant impact on air pollution as the sites are in close proximity to the existing urban areas, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths. In combination this has the potential to reduce the reliance on the private car and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB14	Due to the high car usage in the area, traffic levels will significantly increase if the proposals are approved. This will increase pollution, the cost of maintaining the roads and the number of accident and road deaths. The existing roads are in a poor condition and can not cope with the existing traffic.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The current condition and maintenance of the road network is not a planning issue. Planning Policy would recommend highlighting this matter to the County Highways Authority.</p> <p>The potential increase in pollution has been considered with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. This document is available for viewing online on the Council's website. Generally, the sites identified for allocation are not expected to have a significant impact on air pollution as the sites are in close proximity to the existing urban areas, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths. In combination this has the potential to reduce the reliance on the private car and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling.</p>	
789	Paul	Allard	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. Other roads are very narrow and will struggle to cope with additional traffic. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. Other roads are very narrow and will struggle to cope with additional traffic. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. Other roads are very narrow and will struggle to cope with additional traffic. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
789	Paul	Allard	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. Other roads are very narrow and will struggle to cope with additional traffic. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.		footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
789	Paul	Allard	GB14	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. Other roads are very narrow and will struggle to cope with additional traffic. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify sites for allocation, with sites in the urban area considered before the Green Belt. No urban sites have been considered, and doubts the validity of there being no other sites across the whole Borough that are identified or suitable. Where no sites are available in the urban area, priority will be given to edge of centre sites with good access to jobs, shops and infrastructure. Mayford does not satisfy this criteria.	None stated.	There has been a thorough assessment of reasonable alternative sites to inform the selection of preferred sites, including this one. This is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 4.0, 9.0, and 11.0. There is potential for improvements to local infrastructure and services in Mayford, as outlined in Section 3.0 of Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Further to this, there is the opportunity at Site GB9 Egley Road Garden Centre to provide an element of small scale retail and/or community development, to enhance the currently rather dispersed provision in the Mayford area, and better meet the day to day needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common, a SSSI, used for leisure purposes. Any increase in the present Traveller site would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife due to domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB8	Appalled by the state of roads in Surrey, which cannot cope with the volume of traffic they are currently exposed to and will not cope with additional traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB9	Appalled by the state of roads in Surrey, which cannot cope with the volume of traffic they are currently exposed to and will not cope with additional traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB10	Appalled by the state of roads in Surrey, which cannot cope with the volume of traffic they are currently exposed to and will not cope with additional traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB11	Appalled by the state of roads in Surrey, which cannot cope with the volume of traffic they are currently exposed to and will not cope with additional traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB14	Appalled by the state of roads in Surrey, which cannot cope with the volume of traffic they are currently exposed to and will not cope with additional traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1463	Anita	Allard	GB8	Nearly all journeys around Mayford are made in motorised transport due to the lack of amenities (just a post office, barbers and pub) within walking distance and because the roads are unsuitable and dangerous to pedestrians due to a lack of footpaths. When there is ice and snow roads are not gritted, meaning cars skid and making walking, particularly with children very dangerous. Any existing footpaths are the most unused of anywhere I have lived.	None stated.	<p>This representation's points about traffic have been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Section 3.0 also outlines the Council's general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposed allocations. The County Council will be made aware of safety issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations. With regard to the lack of local amenities and reliance on motorised transport, the proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. This shows the potential for the proposed allocations to improve the situation in terms of local amenities and infrastructure, rather than having a negative impact, as suggested.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB9	Nearly all journeys around Mayford are made in motorised transport due to the lack of amenities (just a post office, barbers and pub) within walking distance and because the roads are unsuitable and dangerous to pedestrians due to a lack of footpaths. When there is ice and snow roads are not gritted, meaning cars skid and making walking, particularly with children very dangerous. Any existing footpaths are the most unused of anywhere I have lived.	None stated.	<p>This representation's points about traffic have been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Section 3.0 also outlines the Council's general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposed allocations. The County Council will be made aware of safety issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations. With regard to the lack of local amenities and reliance on motorised transport, the proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. This shows the potential for the proposed allocations to improve the situation in terms of local amenities and infrastructure, rather than having a negative impact, as suggested.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB10	Nearly all journeys around Mayford are made in motorised transport due to the lack of amenities (just a post office, barbers and pub) within walking distance and because the roads are unsuitable and dangerous to pedestrians due to a lack of footpaths. When there is ice and snow roads are not gritted, meaning cars skid and making walking, particularly with children very dangerous. Any existing footpaths are the most unused of anywhere I have lived.	None stated.	<p>This representation's points about traffic have been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Section 3.0 also outlines the Council's general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposed allocations. The County Council will be made aware of safety issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations. With regard to the lack of local amenities and reliance on motorised transport, the proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. This shows the potential for the proposed allocations to improve the situation in terms of local amenities and infrastructure, rather than having a negative impact, as suggested.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB11	Nearly all journeys around Mayford are made in motorised transport due to the lack of amenities (just a post office, barbers and pub) within walking distance and because the roads are unsuitable and dangerous to pedestrians due to a lack of footpaths. When there is ice and snow roads are not gritted, meaning cars skid and making walking, particularly with children very dangerous. Any existing footpaths are the most unused of anywhere I have lived.	None stated.	<p>This representation's points about traffic have been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Section 3.0 also outlines the Council's general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposed allocations. The County Council will be made aware of safety issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations. With regard to the lack of local amenities and reliance on motorised transport, the proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. This shows the potential for the proposed allocations to improve the situation in terms of local amenities and infrastructure, rather than having a negative impact, as suggested.	
1463	Anita	Allard	GB14	Nearly all journeys around Mayford are made in motorised transport due to the lack of amenities (just a post office, barbers and pub) within walking distance and because the roads are unsuitable and dangerous to pedestrians due to a lack of footpaths. When there is ice and snow roads are not gritted, meaning cars skid and making walking, particularly with children very dangerous. Any existing footpaths are the most unused of anywhere I have lived.	None stated.	<p>This representation's points about traffic have been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Section 3.0 also outlines the Council's general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposed allocations. The County Council will be made aware of safety issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations. With regard to the lack of local amenities and reliance on motorised transport, the proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. This shows the potential for the proposed allocations to improve the situation in terms of local amenities and infrastructure, rather than having a negative impact, as suggested.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB8	Outlines the perfect balance between town and country living that Mayford has, and how its open space, wildlife and greenery are priceless in the current industrialised world. There is a enormous benefit of this open space and tranquillity to well being. There would be a huge loss for this to be taken away. The proposals obliterate this space and irrevocably destroy the area.	None stated.	<p>The reasons for this objection are noted. However, there is a real need to provide significant levels of additional housing in the Borough, and not enough urban area land remaining to deliver this. This point is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0, 11.0, 21.0 and 23.0 (Section 7 may also be of interest). In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB9	Outlines the perfect balance between town and country living that Mayford has, and how its open space, wildlife and greenery are priceless in the current industrialised world. There is a enormous benefit of this open space and tranquillity to well being. There would be a huge loss for this to be taken away. The proposals obliterate this space and irrevocably destroy the area.	None stated.	<p>The reasons for this objection are noted. However, there is a real need to provide significant levels of additional housing in the Borough, and not enough urban area land remaining to deliver this. This point is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0, 11.0, 21.0 and 23.0 (Section 7 may also be of interest). In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
1463	Anita	Allard	GB10	<p>Outlines the perfect balance between town and country living that Mayford has, and how its open space, wildlife and greenery are priceless in the current industrialised world. There is a enormous benefit of this open space and tranquillity to well being. There would be a huge loss for this to be taken away. The proposals obliterate this space and irrevocably destroy the area.</p>	None stated.	<p>The reasons for this objection are noted. However, there is a real need to provide significant levels of additional housing in the Borough, and not enough urban area land remaining to deliver this. This point is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0, 11.0, 21.0 and 23.0 (Section 7 may also be of interest). In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB11	<p>Outlines the perfect balance between town and country living that Mayford has, and how its open space, wildlife and greenery are priceless in the current industrialised world. There is a enormous benefit of this open space and tranquillity to well being. There would be a huge loss for this to be taken away. The proposals obliterate this space and irrevocably destroy the area.</p>	None stated.	<p>The reasons for this objection are noted. However, there is a real need to provide significant levels of additional housing in the Borough, and not enough urban area land remaining to deliver this. This point is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0, 11.0, 21.0 and 23.0 (Section 7 may also be of interest). In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
1463	Anita	Allard	GB14	<p>Outlines the perfect balance between town and country living that Mayford has, and how its open space, wildlife and greenery are priceless in the current industrialised world. There is a enormous benefit of this open space and tranquillity to well being. There would be a huge loss for this to be taken away. The proposals obliterate this space and irrevocably destroy the area.</p>	None stated.	<p>The reasons for this objection are noted. However, there is a real need to provide significant levels of additional housing in the Borough, and not enough urban area land remaining to deliver this. This point is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0, 11.0, 21.0 and 23.0 (Section 7 may also be of interest). In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB7	<p>Outlines the perfect balance between town and country living that Mayford has, and how its open space, wildlife and greenery are priceless in the current industrialised world. There is a enormous benefit of this open space and tranquillity to well being. There would be a huge loss for this to be taken away. The proposals obliterate this space and irrevocably destroy the area.</p>	None stated.	<p>The reasons for this objection are noted. However, there is a real need to provide significant levels of additional housing, and unfortunately not enough urban area sites remaining to deliver this. This point is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0, 21.0 and 23.0 (Section 7 may also be of interest). In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
1463	Anita	Allard	GB8	The sports centre proposed will amplify concerns raised due to the additional volume of people and traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB8	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB9	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB10	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB11	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB14	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB8	There will be a significant impact from noise and light pollution from the sports centre. The open spaces of Mayford are valued as a positive, valued life enhancing feature in the day and equally at night for the quiet and darkness this provides. Concerned about husband's condition (being unable to sleep without medication) if this development proceeds.	None stated.	Regarding noise and light pollution, the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. There are further detailed policies on noise and light pollution in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB7	The Sustainability Impact Assessment's analysis regarding 'Personal safety and reduced fear of crime' is flawed. An uninhabited area has no crime. Crime exists because of people and therefore the introduction of new dwellings on the scale being proposed will unquestionably increase the probability of crime. The refusal to acknowledge this in official documents throws into question the accuracy of the other assessments made.	None stated.	It is also widely known that increasing surveillance can help to reduce crime. This may be from an increased population, and through carefully designed development. The concept of 'Designing out Crime' has an important role to play in preventing crime and reducing criminal activity, and is promoted by the Home Office and the police. Any development will be built to the high design and environmental standards outlined in Council's Core Strategy. The draft DPD is based on robust evidence, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 8.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB8	The Sustainability Impact Assessment's analysis regarding 'Personal safety and reduced fear of crime' is flawed. An uninhabited area has no crime. Crime exists because of people and therefore the introduction of new dwellings on the scale being proposed will unquestionably increase the	None stated.	It is also widely known that increasing surveillance can help to reduce crime. This may be from an increased population, and through carefully designed development. The concept of 'Designing out Crime' has an important role to play in preventing crime and reducing criminal activity, and is promoted by the Home Office and the police. Any development will be built to the high design and environmental standards outlined in Council's Core Strategy. The draft	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				probability of crime. The refusal to acknowledge this in official documents throws into question the accuracy of the other assessments made.		DPD is based on robust evidence, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 8.0.	
1463	Anita	Allard	GB9	The Sustainability Impact Assessment's analysis regarding 'Personal safety and reduced fear of crime' is flawed. An uninhabited area has no crime. Crime exists because of people and therefore the introduction of new dwellings on the scale being proposed will unquestionably increase the probability of crime. The refusal to acknowledge this in official documents throws into question the accuracy of the other assessments made.	None stated.	It is also widely known that increasing surveillance can help to reduce crime. This may be from an increased population, and through carefully designed development. The concept of 'Designing out Crime' has an important role to play in preventing crime and reducing criminal activity, and is promoted by the Home Office and the police. Any development will be built to the high design and environmental standards outlined in Council's Core Strategy. The draft DPD is based on robust evidence, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 8.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB10	The Sustainability Impact Assessment's analysis regarding 'Personal safety and reduced fear of crime' is flawed. An uninhabited area has no crime. Crime exists because of people and therefore the introduction of new dwellings on the scale being proposed will unquestionably increase the probability of crime. The refusal to acknowledge this in official documents throws into question the accuracy of the other assessments made.	None stated.	It is also widely known that increasing surveillance can help to reduce crime. This may be from an increased population, and through carefully designed development. The concept of 'Designing out Crime' has an important role to play in preventing crime and reducing criminal activity, and is promoted by the Home Office and the police. Any development will be built to the high design and environmental standards outlined in Council's Core Strategy. The draft DPD is based on robust evidence, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 8.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB11	The Sustainability Impact Assessment's analysis regarding 'Personal safety and reduced fear of crime' is flawed. An uninhabited area has no crime. Crime exists because of people and therefore the introduction of new dwellings on the scale being proposed will unquestionably increase the probability of crime. The refusal to acknowledge this in official documents throws into question the accuracy of the other assessments made.	None stated.	It is also widely known that increasing surveillance can help to reduce crime. This may be from an increased population, and through carefully designed development. The concept of 'Designing out Crime' has an important role to play in preventing crime and reducing criminal activity, and is promoted by the Home Office and the police. Any development will be built to the high design and environmental standards outlined in Council's Core Strategy. The draft DPD is based on robust evidence, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 8.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB14	The Sustainability Impact Assessment's analysis regarding 'Personal safety and reduced fear of crime' is flawed. An uninhabited area has no crime. Crime exists because of people and therefore the introduction of new dwellings on the scale being proposed will unquestionably increase the probability of crime. The refusal to acknowledge this in official documents throws into question the accuracy of the other assessments made.	None stated.	It is also widely known that increasing surveillance can help to reduce crime. This may be from an increased population, and through carefully designed development. The concept of 'Designing out Crime' has an important role to play in preventing crime and reducing criminal activity, and is promoted by the Home Office and the police. Any development will be built to the high design and environmental standards outlined in Council's Core Strategy. The draft DPD is based on robust evidence, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 8.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB7	Having worked hard to earn the money needed to buy their house, find it insulting that the council would provide free land for travellers. Travelling is a lifestyle choice that is incompatible with 20th century life. If the Council really needs to provide land for this group of society to meet government or EU led diversity targets, the land should be far away from the rest of the community as the majority of people do not want travellers living anywhere near them. The Council is an elected body that should serve the wishes of the people that elected them.	None stated.	The Council does not advocate segregation of travellers from the rest of the Borough's residents, as put forward by the representor, which in itself would add to social exclusion and create further issues. The Council seeks to promote fair and equal treatment of Travellers, in line with Government guidance. In this document, this is taken forward through identification of sites to meet need for Traveller pitches. It is similar (and equal) to the Council's approach to identifying sites to meet more general housing need in the Borough. This approach is detailed further in Section 4.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB7	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development. Enjoys seeing deer, rabbits and heron in the garden. Please save our precious British wildlife.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						adverse effects prior to approval of the development. None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	
1463	Anita	Allard	GB8	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development. Enjoys seeing deer, rabbits and heron in the garden. Please save our precious British wildlife.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB9	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development. Enjoys seeing deer, rabbits and heron in the garden. Please save our precious British wildlife.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB10	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development. Enjoys seeing deer, rabbits and heron in the garden. Please save our precious British wildlife.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. None of the proposed allocated sites are	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	
1463	Anita	Allard	GB11	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development. Enjoys seeing deer, rabbits and heron in the garden. Please save our precious British wildlife.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3, and for further background, Section 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12. The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and current supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB7	Please reconsider your plans, which are excessive and will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village and as a perfectly balanced area. They will negatively effect quality of life through increase traffic, noise and light pollution and more strain on already overstretched amenities. While understanding the need to cater for a growing population, the Council should maintain the quality of life for existing residents. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 21.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. On noise and light pollution, the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. There are further detailed policies on noise and light pollution in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB8	Please reconsider your plans, which are excessive and will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village and as a perfectly balanced area. They will negatively effect quality of life through increase traffic, noise and light pollution and more strain on already overstretched amenities. While understanding the need to cater for a growing population, the Council should maintain the quality of life for existing residents. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 21.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. On noise and light pollution, the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. There are further detailed policies on noise and light pollution in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB9	Please reconsider your plans, which are excessive and will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village and as a perfectly balanced area. They will negatively effect quality of life through increase traffic, noise and light pollution and more strain on already overstretched amenities. While understanding the need to cater for a growing population, the Council should maintain the quality of life for existing	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 21.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. On noise and light pollution, the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				residents. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.		the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. There are further detailed policies on noise and light pollution in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	
1463	Anita	Allard	GB10	Please reconsider your plans, which are excessive and will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village and as a perfectly balanced area. They will negatively effect quality of life through increase traffic, noise and light pollution and more strain on already overstretched amenities. While understanding the need to cater for a growing population, the Council should maintain the quality of life for existing residents. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 21.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. On noise and light pollution, the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. There are further detailed policies on noise and light pollution in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB11	Please reconsider your plans, which are excessive and will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village and as a perfectly balanced area. They will negatively effect quality of life through increase traffic, noise and light pollution and more strain on already overstretched amenities. While understanding the need to cater for a growing population, the Council should maintain the quality of life for existing residents. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 21.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. On noise and light pollution, the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. There are further detailed policies on noise and light pollution in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB14	Please reconsider your plans, which are excessive and will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village and as a perfectly balanced area. They will negatively effect quality of life through increase traffic, noise and light pollution and more strain on already overstretched amenities. While understanding the need to cater for a growing population, the Council should maintain the quality of life for existing residents. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 21.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. On noise and light pollution, the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. There are further detailed policies on noise and light pollution in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB7	Objects to the proposal. Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0. With regard to the justification for the development in a Green Belt location, this is addressed in Sections 1.0. and 4.0 (paragraph 4.3) of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB8	The fact that 99% journeys require motorised transport mean that traffic will increase significantly if the plans are approved. This will increase pollution, the cost of maintaining already poor quality roads and the number of accidents and road deaths.	None stated.	With regard to the reliance on motorised transport, the proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. This shows the potential for the proposed allocations to reduce the need to use motorised transport to access local amenities and infrastructure. This representation's points about traffic have been	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The County Council will be made aware of safety and road maintenance issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations.	
1463	Anita	Allard	GB9	The fact that 99% journeys require motorised transport mean that traffic will increase significantly if the plans are approved. This will increase pollution, the cost of maintaining already poor quality roads and the number of accidents and road deaths.	None stated.	<p>With regard to the reliance on motorised transport, the proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. This shows the potential for the proposed allocations to reduce the need to use motorised transport to access local amenities and infrastructure. This representation's points about traffic have been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The County Council will be made aware of safety and road maintenance issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB10	The fact that 99% journeys require motorised transport mean that traffic will increase significantly if the plans are approved. This will increase pollution, the cost of maintaining already poor quality roads and the number of accidents and road deaths.	None stated.	<p>With regard to the reliance on motorised transport, the proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. This shows the potential for the proposed allocations to reduce the need to use motorised transport to access local amenities and infrastructure. This representation's points about traffic have been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The County Council will be made aware of safety and road maintenance issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB11	The fact that 99% journeys require motorised transport mean that traffic will increase significantly if the plans are approved. This will increase pollution, the cost of maintaining already poor quality roads and the number of accidents and road deaths.	None stated.	<p>With regard to the reliance on motorised transport, the proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. This shows the potential for the proposed allocations to reduce the need to use motorised transport to access local amenities and infrastructure. This representation's points about traffic have been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The County Council will be made aware of safety and road maintenance issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB14	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (many of which have no pavements) or railway bridges (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station. The narrow roads make it difficult for cars travelling in opposite directions to pass, and also make access for emergency vehicles difficult. The additional traffic resulting from these plans would cause	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				severe back logs at such narrow points.			
1463	Anita	Allard	GB8	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (many of which have no pavements) or railway bridges (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station. The narrow roads make it difficult for cars travelling in opposite directions to pass, and also make access for emergency vehicles difficult. The additional traffic resulting from these plans would cause severe back logs at such narrow points.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB9	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (many of which have no pavements) or railway bridges (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station. The narrow roads make it difficult for cars travelling in opposite directions to pass, and also make access for emergency vehicles difficult. The additional traffic resulting from these plans would cause severe back logs at such narrow points.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB10	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (many of which have no pavements) or railway bridges (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station. The narrow roads make it difficult for cars travelling in opposite directions to pass, and also make access for emergency vehicles difficult. The additional traffic resulting from these plans would cause severe back logs at such narrow points.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1463	Anita	Allard	GB11	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (many of which have no pavements) or railway bridges (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station. The narrow roads make it difficult for cars travelling in opposite directions to pass, and also make access for emergency vehicles difficult. The additional traffic resulting from these plans would cause severe back logs at such narrow points.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
124	Matt	Allen	GB13	The impact to traffic on country roads. Develop just one site in Pyrford.	Instead of both sites just have one	The comment is noted. Sites GB12 and GB13 are both needed to contribute towards meet the housing requirement of the area. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	
124	Matt	Allen	GB13	The impact of development on local services and water supply. Develop just one site in Pyrford.	Instead of both sites just have one	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve development is addressed comprehensively in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB10	Mayford lacks facilities such as doctors or dentists.	Please reconsider your plans	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the development is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB11	Mayford lacks facilities such as doctors or dentists.	Please reconsider your plans	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the development is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB14	Mayford lacks facilities such as doctors or dentists.	Please reconsider your plans	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the development is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB8	Mayford lacks facilities such as doctors or dentists.	Please reconsider your plans	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the development is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB9	Mayford lacks facilities such as doctors or dentists.	Please reconsider your plans	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the development is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	Please reconsider your plans	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB9	The supply of brownfield sites has not been fully utilised; this should be the Council's first option. Please reconsider your plans, once lost Green Belt can never be replenished.	Please reconsider your plans	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB10	The supply of brownfield sites has not been fully utilised; this should be the Council's first option. Please reconsider your plans, once lost Green Belt can never be replenished.	Please reconsider your plans	The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield in the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. The issue is addressed in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. The justification for the release of Green Belt sites is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
213	Linda	Allen	GB11	The supply of brownfield sites has not been fully utilised; this should be the Council's first option. Please reconsider your plans, once lost Green Belt can never be replenished.	Please reconsider your plans	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land in the urban area to meet the development needs of the entire plan period. This particular matter has been addressed in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB8	The supply of brownfield sites has not been fully utilised; this should be the Council's first option. Please reconsider your plans, once lost Green Belt can never be replenished.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB14	The supply of brownfield sites has not been fully utilised; this should be the Council's first option. Please reconsider your plans, once lost Green Belt can never be replenished.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB10	The impact on the community would be immense - additional traffic on roads already at a standstill at peak times. Mayford has poor public transport provision, residents have to use their cars to access the town centre and station. Saunders Lane and Hook Hill lane are both narrow and there are no pavements.	Please reconsider your plans	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB11	The impact on the community would be immense - additional traffic on roads already at a standstill at peak times. Mayford has poor public transport provision, residents have to use their cars to access the town centre and station. Saunders Lane and Hook Hill lane are both narrow and there are no pavements.	Please reconsider your plans	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB14	The impact on the community would be immense - additional traffic on roads already at a standstill at peak times. Mayford has poor public transport provision, residents have to use	Please reconsider your plans	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				their cars to access the town centre and station. Saunders Lane and Hook Hill lane are both narrow and there are no pavements.		that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
213	Linda	Allen	GB8	The impact on the community would be immense - additional traffic on roads already at a standstill at peak times. Mayford has poor public transport provision, residents have to use their cars to access the town centre and station. Saunders Lane and Hook Hill lane are both narrow and there are no pavements.	Please reconsider your plans	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB9	The impact on the community would be immense - additional traffic on roads already at a standstill at peak times. Mayford has poor public transport provision, residents have to use their cars to access the town centre and station. Saunders Lane and Hook Hill lane are both narrow and there are no pavements.	Please reconsider your plans	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. There are measures that can be introduced to control the movement of HGVs on particular roads. This will apply if it is deemed necessary. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB10	Mayford's green spaces soak up rainwater and alleviate potential flooding along the Hoe Stream. New housing would create more hard landscaping and increase run off to the surrounding area.	Please reconsider your plans	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the proposals will put occupants of the development at any risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the proposals. The proposals are sufficiently informed by robust and adequate evidence base, including a sequential test.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB11	Mayford's green spaces soak up rainwater and alleviate potential flooding along the Hoe Stream. New housing would create more hard landscaping and increase run off to the surrounding area.	Please reconsider your plans	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the proposals will put occupants of the development at any risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the proposals. The proposals are sufficiently informed by robust and adequate evidence base, including a sequential test.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
213	Linda	Allen	GB14	Mayford's green spaces soak up rainwater and alleviate potential flooding along the Hoe Stream. New housing would create more hard landscaping and increase run off to the surrounding area.	Please reconsider your plans	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the proposals will put occupants of the development at any risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the proposals. The proposals are sufficiently informed by robust and adequate evidence base, including a sequential test.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB8	Mayford's green spaces soak up rainwater and alleviate potential flooding along the Hoe Stream. New housing would create more hard landscaping and increase run off to the surrounding area.	Please reconsider your plans	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the proposals will put occupants of the development at any risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the proposals. The proposals are sufficiently informed by robust and adequate evidence base, including a sequential test.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB9	Mayford's green spaces soak up rainwater and alleviate potential flooding along the Hoe Stream. New housing would create more hard landscaping and increase run off to the surrounding area.	Please reconsider your plans	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the proposals will put occupants of the development at any risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the proposals. The proposals are sufficiently informed by robust and adequate evidence base, including a sequential test.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB10	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. These would mean that any green space remaining between Woking and Mayford would be eliminated.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land, including the safeguarded sites to meet future development needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the landscape sensitivity of the sites to accommodate the proposals. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not significantly undermine the overall character of Mayford. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals will also not significantly affect the physical separation between Mayford and Woking and/or Guildford. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Furthermore, the character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB11	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. These would mean that any green space remaining between Woking and Mayford would be eliminated.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land, including the safeguarded sites to meet future development needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the landscape sensitivity of the sites to accommodate the proposals. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not significantly undermine the overall character of Mayford. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals will also not significantly affect the physical separation between Mayford and Woking and/or Guildford. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Furthermore, the character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB14	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. These would mean that any green space remaining between Woking and Mayford would be eliminated.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land, including the safeguarded sites to meet future development needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the landscape sensitivity of the sites to accommodate the proposals. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not significantly undermine the overall character of Mayford. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals will also not significantly affect the physical separation between Mayford and Woking and/or Guildford. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Furthermore, the character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB8	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. These would mean that any green space remaining between Woking and Mayford would be eliminated.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land, including the safeguarded sites to meet future development needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the landscape sensitivity of the sites to accommodate the proposals. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not significantly undermine the overall character of Mayford. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals will also not significantly affect the physical separation between Mayford and Woking and/or Guildford. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Furthermore, the character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
213	Linda	Allen	GB9	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. These would mean that any green space remaining between Woking and Mayford would be eliminated.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land, including the safeguarded sites to meet future development needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the landscape sensitivity of the sites to accommodate the proposals. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not significantly undermine the overall character of Mayford. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals will also not significantly affect the physical separation between Mayford and Woking and/or Guildford. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Furthermore, the character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB7	Proposals would result in the merging of Woking and Guildford. The distinct character of Mayford will be lost. The sites fulfil the purpose of the GB perfectly, development will erode the 'Lungs of London'.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
353	R	Allen	GB8	Proposals would result in the merging of Woking and Guildford. The distinct character of Mayford will be lost. The sites fulfil the purpose of the GB perfectly, development will erode the 'Lungs of London'.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB10	Proposals would result in the merging of Woking and Guildford. The distinct character of Mayford will be lost. The sites fulfil the purpose of the GB perfectly, development will erode the 'Lungs of London'.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB11	Proposals would result in the merging of Woking and Guildford. The distinct character of Mayford will be lost. The sites fulfil the purpose of the GB perfectly, development will erode the 'Lungs of London'.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB8	The roads are at capacity, particularly during rush hour. The network cannot manage with the increase in traffic from proposals. This would also result in more noise and pollution from extra vehicles.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0. See also paragraph 1.5 The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network and the environment. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. The Core Strategy and emerging Development Management Policies DPD sets out robust policy requirements for managing the impacts of development, including pollution. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB10	The roads are at capacity, particularly during rush hour. The network cannot manage with the increase in traffic from proposals. This would also result in more noise and pollution from extra vehicles.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0. See also paragraph 1.5 The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network and the environment. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. The Core Strategy and emerging Development Management Policies DPD sets out robust policy requirements for managing the impacts of development, including pollution. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB11	The roads are at capacity, particularly during rush hour. The network cannot manage with the increase in traffic from proposals. This would also result in more noise and pollution from extra vehicles.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0. See also paragraph 1.5 The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network and the environment. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. The Core Strategy and emerging Development Management Policies DPD sets out robust policy requirements for managing the impacts of development, including pollution. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB8	The infrastructure in Mayford cannot support the proposed increase in population. There are limited services and facilities, lack of school places, and public transport is limited.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
353	R	Allen	GB10	The infrastructure in Mayford cannot support the proposed increase in population. There are limited services and facilities, lack of school places, and public transport is limited.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB11	The infrastructure in Mayford cannot support the proposed increase in population. There are limited services and facilities, lack of school places, and public transport is limited.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB7	The sites proximity to Smarts Heath Common threatens local wildlife and the use of the area for leisure	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
353	R	Allen	GB7	Object to proposals to remove sites from the GB. It is considered totally wrong. Concerned that the proposals will permanently damage the semi-rural character of the area. ...proposals would result in Woking and Guildford merging and the creation of a large unattractive urban metropolis (example: Redhill) ...Mayford is a beautiful, quiet village that is valuable to the Borough and should remain for future generations	None stated.	Whilst, the representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9, 12.0 and 23.0. The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB8	Object to proposals to remove sites from the GB. It is considered totally wrong. Concerned that the proposals will permanently damage the semi-rural character of the area. ...proposals would result in Woking and Guildford merging and the creation of a large unattractive urban metropolis (example: Redhill) ...Mayford is a beautiful, quiet village that is valuable to the Borough and should remain for future generations	None stated.	Whilst, the representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9, 12.0 and 23.0. The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB10	Object to proposals to remove sites from the GB. It is considered totally wrong. Concerned that the proposals will permanently damage the semi-rural character of the area. ...proposals would result in Woking and Guildford merging and the creation of a large unattractive urban metropolis (example: Redhill) ...Mayford is a beautiful, quiet village that is valuable to the Borough and should remain for future generations	None stated.	Whilst, the representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9, 12.0 and 23.0. The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB11	Object to proposals to remove sites from the GB. It is considered totally wrong. Concerned that the proposals will permanently damage the semi-rural character of the area. ...proposals would result in Woking and Guildford merging and the creation of a large unattractive urban metropolis (example: Redhill) ...Mayford is a beautiful, quiet village that is valuable to the Borough and should remain for future generations	None stated.	Whilst, the representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9, 12.0 and 23.0. The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB8	The GBBR assessments are flawed. The journey between Mayford and Woking takes longer than several minutes. The assessment is inaccurate and the methodology is naïve. There are concerns that the research has not been carried out thoroughly.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB10	The GBBR assessments are flawed. The journey between Mayford and Woking takes longer than several minutes. The assessment is inaccurate and the methodology is naïve. There are concerns that the research has not been carried out thoroughly.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB11	The GBBR assessments are flawed. The journey between Mayford and Woking takes longer than several minutes. The assessment is inaccurate and the methodology is naïve. There are concerns that the research has not been carried out thoroughly.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB8	Proposals will have an impact on the local environment. Smarts Heath and Prey Heath are protected areas of natural beauty, with a variety of flora and fauna. Development on the site will destroy these	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0 In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	
353	R	Allen	GB10	Proposals will have an impact on the local environment. Smarts Heath and Prey Heath are protected areas of natural beauty, with a variety of flora and fauna. Development on the site will destroy these	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB11	Proposals will have an impact on the local environment. Smarts Heath and Prey Heath are protected areas of natural beauty, with a variety of flora and fauna. Development on the site will destroy these	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB7	Alternative solutions have not been sought e.g. urban and brownfield sites	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB7	Object to expansion of Ten Acre Farm, the area has made significant contribution towards the traveller community and there is no justification for further expansion	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB8	Building on GB is wrong and unnecessary, when brown field sites are available. On 10th July Business Secretary Sajid Javid himself stated on BBC Radio 4, "There's no need to build on the Green Belt; there's plenty of land that's not Green Belt that we can build on that is suitable for housing and we need to get on with it."	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly paragraph 1.9, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
353	R	Allen	GB10	Building on GB is wrong and unnecessary, when brown field sites are available. On 10th July Business Secretary Sajid Javid himself stated on BBC Radio 4, "There's no need to build on the Green Belt; there's plenty of land that's not Green Belt that we can build on that is suitable for housing and we need to get on with it."	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly paragraph 1.9, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
353	R	Allen	GB11	Building on GB is wrong and unnecessary, when brown field sites are available. On 10th July Business Secretary Sajid Javid himself stated on BBC Radio 4, "There's no need to build on the Green Belt; there's plenty of land that's not Green Belt that we can build on that is suitable for housing and we need to get on with it."	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly paragraph 1.9, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
393	Louise	Allen	UA29	Proposals demonstrate inadequate access routes. Existing residents already suffer from poor road conditions inc potholes on Hawthorn Rd and there a poor parking arrangements on Barnsbury estate. Further development will exacerbate problems.	None stated.	The key requirements for the proposal site requires effective access arrangement to ensure highway safety and to be suitably located away from existing residential dwellings to avoid noise and disruption. It also notes that major highways improvements are likely to be required. Please also see Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
393	Louise	Allen	UA28	Proposals demonstrate inadequate access routes. Existing residents already suffer from poor road conditions inc potholes on Hawthorn Rd and there a poor parking arrangements on Barnsbury estate. Further development will exacerbate problems.	None stated.	The key requirements for the proposal site requires effective access arrangement to ensure highway safety and to be suitably located away from existing residential dwellings to avoid noise and disruption. It also notes that major highways improvements are likely to be required. Please also see Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
393	Louise	Allen	UA28	Consider the Council is ignoring residents views and have not properly informed them of the consultation consider this to be poor and unprofessional	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0. The Council is satisfied that it has demonstrated professionalism throughout.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
393	Louise	Allen	UA29	Consider the Council is ignoring residents views and have not properly informed them of the consultation consider this to be poor and unprofessional	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0. The Council is satisfied that it has demonstrated professionalism throughout.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
393	Louise	Allen	UA28	Object to proposals in Barnsbury. Unclear how many properties will be built and the impact it will have on existing residents. Anticipates significant disruption during the construction stage (similar to existing disruption being experienced at present opposite the football grounds) Concerned about potential overlooking issues.	None stated.	The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
393	Louise	Allen	UA29	Object to proposals, which are likely to cause local residents significant disruption, particularly during the construction stage. E.g. disruption being experienced as a result of flats/houses across from Woking football grounds. Concern about potential overlooking.	None stated.	The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common, a SSSI, used for leisure purposes. Any increase in the present Traveller site would decrease the visual amenity and character of the areas and increase risk to wildlife due to domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	
604	Dee	Allen	GB7	A sequential approach should be adopted to identify suitable pitches, with brownfield site prioritised. No urban sites appear to have been considered in preference.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0 and 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB8	Laughable that the Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is due to ease of access to the town centre (7 minutes using Google maps). At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour, and for the much of the day is also much longer.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB9	Laughable that the Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is due to ease of access to the town centre (7 minutes using Google maps). At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour, and for the much of the day is also much longer.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB10	Laughable that the Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is due to ease of access to the town centre (7 minutes using Google maps). At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour, and for the much of the day is also much longer.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB11	Laughable that the Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is due to ease of access to the town centre (7 minutes using Google maps). At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour, and for the much of the day is also much longer.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB8	Daily gridlock will become a fact of life if these development go ahead. Further new homes being built at Mayford boundary (Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park) and the proposed school at Egley Road will further exacerbate the situation.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB9	Daily gridlock will become a fact of life if these development go ahead. Further new homes being built at Mayford boundary (Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park) and the proposed school at Egley Road will further exacerbate the situation.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB10	Daily gridlock will become a fact of life if these development go ahead. Further new homes being built at Mayford boundary (Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park) and the proposed school at Egley Road will further exacerbate the situation.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB11	Daily gridlock will become a fact of life if these development go ahead. Further new homes being built at Mayford boundary (Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park) and the proposed school at Egley Road will further exacerbate the situation.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB8	No evidence (independently verified) appears to have been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites in the borough as a viable alternative.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
604	Dee	Allen	GB9	No evidence (independently verified) appears to have been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites in the borough as a viable alternative.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB10	No evidence (independently verified) appears to have been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites in the borough as a viable alternative.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB11	No evidence (independently verified) appears to have been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites in the borough as a viable alternative.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB8	Concerned about impact on wildlife, not just on the developed sites but also on nearby protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heath). It is charming to walk around the area, with its abundant wildlife. Surely this is worth protecting for future generations?	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB9	Concerned about impact on wildlife, not just on the developed sites but also on nearby protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heath). It is charming to walk around the area, with its abundant wildlife. Surely this is worth protecting for future generations?	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB10	Concerned about impact on wildlife, not just on the developed sites but also on nearby protected heaths (Smarts	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				and Prey Heath). It is charming to walk around the area, with its abundant wildlife. Surely this is worth protecting for future generations?		<p>Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB11	Concerned about impact on wildlife, not just on the developed sites but also on nearby protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heath). It is charming to walk around the area, with its abundant wildlife. Surely this is worth protecting for future generations?	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB7	Troubled by the proposals that will impact the immediate area. Concerned that the Council has identified a disproportionate number of sites in Mayford, in relation to the whole borough, to remove from the Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Mayford are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB8	Troubled by the proposals that will impact the immediate area. Concerned that the Council has identified a disproportionate number of sites in Mayford, in relation to the whole borough, to remove from the Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Mayford are in sustainable locations (having regard to the infrastructure provision set out in Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper)</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.	
604	Dee	Allen	GB9	Troubled by the proposals that will impact the immediate area. Concerned that the Council has identified a disproportionate number of sites in Mayford, in relation to the whole borough, to remove from the Green Belt.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Mayford are in sustainable locations (having regard to the infrastructure provision set out in Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper) and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB10	Troubled by the proposals that will impact the immediate area. Concerned that the Council has identified a disproportionate number of sites in Mayford, in relation to the whole borough, to remove from the Green Belt.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Mayford are in sustainable locations (having regard to the infrastructure provision set out in Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper) and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB11	Troubled by the proposals that will impact the immediate area. Concerned that the Council has identified a disproportionate number of sites in Mayford, in relation to the whole borough, to remove from the Green Belt.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Mayford are in sustainable locations (having regard to the infrastructure provision set out in Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper) and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB7	Objects to the proposal. Mayford already has its fair share of traveller pitches.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB8	Mayford is a village, and other than a Post Office, barbers, two pub and garden centre, has no supporting infrastructure e.g. other shops, doctors, dentists, schools (except a special needs one).	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate healthcare provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure, including educational facilities, has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB9	Mayford is a village, and other than a Post Office, barbers, two pub and garden centre, has no supporting infrastructure e.g. other shops, doctors, dentists, schools (except a special needs one).	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate healthcare provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure, including educational facilities, has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	
604	Dee	Allen	GB10	Mayford is a village, and other than a Post Office, barbers, two pub and garden centre, has no supporting infrastructure e.g. other shops, doctors, dentists, schools (except a special needs one).	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate healthcare provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure, including educational facilities, has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB11	Mayford is a village, and other than a Post Office, barbers, two pub and garden centre, has no supporting infrastructure e.g. other shops, doctors, dentists, schools (except a special needs one).	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate healthcare provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure, including educational facilities, has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area. This sensible approach should be maintained and alternative, more suitable sites sought for travellers.	Find alternative, more suitable sites for travellers.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3, and for further background, Section 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12. Alternative sites are addressed in Section 4.0, paragraph 4.11 and Section 9.0. The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and current supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB8	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village and threatens to destroy a	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				very special part of Surrey. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.		In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB9	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village and threatens to destroy a very special part of Surrey. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB10	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village and threatens to destroy a very special part of Surrey. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB11	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village and threatens to destroy a very special part of Surrey. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB7	Together, the removal of these sites will have a profound effect on the character of the area, which despite a significant upswing in traffic and noise over the last two decades, is semi-rural, relatively peaceful and retains enough character to give it the village feel we enjoy.	None stated.	Comment noted. The issues it raises are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB8	Together, the removal of these sites will have a profound effect on the character of the area, which despite a significant upswing in traffic and noise over the last two decades, is semi-rural, relatively peaceful and retains enough character to give it the village feel we enjoy. The village is distinct and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB9	Together, the removal of these sites will have a profound effect on the character of the area, which despite a significant upswing in traffic and noise over the last two decades, is semi-rural, relatively peaceful and retains enough character to give it the village feel we enjoy. The village is distinct and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB10	Together, the removal of these sites will have a profound effect on the character of the area, which despite a significant upswing in traffic and noise over the last two decades, is semi-rural, relatively peaceful and retains enough character to give it the village feel we enjoy. The village is distinct and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB11	Together, the removal of these sites will have a profound effect on the character of the area, which despite a significant upswing in traffic and noise over the last two decades, is semi-rural, relatively peaceful and retains enough character to give it the village feel we enjoy. The village is distinct and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB8	Bus services are limited and the station car park is already full. Residents of new development would be isolated without a car.	None stated.	The existing bus provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	
604	Dee	Allen	GB9	Bus services are limited and the station car park is already full. Residents of new development would be isolated without a car.	None stated.	<p>The existing bus provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB10	Bus services are limited and the station car park is already full. Residents of new development would be isolated without a car.	None stated.	<p>The existing bus provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
604	Dee	Allen	GB11	Bus services are limited and the station car park is already full. Residents of new development would be isolated without a car.	None stated.	<p>The existing bus provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB7	The proposals threaten the village environment, and turn Mayford into a suburban corridor between Woking and Guildford, with no buffer between the two.	None stated.	Comment noted. The issues it raises are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 12.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB8	The proposals threaten the village environment and character, have no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, and would turn it into a suburban corridor between Woking and Guildford, with no buffer or 'green lung' between the two. The proposals increase the risk of Woking and Guildford merging, as the Green Belt between the two is already very slim and vulnerable. There is only 2 miles between the Slyfield industrial estate in Guildford and Mayford roundabout, and development would remove this.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 are all in parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and the northern edge of Guildford.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p> <p>It should be noted that most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB9	The proposals threaten the village environment and character, have no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, and would turn it into a suburban corridor between Woking and Guildford, with no buffer or 'green lung' between the two. The proposals increase the risk of Woking and Guildford merging, as the Green Belt between the two is already very slim and vulnerable. There is only 2 miles between the Slyfield industrial estate in Guildford and Mayford roundabout, and development would remove this.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 are all in parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and the northern edge of Guildford.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p> <p>It should be noted that most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	
604	Dee	Allen	GB10	The proposals threaten the village environment and character, have no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, and would turn it into a suburban corridor between Woking and Guildford, with no buffer or 'green lung' between the two. The proposals increase the risk of Woking and Guildford merging, as the Green Belt between the two is already very slim and vulnerable. There is only 2 miles between the Slyfield industrial estate in Guildford and Mayford roundabout, and development would remove this.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 are all in parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and the northern edge of Guildford.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p> <p>It should be noted that most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
604	Dee	Allen	GB11	The proposals threaten the village environment and character, have no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, and would turn it into a suburban corridor between Woking and Guildford, with no buffer or 'green lung' between the two. The proposals increase the risk of Woking and Guildford merging, as the Green Belt between the two is already very slim and vulnerable. There is only 2 miles between the Slyfield industrial estate in Guildford and Mayford roundabout, and development would remove this.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 are all in parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and the northern edge of Guildford.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p> <p>It should be noted that most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
808	Ray	Allen	GB4	Byfleet will be gridlocked	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
808	Ray	Allen	GB5	Byfleet will be gridlocked	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	
808	Ray	Allen	GB4	Flooding has affected a lot of the areas already	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
808	Ray	Allen	GB5	Flooding has affected a lot of the areas already	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
808	Ray	Allen	GB4	Green Belt land must be preserved	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
808	Ray	Allen	GB5	Green Belt land must be preserved	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
808	Ray	Allen	Sustainability Appraisal findings	No comment	None stated.	Not applicable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
969	Jim	Allen	GB5	Will spoil the view across the fields from St Mary's Church and create a separate community.	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0 and 23.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
969	Jim	Allen	GB4	Object to the loss of more Byfleet's limited Green Belt. Access is critical, Parvis Road is already overcrowded and Stream Close is inadequate and has limited opportunity for improvements.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding identifying brownfield sites for development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0. Nevertheless the Council will continue to assess sites as they are put forward for consideration. The representation notes that Oyster Lane and Chertsey Road are suitable for development. As there are no definitive site areas/boundaries noted in the representation, the Council can not assess the</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>site(s) for development. If more detailed information is provided during the Regulation 19 consultation then this will be considered by the Council.</p> <p>It should be noted that the housing need in the Borough can not be met by developing brownfield sites only. The Council has therefore followed national policy by identifying land in the Green Belt for future development needs. This is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p>	
969	Jim	Allen	SA Table Green Belt sites	Green Belt in Byfleet is limited and should therefore be preserved. Lack of brownfield sites in the village is not justification to remove Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
969	Jim	Allen	GB5	Green Belt areas in Byfleet are rare and therefore removal of Green Belt is unwelcome. Development, on a smaller scale, should be considered on forthcoming available brownfield sites.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding identifying brownfield sites for development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0. Nevertheless the Council will continue to assess sites as they are put forward for consideration. The representation notes that Oyster Lane and Chertsey Road are suitable for development. As there are no definitive site areas/boundaries noted in the representation, the Council can not assess the site(s) for development. If more detailed information is provided during the Regulation 19 consultation then this will be considered by the Council.</p> <p>It should be noted that the housing need in the Borough can not be met by developing brownfield sites only. The Council has therefore followed national policy by identifying land in the Green Belt for future development needs. This is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
969	Jim	Allen	GB5	This part of the village has poor infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
969	Jim	Allen	GB4	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Development, on a smaller scale, should be considered on forthcoming available brownfield sites.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
969	Jim	Allen	GB5	The site is located at a poor road junction. The road network, in particular the A245, is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
532	Luke	Allington	GB12	12 year old whose parent moved to Pyrford to be near the countryside. Loves wildlife and walking in the countryside and opens space, and is saddened and upset by the proposals. Outlines a vast array of wildlife spotted in the fields.	None stated.	<p>Comment noted. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
532	Luke	Allington	GB13	12 year old whose parent moved to Pyrford to be near the countryside. Loves wildlife and walking in the countryside and opens space, and is saddened and upset by the proposals. Outlines a vast array of wildlife spotted in the fields.	None stated.	<p>Comment noted. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
532	Luke	Allington	GB12	Enjoys the rural nature of the area, the fact that it is Green Belt and that there are no industrial sites. Would be saddened by the loss of fields for buildings, and the destruction of the habitats and lives of animals.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council is proposing to safeguard this site for residential development needs post 2027 and not for an industrial site.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>The representation regarding landscape impacts has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
532	Luke	Allington	GB13	Enjoys the rural nature of the area, the fact that it is Green Belt and that there are no industrial sites. Would be saddened by the loss of fields for buildings, and the destruction of the habitats and lives of animals.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council is proposing to safeguard this site for residential development needs post 2027 and not for an industrial site.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>The representation regarding landscape impacts has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p>	
1126	Giles Chrissy	Allington	GB12	Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl. Building is a step away from joining Pyrford to Ripley. We oppose building on this land.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the physical separation between Pyrford and any other town or village and/or compromise its identity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1126	Giles Chrissy	Allington	GB13	Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl. Building is a step away from joining Pyrford to Ripley. We oppose building on this land.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals will continue to retain the physical separation of Pyrford from other towns and villages. The are robust policies to make sure that the character and identity of Pyrford is retained.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1126	Giles Chrissy	Allington	GB12	I am emailing to voice our concerns over the plans. We moved to Pyrford to enjoy the countryside and often walk down the cornfield to the canal. It is sad to build housing on this, impacting infrastructure, community, resources, view and wildlife. The school is already oversubscribed. Traffic in the mornings can be horrendous.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1126	Giles Chrissy	Allington	GB13	I am emailing to voice our concerns over the plans. We moved to Pyrford to enjoy the countryside and often walk down the cornfield to the canal. It is sad to build housing on this, impacting infrastructure, community, resources, view and wildlife. The school is already oversubscribed. Traffic in the mornings can be horrendous.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area. The Council has relied on a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they support and justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	
627	Edward	Althans	GB12	Objects to the proposal, due to the loss of Green Belt, an attractive and valued feature of the area that had been identified as inappropriate for development. Loss of trees and views would damage the area's landscape.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, and as justification for the loss of Green Belt land Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
627	Edward	Althans	GB13	Objects to the proposal, due to the loss of Green Belt, an attractive and valued feature of the area that had been identified as inappropriate for development. Loss of trees and views would damage the area's landscape.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, and as justification for the loss of Green Belt land Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
627	Edward	Althans	GB12	Additional houses would detract from the existing village atmosphere.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
627	Edward	Althans	GB13	Additional houses would detract from the existing village atmosphere.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
627	Edward	Althans	GB12	Existing infrastructure would be unable to cope with additional demands i.e. lack of parking around the station and shops, severe damage, noise and nuisance to residential roads from increased parking.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. Noise would be dealt with as part of a potential Noise Impact Assessment, listed as a key requirement of the draft allocation, and would also need to meet the Council's policy requirements on noise, as set out in the Core Strategy (CS21) and in the detailed policy in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, scheduled for examination in May 2016. On parking, the Council sets specific requirements within its Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance, and has a policy framework for car parking (with regard to the locational characteristics of a site) in Core Strategy CS18. The Council's Parking Services Section also works to address specific car parking issues, to ensure there is adequate provision to meet the needs of visitors, shoppers, commuters and businesses in West Byfleet.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
627	Edward	Althans	GB13	Existing infrastructure would be unable to cope with additional demands i.e. lack of parking around the station and shops, severe damage, noise and nuisance to residential roads from increased parking.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. Noise would be dealt with as part of a potential Noise Impact Assessment, listed as a key requirement of the draft allocation, and would also need to meet the Council's policy requirements on noise, as set out in the Core Strategy (CS21) and in the detailed policy in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, scheduled for examination in May 2016. On parking, the Council sets specific requirements within its Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance, and has a policy framework for car parking (with regard to the locational characteristics of a site) in Core Strategy CS18. The Council's Parking Services Section also works to address specific car parking issues, to ensure there is adequate provision to meet the needs of visitors, shoppers, commuters and businesses in West Byfleet.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
627	Edward	Althans	GB12	The principal reason/attraction for existing residents moving to the area would be lost.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	
627	Edward	Althans	GB13	The principal reason/attraction for existing residents moving to the area would be lost.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
627	Edward	Althans	GB12	Traffic congestion and road safety would worsen due to additional road users. There would be permanent gridlock in Pyrford and West Byfleet, and no opportunity to address traffic issues.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
627	Edward	Althans	GB13	Traffic congestion and road safety would worsen due to additional road users. There would be permanent gridlock in Pyrford and West Byfleet, and no opportunity to address traffic issues.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
628	Anne	Althans	GB12	Objects to the proposal, due to the loss of Green Belt, an attractive and valued feature of the area that had been identified as inappropriate for development. Loss of trees and views would damage the area's landscape.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, and as justification for the loss of Green Belt land Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
628	Anne	Althans	GB13	Objects to the proposal, due to the loss of Green Belt, an attractive and valued feature of the area that had been identified as inappropriate for development. Loss of trees and views would damage the area's landscape.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, and as justification for the loss of Green Belt land Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
628	Anne	Althans	GB12	Additional houses would detract from the existing village atmosphere.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
628	Anne	Althans	GB13	Additional houses would detract from the existing village atmosphere.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
628	Anne	Althans	GB12	Existing infrastructure would be unable to cope with additional demands i.e. lack of parking around the station and shops, severe damage, noise and nuisance to residential roads from increased parking.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. Noise would be dealt with as part of a potential Noise Impact Assessment, listed as a key requirement of the draft allocation, and would also need to meet the Council's policy requirements on noise, as set out in the Core Strategy (CS21) and in the detailed policy in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, scheduled for examination in May 2016. On parking, the Council sets specific requirements within its Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance, and has a policy framework for car parking (with regard to the locational characteristics of a site) in Core Strategy CS18. The Council's Parking Services Section also works to address specific car parking issues, to ensure there is adequate provision to meet the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						needs of visitors, shoppers, commuters and businesses in West Byfleet.	
628	Anne	Althans	GB13	Existing infrastructure would be unable to cope with additional demands i.e. lack of parking around the station and shops, severe damage, noise and nuisance to residential roads from increased parking.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. Noise would be dealt with as part of a potential Noise Impact Assessment, listed as a key requirement of the draft allocation, and would also need to meet the Council's policy requirements on noise, as set out in the Core Strategy (CS21) and in the detailed policy in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, scheduled for examination in May 2016. On parking, the Council sets specific requirements within its Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance, and has a policy framework for car parking (with regard to the locational characteristics of a site) in Core Strategy CS18. The Council's Parking Services Section also works to address specific car parking issues, to ensure there is adequate provision to meet the needs of visitors, shoppers, commuters and businesses in West Byfleet.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
628	Anne	Althans	GB12	The principal reason/attraction for existing residents moving to the area would be lost.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
628	Anne	Althans	GB13	The principal reason/attraction for existing residents moving to the area would be lost.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
628	Anne	Althans	GB12	Traffic congestion and road safety would worsen due to additional road users. There would be permanent gridlock in Pyrford and West Byfleet, and no opportunity to address traffic issues.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
628	Anne	Althans	GB13	Traffic congestion and road safety would worsen due to additional road users. There would be permanent gridlock in Pyrford and West Byfleet, and no opportunity to address traffic issues.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1291	J.	Alun-Jones	GB8	Part of the site is PDL therefore some development is acceptable in principle, reference to para 89 NPPF. If the site is acceptable in planning policy terms then it should be considered for allocation to ensure full and efficient use of the land. This would ensure the longer term protection of more strategic areas of the GB.	Site suggestion	The representation did not provide any specific details regarding the area of land to be considered by the Council, although the representor states that it was submitted during previous call for sites and therefore it is likely that the site has been considered. The Council will consider any further information or site specific details that the representor wishes to present during the Regulation 19 consultation of the Site Allocations DPD. Provided this information is presented to the Council, it will assess the site through the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. However at this time the site can not be considered in further detail until additional information is provided by the representor. From the description provided, the general area appears to have been assessed under SHLAAMSG038 and falls under parcel 17 in the Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR). The GBBR found that any development in parcel 17 would relate poorly to the settlement pattern, that the area had low capacity for change and contained numerous absolute constraints.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1291	J.	Alun-Jones	GB8	Should that allocation be made, it will be necessary for the GB boundary to be revised to include the land. This would still ensure a sound and defensible boundary is maintained	Site suggestion	The representation did not provide any specific details regarding the area of land to be considered by the Council, although the representor states that it was submitted during previous call for sites and therefore it is likely that the site has been considered. The Council will consider any further information or site specific details that the representor wishes to present during the Regulation 19 consultation of the Site Allocations DPD. Provided this information is presented to the Council, it will assess the site through the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. However at this time the site can not be considered in further detail until additional information is provided by the representor. From the description provided, the general area appears to have been assessed under SHLAAMSG038 and falls under parcel 17 in the Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR). The GBBR found that any development in parcel 17 would relate poorly to the settlement pattern, that the area had low capacity for change and contained numerous absolute constraints.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1291	J.	Alun-Jones	GB8	Proposals should be amended to include land to the north (client's land) and for policy to make provision for additional traveller pitches together with residential development on the northern part of the site.	Site suggestion	<p>The representation did not provide any specific details regarding the area of land to be considered by the Council, although the representor states that it was submitted during previous call for sites and therefore it is likely that the site has been considered. The Council will consider any further information or site specific details that the representor wishes to present during the Regulation 19 consultation of the Site Allocations DPD. Provided this information is presented to the Council, it will assess the site through the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. However at this time the site can not be considered in further detail until additional information is provided by the representor.</p> <p>From the description provided, the general area appears to have been assessed under SHLAAMSG038 and falls under parcel 17 in the Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR). The GBBR found that any development in parcel 17 would relate poorly to the settlement pattern, that the area had low capacity for change and contained numerous absolute constraints.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1291	J.	Alun-Jones	GB8	Reference is made in relation to GB8 that it will be 'washed over' by the GB. This policy allocation would result in all four side's of client's land being surrounded by built development- it would become an isolated parcel of GB which would perform no strategic function or GB purpose.	None stated.	<p>To reiterate, the representation did not provide any specific details regarding the area of land to be considered by the Council, however from the description provided the Council does not agree that the proposed sites to be allocated would leave an isolated area of Green Belt land. GB7 will remain washed over by the Green Belt and will be subject to Green Belt policies.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1291	J.	Alun-Jones	GB8	<p>The representation relates to land south of Smarts Heath Road, 4.2 hectares, former garden nursery, disused greenhouses and outbuildings in various states of repair. . The buildings are centrally located.</p> <p>The site is bounded by railway line, Smarts Heath Road and traveller site. The settlement of Mayford is to the west.</p> <p>The site comprises PDL in line with Annex 2 in the NPPF</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation did not provide any specific details regarding the area of land to be considered by the Council, although the representor states that it was submitted during previous call for sites and therefore it is likely that the site has been considered. The Council will consider any further information or site specific details that the representor wishes to present during the Regulation 19 consultation of the Site Allocations DPD. Provided this information is presented to the Council, it will assess the site through the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. However at this time the site can not be considered in further detail until additional information is provided by the representor.</p> <p>From the description provided, the general area appears to have been assessed under SHLAAMSG038 and falls under parcel 17 in the Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR). The GBBR found that any development in parcel 17 would relate poorly to the settlement pattern, that the area had low capacity for change and contained numerous absolute constraints.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
403	Tudor	Alvares	GB12	<p>The GBBR did not recommend one of the fields as being appropriate for release. WBC's proposal for the site needs careful scrutiny.</p> <p>Considers that WBC is ignoring technical advice that it has commissioned and considers this a waste of money</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0, 7.0 and 11.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
403	Tudor	Alvares	GB13	<p>The GBBR did not recommend one of the fields as being appropriate for release. WBC's proposal for the site needs careful scrutiny.</p> <p>Considers that WBC is ignoring technical advice that it has commissioned and considers this a waste of money</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0, 7.0 and 11.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
403	Tudor	Alvares	GB12	<p>Strongly urge the reuse of brownfield sites to meet housing need. The GB in the Woking and the rural feel of Pyrford are important to its character. This needs to be protected for future generations.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0, 11.0 and Section 7.0</p> <p>In addition, the Council acknowledges the individual character of Pyrford. This is noted in several Council documents including the Heritage of Woking (2000) and the Woking Character Study (2010).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
403	Tudor	Alvares	GB13	<p>Strongly urge the reuse of brownfield sites to meet housing need. The GB in the Woking and the rural feel of Pyrford are important to its character. This needs to be protected for future generations.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0, 11.0 and Section 7.0</p> <p>In addition, the Council acknowledges the individual character of Pyrford. This is noted in several Council documents including the Heritage of Woking (2000) and the Woking Character Study (2010).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
403	Tudor	Alvares	GB12	<p>Object to proposals to GB12 and GB13. Little consideration given to the increased pressure proposals would have on the existing infrastructure including roads, schools and health services.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure, congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	
403	Tudor	Alvares	GB13	Object to proposals to GB12 and GB13. Little consideration given to the increased pressure proposals would have on the existing infrastructure including roads, schools and health services.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure, congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
403	Tudor	Alvares	GB12	Proposals will result in the loss of important views from Pyrford Escarpment to the North Downs. Once these views are lost they are lost forever.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period.</p> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</p>	
403	Tudor	Alvares	GB13	Proposals will result in the loss of important views from Pyrford Escarpment to the North Downs. Once these views are lost they are lost forever.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period.</p> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
403	Tudor	Alvares	GB12	Understands the housing pressure but considers WBC has a duty to consider brownfield sites first	Consider brownfield sites first	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
403	Tudor	Alvares	GB13	Understands the housing pressure but considers WBC has a duty to consider brownfield sites first	Consider brownfield sites first	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1535	Mark	Ambrus	GB13	Development will cut off Pyrford Common from the countryside. The proposals will have a negative impact on local heritage assets and their setting. There are possibilities of heritage vandalism with a higher population.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0.</p> <p>In addition, there is no evidence to suggest that safeguarding this site for future development needs will result in vandalism or an increase in crime in general.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1535	Mark	Ambrus	GB12	Development will cut off Pyrford Common from the countryside which is rich in wildlife.	None stated.	<p>The proposed allocation of this site is not expected to cut off Pyrford Common from the rest of the countryside. The proposal will result in an urban extension that will be enclosed by Upshot Lane to the east and Pyrford Common Road to the south. Pyrford Common will remain to the south and west of the site and within the Green Belt.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues, as set out in the key requirements.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1535	Mark	Ambrus	GB13	Development will have a negative impact on the adjacent woods and surrounding countryside. This is an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and should be retained. The footpath through the site is used for recreational purposes.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding impact on landscape has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view.	
1535	Mark	Ambrus	GB12	The proposals will have a negative impact on local heritage assets and their setting. There are possibilities of heritage vandalism with a higher population.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, there is no evidence to suggest that safeguarding this site for future development needs will result in vandalism or an increase in crime in general.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
203	Steve	Andrews	GB12	Also concerned that infrastructure will be unable to cope with additional population, especially over subscribed nurseries and schools and doctors.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The County Council has confirmed that the educational needs to support the proposed developments in the DPD can be met by a new secondary school and capacity within existing schools.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
203	Steve	Andrews	GB13	Also concerned that infrastructure will be unable to cope with additional population, especially over subscribed nurseries and schools and doctors.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area. The Council has relied on a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they support and justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
203	Steve	Andrews	GB12	I object to 423 new houses adjoining Pyrford village. This Green Belt is fundamental to retaining character. I choose to live here as access to countryside. Tree planting along Sandy Lane was a community event. We enjoy footpath and uninterrupted views.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the development will cause Pyrford to merge with any other town/village. The council has carried out an assessment of brownfield sites to meet the development needs of the area. This issue is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
203	Steve	Andrews	GB13	I object to 423 new houses adjoining Pyrford village. This Green Belt is fundamental to retaining character. I choose to live here as access to countryside. Tree planting along Sandy Lane was a community event. We enjoy footpath and uninterrupted views.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
203	Steve	Andrews	GB12	Pyrford looked fabulous during the Olympic cycle race and other ride Surrey events, in part due to well defined village boundary and rolling countryside. Please retain this distinct character for future generations to enjoy.	None stated.	The Council acknowledge the distinctive character of Pyrford and has the necessary robust policies to protect that. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
203	Steve	Andrews	GB13	Pyrford looked fabulous during the Olympic cycle race and other ride Surrey events, in part due to well defined village boundary and rolling countryside. Please retain this distinct character for future generations to enjoy.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council acknowledges the distinctive character of Pyrford and has carried out a number of studies to ensure that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. As set out in detail in Sections 7, 19 and 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council is satisfied that the proposals will not significantly undermine the overall character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
204	Nicky	Andrews	GB12	Also concerned that infrastructure will be unable to cope with additional population, especially over subscribed nurseries and schools and doctors.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The County Council has confirmed that the educational needs to support the proposed developments in the DPD can be met by a new secondary school and capacity within existing schools.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
204	Nicky	Andrews	GB13	Also concerned that infrastructure will be unable to cope with additional population, especially over subscribed nurseries and schools and doctors.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area. The Council has relied on a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they support and justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
204	Nicky	Andrews	GB12	I object to 423 new houses adjoining Pyrford village. This Green Belt is fundamental to retaining character. I choose to live here as access to countryside. Tree planting along Sandy Lane was a community event. We enjoy footpath and uninterrupted views.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the development will cause Pyrford to merge with any other town/village. The council has carried out an assessment of brownfield sites to meet the development needs of the area. This issue is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
204	Nicky	Andrews	GB13	I object to 423 new houses adjoining Pyrford village. This Green Belt is fundamental to retaining character. I choose to live here as access to countryside. Tree planting along Sandy Lane was a community event. We enjoy footpath and uninterrupted views.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
204	Nicky	Andrews	GB12	Pyrford looked fabulous during the Olympic cycle race and other ride Surrey events, in part due to well defined village boundary and rolling countryside. Please retain this distinct character for future generations to enjoy.	None stated.	The Council acknowledge the distinctive character of Pyrford and has the necessary robust policies to protect that. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
204	Nicky	Andrews	GB13	Pyrford looked fabulous during the Olympic cycle race and other ride Surrey events, in part due to well defined village boundary and rolling countryside. Please retain this distinct character for future generations to enjoy.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council acknowledges the distinctive character of Pyrford and has carried out a number of studies to ensure that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. As set out in detail in Sections 7, 19 and 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council is satisfied that the proposals will not significantly undermine the overall character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1354	Jim	Andrews	GB12	Object to misuse of GB and urban sprawl	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1354	Jim	Andrews	GB13	Object to misuse of GB and urban sprawl	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
6	Peter	Ankers	General	Maintain the Green Belt for as long as possible.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
6	Peter	Ankers	General	We vitally need more houses, therefore understand and support proposals to release Green Belt when necessary.	None stated.	Support for the release of Green Belt land is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
6	Peter	Ankers	GB8	Support for proposal at Egley Road and Pyrford.	None stated.	Support noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
6	Peter	Ankers	GB12	Support for proposal at Egley Road and Pyrford.	None stated.	Support noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
6	Peter	Ankers	GB13	Support for proposal at Egley Road and Pyrford.	None stated.	Support noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
6	Peter	Ankers	GB8	Seek reassurance that adequate services such as school places and medical facilities will be in place.	Request full reassurance that adequate services such as school places and medical facilities will be in place.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals is set out in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
6	Peter	Ankers	GB12	Seek reassurance that adequate services such as school places and medical facilities will be in place.	Request full reassurance that adequate services such as school places and medical facilities will be in place.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals is set out in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
6	Peter	Ankers	GB13	Seek reassurance that adequate services such as school places and medical facilities will be in place.	Request full reassurance that adequate services such as school places and medical facilities will be in place.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals is set out in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
6	Peter	Ankers	General	Should give older people the option to move out of big family houses into more appropriately sized property.	Give older people the option to move out of big family houses into more appropriately sized property.	The proposed allocations will comprise a range of house types to enable people to downsize to appropriately sized properties if they choose to do so.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1543		Anonymous	GB12	Concur with these views. The density of development will directly impact local services and infrastructure in West Byfleet.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1543		Anonymous	GB13	Concur with these views. The density of development will directly impact local services and infrastructure in West Byfleet.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1543		Anonymous	GB12	What will be the impact on sewerage and water capacity. Will any issues be mitigated before development takes place. Green Belt land absorbs storm water and development on it will result in more flash floods. This area of the borough is more prone to flooding than other parts of the borough.	None stated.	The representation regarding water supply and sewage capacity has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.9 and 3.10. The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1543		Anonymous	GB13	What will be the impact on sewerage and water capacity. Will any issues be mitigated before development takes place. Green Belt land absorbs storm water and development on it will result in more flash floods. This area of the borough is more prone to flooding than other parts of the borough.	None stated.	The representation regarding water supply and sewage capacity has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.9 and 3.10. The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1543		Anonymous	General	The proposals will increase the number of houses in this part of the borough as it is close to the A3 and M25, can these roads cope with extra traffic?	None stated.	The methodology for identifying sites in the Green Belt for development needs includes a number of evidence based documents. This includes the Green Belt boundary review and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). One of the key objectives was to ensure that sites were in sustainable locations, close to existing services and facilities. The proposed allocations are in close proximity to Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre and West Byfleet District Centre. In combination, these centres meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore will reduce the need to travel by unsustainable methods of transport. The Green Belt boundary review methodology is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0. The document is also available on the Council's website along with the SA.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1543		Anonymous	GB15	It will be difficult to provide additional residents with suitable healthcare. In addition, traffic and congestion will make it difficult for healthcare professionals/ emergency vehicles to move around the area.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1543		Anonymous	GB16	It will be difficult to provide additional residents with suitable healthcare. In addition, traffic and congestion will make it difficult for healthcare professionals/ emergency vehicles to move around the area.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	
1543		Anonymous	General	Cobham Council have indicated that there is no possibility of more development and have asked the government to reconsider.	None stated.	The Council is committed to facilitate the delivery of the Core Strategy in full. This includes the provision of 4,964 dwellings, 48,000sqm of office and warehouse floor space and 93,900 sqm of retail floor space. The Site Allocations DPD is being prepared to identify sites to accommodate this future development over the Plan period and beyond, in line with the requirements of the NPPF.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1543		Anonymous	General	Is there sufficient parking in Woking for the increase in population?	None stated.	Parking provision in Woking Town Centre will continue to be a challenge. The proposed and consented Victoria Square scheme (Site UA9) will increase the overall parking provision in the town centre once completed. However it is important to highlight that public transport provision is vital to promoting sustainable methods of transport and reducing journeys made by cars. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1543		Anonymous	GB15	The A245 is gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse. Surrounding roads in New Haw and Woodham will also become congested.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1543		Anonymous	GB16	The A245 is gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse. Surrounding roads in New Haw and Woodham will also become congested.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1543		Anonymous	GB15	School places	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1543		Anonymous	GB16	School places	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1543		Anonymous	General	There is no mention of provision of more retail outlets – Waitrose is already crowded on Friday mornings.	None stated.	Core Strategy Policy CS3: West Byfleet District Centre highlights that as the second largest centre in the Borough, it has the potential for up to 13,000sqm. of additional A class (shops) floor space. The delivery of this amount of retail floor space will provide a significant	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						contribution towards meeting the retail requirements of local residents. The proposed allocations within the DPD set out potential development sites that bring forward additional retail floor space in West Byfleet.	
1543		Anonymous	General	What about the increased noise and air pollution?	None stated.	<p>The potential increase in noise and air pollution has been considered with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. This document is available for viewing online on the Council's website. Generally, the sites identified for allocation are not expected to have a significant impact on noise or air pollution as the sites are in close proximity to the existing urban areas, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths. This has the potential to reduce the reliance on the private car and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Council does not consider that the proposed allocation of this site will have an adverse impact on noise pollution. Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design states that proposals for new development must be designed to avoid significant harm to the environment and general amenity resulting from noise. In addition, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD has a specific policy relating to noise and light pollution (DM7). In combination with the existing and emerging policies, the proposed land use for the site is not expected to generate a significant amount of noise pollution above the existing baseline condition.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1543		Anonymous	General	Would capacity increase on the trains which is already crowded. What do South West Trains say?	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1674	Steven	Anstiss	General	Would like the site to be removed from the Green Belt in order to submit a planning application.	Remove the site from the Green Belt for one detached dwelling.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed modification, the Council notes the proposed new site. As set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA), the allocation of the site would not achieve sustainable development as the site is not within walking or cycling distance of a local centre and would therefore would not promote sustainable methods of travel. In addition, development of the suggested site would result in further encroachment into the countryside. The Green Belt boundary review notes that this area of Green Belt is important in containing the urban area to the north and maintaining a separation between Woking and Guildford.</p> <p>As set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 9.0, paragraph 9.3), the Site Allocations DPD will only allocate sites that have a reasonable prospect of delivering 10 dwellings or more.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1674	Steven	Anstiss	General	Land owner of a plot of land in Pyle Hill. It is within the Green Belt and would like it to be removed from it in order to development a single dwelling. It was intended to be used for residential purposed when the neighbouring houses were built in the 1930s. The site floods and causes adjacent land to also flood. Fly tipping also occurs.	Removal of the site from the Green Belt to develop a single detached dwelling.	<p>The Council notes the proposed new site. As set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA), the allocation of the site would not achieve sustainable development as the site is not within walking or cycling distance of a local centre and would therefore would not promote sustainable methods of travel. In addition, development of the suggested site would result in further encroachment into the countryside. The Green Belt boundary review notes that this area of Green Belt is important in containing the urban area to the north and maintaining a separation between Woking and Guildford.</p> <p>As set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 9.0, paragraph 9.3), the Site Allocations DPD will only allocate sites that have a reasonable prospect of delivering 10 dwellings or more.</p> <p>The existing fly tipping issues are noted by the Council and it is recommended that this is brought to the Council's Environmental Health Service.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1674	Steven	Anstiss	General	Purchased the land to prevent it being used for a caravan and hoped that development of a detached house would end any concerns over the future use of the site. Flooding would be addressed through surface water drainage systems and improved ditches. Fly tipping would stop. The views of local residents have been included and the issues regarding flooding can be addressed. Request that the proposal is given due consideration.	Develop the site for one residential unit and introduce flood mitigation measures to reduce surface water runoff.	<p>The Council notes the proposed new site. As set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA), the allocation of the site would not achieve sustainable development as the site is not within walking or cycling distance of a local centre and would therefore would not promote sustainable methods of travel. In addition, development of the suggested site would result in further encroachment into the countryside. The Green Belt boundary review notes that this area of Green Belt is important in containing the urban area to the north and maintaining a separation between Woking and Guildford.</p> <p>As set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 9.0, paragraph 9.3), the Site Allocations DPD will only allocate sites that have a reasonable prospect of delivering 10 dwellings or more.</p> <p>The existing fly tipping issues are noted by the Council and it is recommended that this is brought to the Council's Environmental Health Service.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB7	An increase in Traveller caravans would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife. Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with urban area sites considered before those in the Green Belt. However no urban sites appear to have been considered - there must be doubt as to the validity of no other sites across the whole of the Borough being identified or suitable. Where no sites are available in the urban area, priority will be given to sites on the edge of the urban area that benefit from good access to jobs, shops and other infrastructure and services. Mayford does not satisfy any of these criteria.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2. The character of Mayford is already protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The Council is satisfied by the evidence and policies it has that the identity of Mayford and its character will not be undermined by the proposals. Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. This matter has been comprehensively been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB8	Strongly object to associated leisure centre, running track, football and other sports pitches, cafe, associated car parking and access provisions. Totally inappropriate development in residential area. Do not meet 800m separation policy. There would be substantial traffic increase on already overloaded road system, especially at peak times. Unfortunate lack of transparency by the Council.	None stated.	The proposed school and leisure centre now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating that it takes 7 minutes to travel from Mayford to Woking (estimated using Google Maps timings). At peak hours actual travel time is over half an hour. Mayford has a poor road network that is heavily congested at peak times. Many of the roads do not have pavements and are narrow, including the road to Worplesdon Station. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. Development will exacerbate this.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating 7 minutes travel time. This is not the case at peak times, when there is	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				congestion and travel time can be substantially longer. There is poor public transport, a limited bus service and narrow, unlit pedestrian footpaths. There are three single line bridges, and gridlock in the village at peak times. Development of two large sites at Mayford's boundary and as proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with roads unable to handle additional traffic.		proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating 7 minutes travel time. This is not the case at peak times, when there is congestion and travel time can be substantially longer. There is poor public transport, a limited bus service and narrow, unlit pedestrian footpaths. There are three single line bridges, and gridlock in the village at peak times. Development of two large sites at Mayford's boundary and as proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with roads unable to handle additional traffic. Worplesdon rail station would notice a major increase in congestion.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating 7 minutes travel time. This is not the case at peak times, when there is congestion and travel time can be substantially longer. There is poor public transport, a limited bus service and narrow, unlit pedestrian footpaths. There are three single line bridges, and gridlock in the village at peak times. Development of two large sites at Mayford's boundary and as proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with roads unable to handle additional traffic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (Policy CS24). Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB10	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB11	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB8	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB9	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB10	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	The Council do not see any inconsistency in its approach to identifying sites to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB8	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach. It identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints) then recommended land that contained these constraints (including Mayford - the Review rejected the Ten	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied in the review. The Council does not think its decisions has also been inconsistency. The Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD. Collectively they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Acre Site as a Traveller site).			
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB9	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach. It identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints) then recommended land that contained these constraints (including Mayford - the Review rejected the Ten Acre Site as a Traveller site).	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied in the review. The Council does not think its decisions has also been inconsistency. The Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD. Collectively they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB11	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach. It identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints) then recommended land that contained these constraints (including Mayford - the Review rejected the Ten Acre Site as a Traveller site).	None stated.	The methodology for carrying the review is considered sufficiently robust and consistently applied. This issues has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB10	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test and it is not envisaged that the proposals will lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB11	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB8	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB9	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected heathland (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB11	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11, which will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or impact on its character. Residents chose to live in a semi-rural, not urban, environment.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that based on the evidence the character of the area will be significantly undermined. The character of Mayford in particular is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB8	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11, which will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or impact on its character. Residents chose to live in a semi-rural, not urban, environment.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB9	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11, which will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or impact on its character. Residents chose to live in a semi-rural, not urban, environment.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB10	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. The housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging of Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, the impact on the character of this isolated village community. Development will have a disproportionate, totally unjustifiable impact on residents, who chose to live in a semi-rural not urban environment.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2, 4. The Council is satisfied that the proposals can come forward without undermining the general character of the area. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. The evidence demonstrate that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. The issue about the separation between Woking and Guildford is addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Mayford will retain its identity. It is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB8	I accept the proposed secondary school is a special purpose allowed in Green Belt and support the school proposal including mitigation for traffic congestion, visual and noise pollution, safety measures for students and the public, flooding and run-off.	None stated.	Support for the school is noted. It now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has carried out an assessment of the urban area to meet development needs. The evidence demonstrates that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively covered in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the identity of Mayford or its separation from Guildford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has carried out an assessment of the urban area to meet development needs. The evidence demonstrates that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively covered in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the identity of Mayford or its separation from Guildford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.			
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB9	<p>National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.</p> <p>Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.</p>	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has carried out an assessment of the urban area to meet development needs. The evidence demonstrates that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively covered in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the identity of Mayford or its separation from Guildford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB10	<p>National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.</p> <p>Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.</p>	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2, 4. The Council is satisfied that the proposals can come forward without undermining the general character of the area. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. The evidence demonstrate that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. The issue about the separation between Woking and Guildford is addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Mayford will retain its identity. It is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB11	The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	None stated.	The Council has always been clear that the Egley Road site is allocated for a school and residential development. The school now has the benefit of planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB10	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the	None stated.	The Council has always been clear that the site at Egley Road referred to is allocated for a school and residential development. The school now has the benefit of planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.			of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB8	The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	None stated.	The school has planning permission. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB9	The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	None stated.	The school now has planning permission. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB11	<p>The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.</p> <p>Please reconsider your plans - what is currently planned will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique in the U.K. and as stated above is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.</p>	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB8	<p>The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.</p> <p>Please reconsider your plans - what is currently planned will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique in the U.K. and as stated above is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.</p>	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB9	<p>The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.</p> <p>Please reconsider your plans - what is currently planned will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique in the U.K. and as stated above is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.</p>	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB10	<p>The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.</p> <p>Please reconsider your plans - what is currently planned will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique in the U.K. and as stated above is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.</p>	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in, for existing and new residents. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Directing traffic down Saunders Lane is ridiculous - a narrow road with pinch points and significant through traffic at inappropriate speeds.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Prey Heath Road and Saunders Lane are unsuitable.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Prey Heath Road and Saunders Lane are unsuitable.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Prey Heath Road and Saunders Lane are unsuitable.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate amenity for its occupiers, including space for related business activities. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road of 25 houses, with two Grade Two listed buildings near Ten Acre Farm. Travellers related business activities are out of keeping.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
187	Andrew	Arabin-Jones	GB7	Smarts Heath Road is not currently close to schools. It does not have easy access to local facilities required for a Traveller site.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
33	Melanie	Archer	GB12	Concerns raised about the GB review have been ignored The surrounding countryside around Pyrford is a natural asset, providing open space and natural vista. Object to development of the site	None stated.	The concerns expressed by residents of Pyrford have not been ignored. However, the Council has to balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. The proposed sites are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives. This is evidenced in the Sustainability Appraisal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
33	Melanie	Archer	GB12	The existing infrastructure cannot support increased population and traffic. Traffic problems were highlighted in relation to a smaller development proposal. Proposals for GB development is larger and would increase problems	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD has robust policies to ensure that development does not lead to unacceptable pollution that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
33	Melanie	Archer	GB12	The primary school is at full capacity with little opportunity to expand further. There will be no school places available for new residents	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
33	Melanie	Archer	GB12	The proposals are not appropriate for Pyrford. Opinions of residents and independent advisors have been ignored. Strongly object	None stated.	The proposals are justified by robust evidence. Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Topic Paper deals with the extent of research that has been used to inform the DPD. They collectively support the allocation of the proposals. The proposals are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The matter in which reasonable alternatives were assessed is comprehensively addressed in Section 9 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Green Belt boundary review is robust in providing evidence to inform the DPD. However, the Council has also used a range of other evidence such as the Sustainability Appraisal to inform the DPD. The evidence collectively justifies the proposed allocations. The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is set out in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
33	Melanie	Archer	GB13	Concerns raised about the GB review have been ignored The surrounding countryside around Pyrford is a natural asset, providing open space and natural vista. Object to development of the site	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
33	Melanie	Archer	GB13	The existing infrastructure cannot support increased population and traffic.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Traffic problems were highlighted in relation to a smaller development proposal. Proposals for GB development is larger and would increase problems		As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area. The Council has relied on a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they support and justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	
33	Melanie	Archer	GB13	The primary school is at full capacity with little opportunity to expand further. There will be no school places available for new residents	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
33	Melanie	Archer	GB13	The proposals are not appropriate for Pyrford. Opinions of residents and independent advisors have been ignored. Strongly object	None stated.	The proposals are justified by robust evidence. Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Topic Paper deals with the extent of research that has been used to inform the DPD. They collectively support the allocation of the proposals. The proposals are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The matter in which reasonable alternatives were assessed is comprehensively addressed in Section 9 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Green Belt boundary review is robust in providing evidence to inform the DPD. However, the Council has also used a range of other evidence such as the Sustainability Appraisal to inform the DPD. The evidence collectively justifies the proposed allocations. The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is set out in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB7	Traveller sites should be close to schools and services as set out in the Core Strategy and SHLAA, this site is not. There is a lack of supporting infrastructure in the area. The development of a communal building for Travellers will not positively enhance the environment and openness of the area.	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy states that it is key that most new development is concentrated in sustainable locations where facilities and services are easily accessible by all relevant modes of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport. Following a through assessment against all reasonable and deliverable alternatives, this site is considered to be suitable for additional Traveller pitches on what is an existing Traveller site.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Council fully acknowledge the existing public transport provision in the local area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes design requirements that will ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the character and landscape setting of the area. The site will also remain within the Green Belt and therefore the design and layout of the proposed allocation will have to be in general conformity with the relevant policies of the NPPF and Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB7	The site offers no visual privacy and the noise pollution from the railway line is unlikely to be suitably mitigated. The road to the site is busy with lorries and with no footpath, this would result in health and safety concerns.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above	<p>All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB7	<p>The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008.</p> <p>Business use on the site would result in noise, traffic and nuisance to residents which is also out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI and Hoe Stream SNCI and would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites that form the boundary of the land.	None stated.	<p>The Council agrees with the above, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers.</p> <p>The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB8	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB11	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB7	<p>The site is adjacent to 22 houses, including heritage assets. Development should comply with CS14, CS24 and the PPFTS in that it should have not adverse impacts on the character of the local area or local environment.</p> <p>The site was granted planning permission in 1987 for one family only. Additional pitches will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and local environment and will have an adverse impact on the openness of the area which is contrary to CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.</p> <p>Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.</p>	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB7	The site has little or no infrastructure or services on site at present and will require a substantial investment to connect the site to essential services. Acoustic barriers will also be required to mitigate the noise pollution from the railway line.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.		of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB8	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB10	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB11	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB8	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB10	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB11	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	The removal of GB8, GB10, GB11 from the development plan.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	The removal of GB8, GB10, GB11 from the development plan.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	The removal of GB8, GB10, GB11 from the development plan.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB8	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is not currently deliverable as the landowner has not confirmed that the site is available for development. The landowner wishes to develop the site for their own accommodation and not for an increase in Traveller accommodation.	None stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB7	Other sites identified in the Green Belt Boundary Review for Traveller accommodation have been omitted from the DPD.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.11	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3 and Flood Zone 2. This will result in development being closer to the road which will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB7	Sequential approach has not been undertaken - The council has chosen to set aside the GBR recommendations, selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b when proposing to	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>expand the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches.</p> <p>No independently verified evidence has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for Traveller site development in its Plan, nor as to why sites identified in the Council's Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm, Smarts Heath Road) and Five Acres (Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.</p>			
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB7	The site is considered to contain contaminated land. It is therefore unsuitable to consider using the site for residential uses until the land has been properly decontaminated.	None stated.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB7	There is a lack of Very Special Circumstances to justify developing the site for Travellers accommodation, including the argument for unmet need. This is highlighted in the comments made by B Lewis MP.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9 and Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB7	The proposal is contrary to the SHLAA 2014 and should not be in the DPD.	None stated.	<p>In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process based on its evidence base.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB8	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB10	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB11	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB8	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB10	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB11	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB8	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB10	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB11	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB8	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB10	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB11	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB8	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB10	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB11	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB7	The site has low existing land use value and residential development will be viable at low density. The owner of the site is seeking permission for his own residential use.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD proposes to retain the site within the Green Belt. This means that Green Belt policy within the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CS6 will continue to apply. The proposed use within the DPD is for an additional 12 Traveller pitches. Therefore if the claim within the representation is correct, a new dwelling in the Green Belt would be required to demonstrate exceptional circumstances and will be considered as part of the decision making process on its own individual merits.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB8	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station. The roads also suffer from flooding and regular maintenance works.	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have an impact on congestion and accessibility through the local area.</p> <p>Any proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB10	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station. The roads also suffer from flooding and regular maintenance works.	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have an impact on congestion and accessibility through the local area.</p> <p>Any proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB11	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station. The roads also suffer from flooding and regular maintenance works.	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have an impact on congestion and accessibility through the local area.</p> <p>Any proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB11	There is little provision for cyclists in the area. The existing paths are poorly designed and incomplete, against the principles of sustainable development	None stated.	<p>The key requirements for the site state that potential infrastructure issues to be addressed include provision of cycling access and links to the site as well as improve provision and connectivity to existing recreation spaces. The Council will ensure that as a specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB10	There is little provision for cyclists in the area. The existing paths are poorly designed and incomplete, against the principles of sustainable development	None stated.	<p>The key requirements for the site state that potential infrastructure issues to be addressed include provision of cycling access to the site as well as improve provision and connectivity to existing recreation spaces. The Council will ensure that as a specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB8	There is little provision for cyclists in the area. The existing paths are poorly designed and incomplete, against the principles of sustainable development	None stated.	<p>The key requirements for the site state that potential infrastructure issues to be addressed include provision of cycling facilities as well as improve provision and connectivity to existing recreation spaces. The Council will ensure that as a specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB8	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB10	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB11	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB8	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station.	None stated.	<p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB10	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station.	None stated.	<p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1640	Lindsey	Arden	GB11	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station.	None stated.	<p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB7	<p>Traveller sites should be close to schools and services as set out in the Core Strategy and SHLAA, this site is not.</p> <p>There is a lack of supporting infrastructure in the area. The</p>	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy states that it is key that most new development is concentrated in sustainable locations where facilities and services are easily accessible by all relevant modes of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport. Following a through assessment against all reasonable and deliverable alternatives, this site is considered to be suitable for additional</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				development of a communal building for Travellers will not positively enhance the environment and openness of the area.		<p>Traveller pitches on what is an existing Traveller site.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Council fully acknowledge the existing public transport provision in the local area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes design requirements that will ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the character and landscape setting of the area. The site will also remain within the Green Belt and therefore the design and layout of the proposed allocation will have to be in general conformity with the relevant policies of the NPPF and Core Strategy.</p>	
1661	Ian	Arden	GB7	The site offers no visual privacy and the noise pollution from the railway line is unlikely to be suitably mitigated. The road to the site is busy with lorries and with no footpath, this would result in health and safety concerns.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above	<p>All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				of the escarpment.		<p>Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	
1661	Ian	Arden	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB7	<p>The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008.</p> <p>Business use on the site would result in noise, traffic and nuisance to residents which is also out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.</p>	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI and Hoe Stream SNCI and would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites that form the boundary of the land.	None stated.	<p>The Council agrees with the above, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers.</p> <p>The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB8	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB11	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB7	The site is adjacent to 22 houses, including heritage assets. Development should comply with CS14, CS24 and the PPFTS in that it should have not adverse impacts on the character of the local area or local environment.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>The site was granted planning permission in 1987 for one family only. Additional pitches will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and local environment and will have an adverse impact on the openness of the area which is contrary to CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.</p> <p>Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.</p>		<p>Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	
1661	Ian	Arden	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB7	<p>The site has little or no infrastructure or services on site at present and will require a substantial investment to connect the site to essential services. Acoustic barriers will also be required to mitigate the noise pollution from the railway line.</p> <p>The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.</p>	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB8	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1661	Ian	Arden	GB10	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB11	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB8	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB10	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB11	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB8	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB10	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1661	Ian	Arden	GB11	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is not currently deliverable as the landowner has not confirmed that the site is available for development. The landowner wishes to develop the site for their own accommodation and not for an increase in Traveller accommodation. Development of the site will be economically viable at a low density. The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.	None stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB7	Other sites identified in the Green Belt Boundary Review for Traveller accommodation have been omitted from the DPD.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.11	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3 and Flood Zone 2. This will result in development being closer to the road which will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB7	Sequential approach has not been undertaken - The council has chosen to set aside the GBR recommendations, selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b when proposing to expand the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches. No independently verified evidence has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for Traveller site development in its Plan, nor as to why sites identified in the Council's Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm, Smarts Heath Road) and Five Acres (Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB7	The site is considered to contain contaminated land. It is therefore unsuitable to consider using the site for residential uses until the land has been properly decontaminated.	None stated.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB7	There is a lack of Very Special Circumstances to justify developing the site for Travellers accommodation, including the argument for unmet need. This is highlighted in the comments made by B Lewis MP.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9 and Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB8	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1661	Ian	Arden	GB10	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB11	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB8	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB8	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	The removal of GB8, GB10, GB11 from the development plan.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB10	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	The removal of GB8, GB10, GB11 from the development plan.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB11	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	The removal of GB8, GB10, GB11 from the development plan.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB8	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station. Regular works and flooding make them impassable.		<p>journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential.</p> <p>Any proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.</p>	
1661	Ian	Arden	GB10	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station. Regular works and flooding make them impassable.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential.</p> <p>Any proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB11	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station. Regular works and flooding make them impassable.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential.</p> <p>Any proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.</p>	
1661	Ian	Arden	GB8	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB10	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB11	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB8	Little provision for cyclists, with few paths that are poorly designed and incomplete. This fails to promote sustainable transport.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB10	Little provision for cyclists, with few paths that are poorly designed and incomplete. This fails to promote sustainable transport.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB11	Little provision for cyclists, with few paths that are poorly designed and incomplete. This fails to promote sustainable transport.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB8	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB10	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB11	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB8	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB10	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1661	Ian	Arden	GB11	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1249	Halina	Arendt	UA11	Has concerns about a development along Goldsworth Road which is nearing completion. Does not believe that any more flats should be built on this site too.	None stated.	<p>Development proposals will need to comply with Development Plan policies including Core Strategy policy CS11 on housing mix.</p> <p>With regards to the representation on noise nuisance, the Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment including noise pollution.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1249	Halina	Arendt	UA11	The webpage that contains the consultation documents is difficult to navigate. Could not find what the proposals for UA11	None stated.	<p>This is noted.</p> <p>The Council ensures that digital versions of the documents are readily available on its website. We endeavour to ensure the information is easily accessible and user friendly. However we</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>appreciate the difficulties you may have come across.</p> <p>We acknowledge these comments and will continue to ensure that the information published on our website is comprehensive and accessible.</p>	
1547	Sylvia M	Argent	GB12	independent advisors did not support such a large scale development, why is the Council ignoring this. Horrified to imagine what this would do to the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0, paragraph 17.1 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1547	Sylvia M	Argent	GB13	independent advisors did not support such a large scale development, why is the Council ignoring this. Horrified to imagine what this would do to the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0, paragraph 17.1 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1547	Sylvia M	Argent	GB12	Life in Pyrford is already less pleasant due to traffic and parking close to the village centre.	None stated.	<p>The Council note the existing traffic and parking issues within the village at present.</p> <p>Regarding the impact of the proposed allocations on the highways network, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1547	Sylvia M	Argent	GB13	Life in Pyrford is already less pleasant due to traffic and parking close to the village centre.	None stated.	<p>The Council note the existing traffic and parking issues within the village at present.</p> <p>Regarding the impact of the proposed allocations on the highways network, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1547	Sylvia M	Argent	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1547	Sylvia M	Argent	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
1547	Sylvia M	Argent	GB12	West Byfleet supermarket and medical facilities are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>Core Strategy Policy CS3: West Byfleet District Centre highlights that as the second largest centre in the Borough, it has the potential for up to 13,000sqm. of additional A class (shops) floor space. The delivery of this amount of retail floor space will provide a significant contribution towards meeting the retail requirements of local residents. The proposed allocations within the DPD set out potential development sites that bring forward additional retail floor space in West Byfleet.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding traffic congestion has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6.</p> <p>In combination these measures highlighted are expected to make sure that there are minimal adverse impacts on local infrastructure and facilities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1547	Sylvia M	Argent	GB13	West Byfleet supermarket and medical facilities are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>Core Strategy Policy CS3: West Byfleet District Centre highlights that as the second largest centre in the Borough, it has the potential for up to 13,000sqm. of additional A class (shops) floor space. The delivery of this amount of retail floor space will provide a significant contribution towards meeting the retail requirements of local residents. The proposed allocations within the DPD set out potential development sites that bring forward additional retail floor space in West Byfleet.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding traffic congestion has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6.</p> <p>In combination these measures highlighted are expected to make sure that there are minimal adverse impacts on local infrastructure and facilities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1547	Sylvia M	Argent	GB12	The local infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1547	Sylvia M	Argent	GB13	The local infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1469	Tom	Armfield	UA51	Concerned about the requirement for provision of 40% affordable housing could be prohibitive to redevelopment of the site. Outlines the NPPG which states that to bring brownfield sites back into use, local authorities should take a flexible approach in seeking planning obligations and other contribution to ensure they don't make a site unviable. Affordable housing contributions should have regard to	Suggests amendment to bullet seven: "Contributions towards Affordable Housing	Alongside the Key requirement on affordable housing, the Council's Core Strategy Policy CS12: Affordable housing also applies, and outlines that the proportion of affordable housing to be provided on any given site will take account of financial viability as well as a number of other factors, including provision of an appropriate tenure mix and constraints on development of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				individual site viability. Suggests subtle amendments (see Proposed Modifications) to ensure sufficient flexibility to enable the viable redevelopment of the site.	provision, in this case 40% to be provided in-situ, unless it is demonstrated that it is unviable to do so". The supporting text to the policy would also need to be amended to reflect this.		
1469	Tom	Armfield	UA51	Bullets 23, 32 and 33 are repetitive of other bullets earlier in the Policy and can be deleted.	Suggests deletion of bullets 23, 32 and 33 as they repeat other bullets in the policy.	Suggested amendment, to delete repeated bullet points, is agreed. Bullet 23 repeats bullet 14 (on servicing), bullet 32 repeats bullet 24 (on adaptability and Lifetime Homes) and bullet 33 repeats bullet 25 (sustainable construction).	Delete bullet points 14, 32 and 33.
1469	Tom	Armfield	UA51	Policy UA51 requires the appropriate provision of car and cycle parking taking account of the site's sustainable location, but car parking should not be reduced (bullet 19). It is unclear whether the reduction is in relation to the existing level of parking on site or the level of prescribed by the adopted Parking Standards SPD. In light of the Council's aspiration to deliver a density in excess of 50-100 dph the policy should include sufficient flexibility for reducing car parking below that prescribed in the Parking Standards SPD. Sets out amendments (see Proposed Modifications) to provide this flexibility.	Suggests amendment to bullet 19: Appropriate and adequate provision of car and cycle parking that takes into account the site's sustainable location and the quantum of development, and will not compromise on highway safety.; (and comply All development should seek to comply with the Parking Standards SPD where it is appropriate to do so). Car parking provision should not be reduced and suitable provision for cycle parking should be provided".	The density of development proposed brings with it potential transport implications for future occupiers (both residents and businesses). While the site is located in a sustainable location, there may well be need generated for a range of transport modes, which should be assessed as part of any development, within the parking framework set out in Core Strategy Policy CS18 Transport and Accessibility. The policy is considered to be worded adequately to allow consideration of these issues. The site also plays an important role in providing car parking for West Byfleet District Centre, and with regard to the increased development proposed at the site and in the surrounding area, provision of car parking at the same level as exists is considered necessary. Any proposal for a lower level of car parking than existing would be considered on its merits, in relation to evidence presented.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1469	Tom	Armfield	UA51	Supports the principle and aims of the policy, but encourages subtle amendments, as outlined, to provide sufficient flexibility to enable delivery of a viable development, which will boost the vitality and promote competitiveness in the wider District Centre, in accordance with national planning policy.	None stated.	Comment noted and responses are provided to the relevant parts of the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1469	Tom	Armfield	UA51	Viability. Concerned that the requirement to provide equivalent existing office floorspace (bullet 2) would be prohibitive to redevelopment of the site. The NPPF states planning policies should avoid long term protection of employment uses where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that prospect. The NPPF also recognises the need to pursue policies to support the viability and vitality of town centres. Their client intends to provide a meaningful amount of office floorspace, and in the case of a net reduction we would seek to offset the employment generated by retail, hotel and leisure provision. Suggests subtle amendments (see Proposed Modifications) to ensure sufficient flexibility to enable the viable redevelopment of the site.	Suggests amendment to bullet two: "Existing office floorspace should be re-provided within any redevelopment scheme, unless it is demonstrated that it is unviable to do so". The supporting text to the policy would also need to be amended to reflect this.	The office floor space at this site is important to West Byfleet as a District Centre, with the strategic context to its safeguarding highlighted in Core Strategy Policy CS3: West Byfleet District Centre, bullet point 4. Therefore this policy is simply re-stating this policy in the context of the site allocation. It should be noted that evidence of viability of a development proposal would be considered as standard in the assessment of a planning proposal, as would alternative employment generation from other uses proposed on the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1469	Tom	Armfield	UA51	Their Client's site forms part of proposed allocation UA51, as outlined on the proposed Site Location Plan, and part of the wider redevelopment of West Byfleet District Centre. Sets out the policy context of the site, including its role as a transport interchange and a District Centre (the second largest centre in the borough) and the Core Strategy CS3's intention to encourage high density mixed use development to help the vitality and viability of the centre. The Council's Design SPD identifies the potential for further economic investment in the centre and encourages medium scale buildings (five to six storeys) in a clear block structure with good public space and opportunities to enhance the streetscape and public realm. The NPPF further encourages the effective use of land by reusing previously developed land. In this light, supports the proposed mix of uses, but the policy needs to be sufficiently flexible and concerned that a number of key requirements could be prohibitive and compromise the viability of redeveloping the site.	None stated.	Support for elements of the proposal, including its mix of uses, is welcomed. This is the opening Section of the representation, including policy context. The representation's substantive points, relating to the key requirements that it considers prohibitive and compromising to the redevelopment of the site, are responded to in later parts of the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB12	Accepts need for expansion of housing stock in the Woking area without increasing strain on already overburdened infrastructure. Suggests housing of types mentioned above (for older people, affordable and starter homes) that are discrete and modest, which would be more appropriate to meet the needs of the village now and in the future.	Suggests discrete and modest housing development for older people, affordable, key worker and starter homes to meet the needs of the village now and in the future.	Comment noted. The part of the point on infrastructure is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. Development will be built to a high quality of design and to fit with the general character of the area, in line with the Core Strategy, the draft allocation's key requirements and as addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB13	Accepts need for expansion of housing stock in the Woking area without increasing strain on already overburdened infrastructure. Suggests housing of types mentioned above (for older people, affordable and starter homes) that are discrete and modest, which would be more appropriate to meet the needs of the village now and in the future.	Suggests discrete and modest housing development for older people, affordable, key worker and starter homes to meet the needs of the village now and in the future.	Comment noted. The part of the point on infrastructure is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. Development will be built to a high quality of design and to fit with the general character of the area, in line with the Core Strategy, the draft allocation's key requirements and as addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB12	Access to a woodland footpath is being obstructed and property developers are changing our freedom of movement. There is evidence on maps of a walk from the common land to Pyrford Village Hall. Many homes had gates from their gardens on to this path. Burhill Estates may have to rethink their plans. Access obstruction was reported to Surrey County Council but there has been no response.	None stated.	The various incidents that have been mentioned are noted and will be passed on to the relevant Officers to address. Regarding the Site Allocations DPD, the Council believes that there is sufficient justification to justify the allocation of the sites in Pyrford (GB12 and GB13). The Council is satisfied based on the evidence that the sites can be developed without undermining the general character of the area. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB13	Access to a woodland footpath is being obstructed and property developers are changing our freedom of movement. There is evidence on maps of a walk from the common land to Pyrford Village Hall. Many homes had gates from their gardens on to this path. Burhill Estates may have to rethink their plans. Access obstruction was reported to Surrey County Council but there has been no response.	None stated.	The various incidents that have been mentioned are noted and will be passed on to the relevant Officers to address. Regarding the Site Allocations DPD, the Council believes that there is sufficient justification to justify the allocation of the sites in Pyrford (GB12 and GB13). The Council is satisfied based on the evidence that the sites can be developed without undermining the general character of the area. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB12	As a keen walker and cyclist, the development plans together with those by Guildford Council to build on Wisley Airfield will have an adverse impact on the area due to traffic impacts. The road infrastructure, some of which is very narrow, is not suitable for a high volume of traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB13	As a keen walker and cyclist, the development plans together with those by Guildford Council to build on Wisley Airfield will have an adverse impact on the area due to traffic impacts. The road infrastructure, some of which is very narrow, is not suitable for a high volume of traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB12	The heritage site of St Nicholas Church will be adversely effected by traffic fumes from the road in future, which will effect its structure.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 19.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB13	The heritage site of St Nicholas Church will be adversely effected by traffic fumes from the road in future, which will effect its structure.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 19.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB12	The school's location on a dangerous road (at drop off and pick up times) means that it is not suitable to expand to cope with more children. Safety must be of paramount importance.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6, 3.8 and 3.11. The County Council will be made aware of safety issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB13	The school's location on a dangerous road (at drop off and pick up times) means that it is not suitable to expand to cope with more children. Safety must be of paramount importance.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6, 3.8 and 3.11. The County Council will be made aware of safety issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB12	Existing infrastructure (addition to points raised on traffic and road safety) such as water supply and sewerage would be unable to cope with the proposed new houses.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB13	Existing infrastructure (addition to points raised on traffic and road safety) such as water supply and sewerage would be unable to cope with the proposed new houses.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB12	For hundred of years the village has been a place where people have lived from generation to generation. Younger people are now unable to afford to buy a property in the village and move to cheaper locations. This means the very large elderly population do not have family living nearby to care for them, and impacts the Council in its responsibility to care for the elderly.	None stated.	<p>The Council agrees that affordability or the ability for people to get on the property ladder, is a key issue throughout the Borough. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) notes that most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. The proposed allocations set out in the Site Allocations DPD will provide a significant contribution to the housing stock of the Borough and will help address some of the housing needs. The proposed sites in Pyrford are required to provide 50% affordable housing onsite, as set out in the key requirements and within Core Strategy Policy CS12.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS13 states that the Council will encourage the provision of elderly accommodation in sustainable locations across the Borough. It is recognised that this will help in freeing up family sized housing in the Borough. Nevertheless this alone will not reduce the amount of land or dwellings required to meet the local housing need.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB13	For hundred of years the village has been a place where people have lived from generation to generation. Younger people are now unable to afford to buy a property in the village and move to cheaper locations. This means the very large elderly population do not have family living nearby to care for them, and impacts the Council in its responsibility to care for the elderly.	None stated.	<p>The Council agrees that affordability or the ability for people to get on the property ladder, is a key issue throughout the Borough. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) notes that most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. The proposed allocations set out in the Site Allocations DPD will provide a significant contribution to the housing stock of the Borough and will help address some of the housing needs. The proposed sites in Pyrford are required to provide 50% affordable housing onsite, as set out in the key requirements and within Core Strategy Policy CS12.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS13 states that the Council will encourage the provision of elderly accommodation in sustainable locations across the Borough. It is recognised that this will help in freeing up family sized housing in the Borough. Nevertheless this alone will not reduce the amount of land or dwellings required to meet the local housing need.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB12	It would be more prudent to focus on the supply of suitable downsizing apartments for mature citizens who want to stay in the area but cannot find suitable accommodation. Suggests the Mayford Grange retirement village as an example of what needs to be built in several locations around Woking. These should be built near a range of infrastructure such as shops, doctors and bus routes. Pyrford lack these facilities so is not suitable for large development or to assist the growing ageing population. If any development is sanctioned it should be for individually occupied retirement bungalows, which for release larger houses for growing families.	Suggests small scale, individual occupation retirement bungalows to meet the local need of the ageing population, and enable larger houses to be released for families.	<p>Core Strategy Policy CS13 states that the Council will encourage the provision of elderly accommodation in sustainable locations across the Borough. It is recognised that this will help in freeing up family sized housing in the Borough. Nevertheless this alone will not reduce the amount of land or dwellings required to meet the local housing need.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate healthcare provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>As part of the key requirements for the site, any proposed development will be required to improve provision of and connectivity to existing informal and formal recreation space. The Core Strategy also sets out open space requirements for new developments to ensure future residents have access to open space and recreation facilities.</p> <p>The Core Strategy, in particular Policy CS11: Housing mix, requires all new residential proposals to provide a housing mix based on local housing needs. This should be referenced to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) which takes into account local demographics and population forecasts. The exact type and nature of housing on the site will be considered in detail at the planning application stage. This is expected to be post-2027 when the site is proposed to be released from the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB13	It would be more prudent to focus on the supply of suitable downsizing apartments for mature citizens who want to stay in the area but cannot find suitable accommodation. Suggests the Mayford Grange retirement village as an example of what needs to be built in several locations around Woking. These should be built near a range of infrastructure such as shops, doctors and bus routes. Pyrford lack these facilities so is not suitable for large development or to assist the growing ageing population. If any development is sanctioned it should be for individually occupied retirement bungalows, which for release larger houses for growing families.	Suggests small scale, individual occupation retirement bungalows to meet the local need of the ageing population, and enable larger houses to be released for families.	Core Strategy Policy CS13 states that the Council will encourage the provision of elderly accommodation in sustainable locations across the Borough. It is recognised that this will help in freeing up family sized housing in the Borough. Nevertheless this alone will not reduce the amount of land or dwellings required to meet the local housing need. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate healthcare provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. As part of the key requirements for the site, any proposed development will be required to improve provision of and connectivity to existing informal and formal recreation space. The Core Strategy also sets out open space requirements for new developments to ensure future residents have access to open space and recreation facilities. The Core Strategy, in particular Policy CS11: Housing mix, requires all new residential proposals to provide a housing mix based on local housing needs. This should be referenced to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) which takes into account local demographics and population forecasts. The exact type and nature of housing on the site will be considered in detail at the planning application stage. This is expected to be post-2027 when the site is proposed to be released from the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB12	There is greater need for affordable and key worker homes which are currently lacking in Pyrford.	None stated.	The Council accepts that there is a need for affordable housing in the Borough. This is set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment as well as Core Strategy Policy CS12. The proposed allocation would require 50% of the dwellings to be affordable, thus increasing the supply of affordable housing in the Borough.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB13	There is greater need for affordable and key worker homes which are currently lacking in Pyrford.	None stated.	The Council accepts that there is a need for affordable housing in the Borough. This is set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment as well as Core Strategy Policy CS12. The proposed allocation would require 50% of the dwellings to be affordable, thus increasing the supply of affordable housing in the Borough.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB12	Lorries and buses get stuck trying to take the bend by the church. This is dangerous for other traffic.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB13	Lorries and buses get stuck trying to take the bend by the church. This is dangerous for other traffic.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB12	Objects to proposal to development over 400 houses in Pyrford. There are a lot of good reasons why development should not proceed, but my top 10 are: the semi-rural location with easy access to open, unspoilt countryside. The proposal will change the rural aspect of the village.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
506	Amanda Jane	Armitage	GB13	Objects to proposal to development over 400 houses in Pyrford. There are a lot of good reasons why development should not proceed, but my top 10 are: the semi-rural location with easy access to open, unspoilt countryside. The proposal will change the rural aspect of the village.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1102	Keith	Armstrong	GB12	Most concerned about safety given increase of 800+ cars using local roads. This will lead to gridlock and increase risks for children. Coldharbour Road will be a main route; already a significant problem, especially during term time. We have witnessed accidents and near misses. It's a matter of time before something more serious happens. I will be taking this up with my local M.P.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The combination of the above will minimise and safety concerns about the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1102	Keith	Armstrong	GB13	Most concerned about safety given increase of 800+ cars using local roads. This will lead to gridlock and increase risks for children. Coldharbour Road will be a main route; already a significant problem, especially during term time. We have witnessed accidents and near misses. It's a matter of time before something more serious happens. I will be taking this up with my local M.P.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1102	Keith	Armstrong	GB13	I am very concerned about the proposal to release Green Belt land in Pyrford. We moved to this beautiful, peaceful village. A safe environment was very important to our family. The area does not have the infrastructure to support so many new households. The school and doctors are already oversubscribed. The nearest NHS dentist is in Staines.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1102	Keith	Armstrong	GB12	I am very concerned about the proposal to release Green Belt land in Pyrford. We moved to this beautiful, peaceful village. A safe environment was very important to our family. The area does not have the infrastructure to support so many new households. The school and doctors are already oversubscribed. The nearest NHS dentist is in Staines.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area.	
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB8	Development will have a negative impact on wildlife on the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) SSSI.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB9	Development will have a negative impact on wildlife on the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) SSSI.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB10	Development will have a negative impact on wildlife on the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) SSSI.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB11	Development will have a negative impact on wildlife on the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) SSSI.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB14	Development will have a negative impact on wildlife on the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) SSSI.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB8	Object to proposals which will diminish the village character of the Mayford. Proposals in Mayford will eventually see the Woking and Guildford merging.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 7.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB9	Object to proposals which will diminish the village character of the Mayford. Proposals in Mayford will eventually see the Woking and Guildford merging.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 7.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB10	Object to proposals which will diminish the village character of the Mayford. Proposals in Mayford will eventually see the Woking and Guildford merging.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 7.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB11	Object to proposals which will diminish the village character of the Mayford. Proposals in Mayford will eventually see the Woking and Guildford merging.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 7.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB14	Object to proposals which will diminish the village character of the Mayford. Proposals in Mayford will eventually see the Woking and Guildford merging.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 7.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB8	Reconsider plans.	None stated.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB9	Reconsider plans.	None stated.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB10	Reconsider plans.	None stated.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB11	Reconsider plans.	None stated.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB14	Reconsider plans.	None stated.	Noted. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB7	Mayford resident. Believes that Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough. Therefore Mayford already makes a major contribution towards the traveller community and there is no justification for further expansion here.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0, 21.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB9	There is no supporting infrastructure. Proposals will impact on the health and well being of residents. Concern about the adequacy of various roads. Prey Heath Road towards Worplesdon Station is a safety hazard. Egley Road is at capacity and often at gridlock. Where the station itself is at capacity. The increase in housing will have a negative impact, exacerbating existing traffic problems as well as adding to pollution levels in the area.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>Since the Infrastructure Delivery Plan was published Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough, as set out in the Wessex Report. Network Rail are currently in the process of increasing the parking provision across a number of stations along this route in order to increase capacity at individual stations and usage of the trains across the network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB10	There is no supporting infrastructure. Proposals will impact on the health and well being of residents. Concern about the adequacy of various roads. Prey Heath Road towards Worplesdon Station is a safety hazard. Egley Road is at capacity and often at gridlock. Where the station itself is at capacity. The increase in housing will have a negative impact, exacerbating existing traffic problems as well as adding to pollution levels in the area.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>Since the Infrastructure Delivery Plan was published Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough, as set out in the Wessex Report. Network Rail are currently in the process of increasing the parking provision</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						across a number of stations along this route in order to increase capacity at individual stations and usage of the trains across the network.	
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB11	<p>There is no supporting infrastructure. Proposals will impact on the health and well being of residents.</p> <p>Concern about the adequacy of various roads. Prey Heath Road towards Worplesdon Station is a safety hazard. Egley Road is at capacity and often at gridlock. Where the station itself is at capacity.</p> <p>The increase in housing will have a negative impact, exacerbating existing traffic problems as well as adding to pollution levels in the area.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>Since the Infrastructure Delivery Plan was published Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough, as set out in the Wessex Report. Network Rail are currently in the process of increasing the parking provision across a number of stations along this route in order to increase capacity at individual stations and usage of the trains across the network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB14	<p>There is no supporting infrastructure. Proposals will impact on the health and well being of residents.</p> <p>Concern about the adequacy of various roads. Prey Heath Road towards Worplesdon Station is a safety hazard. Egley Road is at capacity and often at gridlock. Where the station itself is at capacity.</p> <p>The increase in housing will have a negative impact, exacerbating existing traffic problems as well as adding to pollution levels in the area.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>Since the Infrastructure Delivery Plan was published Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough, as set out in the Wessex Report. Network Rail are currently in the process of increasing the parking provision across a number of stations along this route in order to increase capacity at individual stations and usage of the trains across the network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB8	<p>There is no supporting infrastructure. Proposals will impact on the health and well being of residents.</p> <p>Concern about the adequacy of various roads. Prey Heath Road towards Worplesdon Station is a safety hazard. Egley</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Road is at capacity and often at gridlock. Where the station itself is at capacity. The increase in housing will have a negative impact, exacerbating existing traffic problems as well as adding to pollution levels in the area.		<p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>Since the Infrastructure Delivery Plan was published Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough, as set out in the Wessex Report. Network Rail are currently in the process of increasing the parking provision across a number of stations along this route in order to increase capacity at individual stations and usage of the trains across the network.</p>	
1275	John	Arvanitopoulos	GB7	Believes that Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough and there is no justification for further expansion here. Successive planning inspectors have refused planning permission on the site as it would reduce the openness of the GB	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
490	James	Ashby	GB12	Against proposals for future housing in Pyrford due to the impact of adding more traffic and potential gridlock to existing congestion, particularly at peak times. Any problems on the A3 and M25 result in further traffic through Pyrford.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
490	James	Ashby	GB13	Against proposals for future housing in Pyrford due to the impact of adding more traffic and potential gridlock to existing congestion, particularly at peak times. Any problems on the A3 and M25 result in further traffic through Pyrford.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
490	James	Ashby	GB12	The village's infrastructure is not adequate for purpose, and will not cope with 400+ car movements carrying children to and from school, adding to existing congestion.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding other forms of local infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.7 to 3.11.</p>	
490	James	Ashby	GB13	The village's infrastructure is not adequate for purpose, and will not cope with 400+ car movements carrying children to and from school, adding to existing congestion.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding other forms of local infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.7 to 3.11.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
318	Janine	Ashfield	GB4	The existing infrastructure and the local highways is strained. Object to further development in the small village.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure, congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
318	Janine	Ashfield	GB5	The existing infrastructure and the local highways is strained. Object to further development in the small village.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure, congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
318	Janine	Ashfield	GB4	Object to development of GB land in Byfleet. Byfleet is gradually losing its once peaceful character. The loss of GB land will further ruin its character	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>Please also see Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
318	Janine	Ashfield	GB5	Object to development of GB land in Byfleet. Byfleet is gradually losing its once peaceful character. The loss of GB land will further ruin its character	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>Please also see Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
908	Brian	Ashfield	GB4	Boundary with Aviary Road not strong.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
908	Brian	Ashfield	GB5	Object to the scale of development proposals in Pyrford and Wisley.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB8	A free school may be justified, although questions why the Highlands School site was not used. Against the inclusion of a leisure centre which will add to traffic flow and could be open until 10pm. There are plenty of sporting facilities in the borough.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB10	To accommodate this development there would need to be significant structural change to the road layout and two current single line bridges and rail tunnel on Black Horse Road. Traffic management will be a nightmare and we will become urban overnight.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB11	To accommodate this development there would need to be significant structural change to the road layout and two current single line bridges and rail tunnel on Black Horse Road. Traffic management will be a nightmare and we will become urban overnight.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB10	Hundreds of houses will double the number of cars and increase dramatically noise and pollution. The proposals will lead to worsened quality of life (residential amenity is already effected).	None stated.	In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB11	Hundreds of houses will double the number of cars and increase dramatically noise and pollution. The proposals will lead to worsened quality of life (residential amenity is already effected).	None stated.	This representation has been addressed, with regard to increased cars and traffic, in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. On pollution, the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of pollution. In addition, the Council's Development Management Policies DPD (examined in May 2016) includes policies to control pollution from development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB7	Mayford will struggle to cope with the level of development envisaged. The floodplain should be considered and the	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 5.0 and 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				proposals will push our houses closer to flooding. The Victorians understood these issues, we should not ignore them.			of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB8	Mayford will struggle to cope with the level of development envisaged. The floodplain should be considered and the proposals will push our houses closer to flooding. The Victorians understood these issues, we should not ignore them.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB9	Mayford will struggle to cope with the level of development envisaged. The floodplain should be considered and the proposals will push our houses closer to flooding. The Victorians understood these issues, we should not ignore them.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB10	Mayford will struggle to cope with the level of development envisaged. The floodplain should be considered and the proposals will push our houses closer to flooding. The Victorians understood these issues, we should not ignore them.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB11	Mayford will struggle to cope with the level of development envisaged. The floodplain should be considered and the proposals will push our houses closer to flooding. The Victorians understood these issues, we should not ignore them.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB7	Objects to the development, which is too much and will irrevocably change a rural area into an urban one - it is disproportionate.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Mayford are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB8	Objects to the development, which is too much and will irrevocably change a rural area into an urban one - it is disproportionate.	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Mayford are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Mayford and Brookwood, Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest. It should be noted that new development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (see Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper) and also green infrastructure - key requirements for sites state they must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. In addition site GB14 is an allocation that safeguards for green infrastructure. The landscape character of sites, including their rural context, will be considered, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7.0 and with regard to the Council's Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's landscape and townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB9	Objects to the development, which is too much and will irrevocably change a rural area into an urban one - it is disproportionate.	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Mayford are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Mayford and Brookwood, Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest. It should be noted that new	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (see Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper) and also green infrastructure - key requirements for sites state they must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. In addition site GB14 is an allocation that safeguards for green infrastructure. The landscape character of sites, including their rural context, will be considered, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7.0 and with regard to the Council's Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's landscape and townscape.	
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB10	Objects to the development, which is too much and will irrevocably change a rural area into an urban one - it is disproportionate.	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Mayford are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Mayford and Brookwood, Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest. It should be noted that new development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (see Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper) and also green infrastructure - key requirements for sites state they must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. In addition site GB14 is an allocation that safeguards for green infrastructure. The landscape character of sites, including their rural context, will be considered, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7.0 and with regard to the Council's Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's landscape and townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB11	Objects to the development, which is too much and will irrevocably change a rural area into an urban one - it is disproportionate.	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Mayford are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Mayford and Brookwood, Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest. It should be noted that new development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (see Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper) and also green infrastructure - key requirements for sites state they must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. In addition site GB14 is an allocation that safeguards for green infrastructure. The landscape character of sites, including their rural context, will be considered, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7.0 and with regard to the Council's Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's landscape and townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB8	Objects to the development, which is too much and will irrevocably change a rural area into an urban one - it is disproportionate.	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Mayford are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Mayford and Brookwood, Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest. It should be noted that new development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (see Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper) and also green infrastructure - key requirements for sites state they must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. In addition site GB14 is an allocation that safeguards for green infrastructure. The landscape character of sites, including their rural context, will be considered, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7.0 and with regard to the Council's Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's landscape and townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB10	Objects to the development, which is too much and will irrevocably change a rural area into an urban one - it is disproportionate.	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Mayford are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Mayford and Brookwood, Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest. It should be noted that new development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (see Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper) and also green infrastructure - key requirements for sites state they must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. In addition site GB14 is an allocation that safeguards for green infrastructure. The landscape character of sites, including their rural context, will be considered, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7.0 and with regard to the Council's Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's landscape and townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB11	Objects to the development, which is too much and will irrevocably change a rural area into an urban one - it is disproportionate.	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Mayford are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Mayford and Brookwood, Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest. It should be noted that new development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (see Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper) and also green infrastructure - key requirements for sites state they must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. In addition site GB14 is an allocation that safeguards for green infrastructure. The landscape character of sites, including their rural context, will be considered, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7.0 and with regard to the Council's Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's landscape and townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB7	Objects to the development, which is too much and will irrevocably change a rural area into an urban one - it is disproportionate.	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Mayford are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Mayford and Brookwood, Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest. It should be noted that new development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (see Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper) and also green infrastructure - key requirements for sites state they must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. In addition site GB14 is an allocation that safeguards for green infrastructure. The landscape character of sites, including their rural context, will be considered, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7.0 and with regard to the Council's Core Strategy Policies CS21 Design and CS24 Woking's landscape and townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB8	The Council should consider brownfield sites and reusing 'mothballed facilities'	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB9	The Council should consider brownfield sites and reusing 'mothballed facilities'	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB10	The Council should consider brownfield sites and reusing 'mothballed facilities'	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1390	Martin, Caroline	Ashford	GB11	The Council should consider brownfield sites and reusing 'mothballed facilities'	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
132	Alec	Ashley	General	<p>Mayford residents for forty and sixty years, have lived current address in Saunders Lane for forty years.</p> <p>Deplore any erosion of the Green Belt anywhere in the country due to its instituted purposes – to protect the integrity of individual towns and cities and to prevent urban sprawl. Occasionally there are exceptional circumstances where this might be reviewed, perhaps the siting of a school in GB9 would fall into this category. However in general the building on Green Belt sets a dangerous precedent which will make further erosion of the Green Belt easier in the future.</p>	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper 1.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
132	Alec	Ashley	GB7	Further development of this site would have a visual impact and is inappropriate. There is no buffer between it and a listed property and Smarts Heath Common (SSSI), used extensively for recreation by local residents. Local amenities are limited and no space for business activities associated with a traveller site. The West side of Woking already provides a significant contribution to the needs of travellers with sites in close proximity in Burdeshott Road and Brookwood Lye Road.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
132	Alec	Ashley	GB8	<p>Object to the removal of this site from the Green Belt for development as the area is integral in providing a green space between the historic Mayford and Woking. There are very limited amenities locally. The A320 is extremely busy especially during rush hour; the route between Mayford and Woking is frequently gridlocked. The area around Barnsbury School, is situated on a cross roads with poor sight lines and uses on-road parking for dropping off Primary school children, is potentially dangerous without increasing traffic volumes. The bus service between Woking and Guildford is infrequent and unreliable. At Worplesdon Station; parking is restricted and access by foot or cycle is dangerous because of the narrowness and lack of footpaths in Prey Heath Road.</p> <p>Understand objections can be made through the current Secondary School planning application. Appreciate the modifications achieved through consultation between the Mayford Village Society and the Applicants, this will probably help make the development acceptable to many Mayford residents. However the application includes a running track and leisure centre and cannot see any justification for this with a recently refurbished leisure centre a mile or so away and excellent sports facilities available to the public at the Winston Churchill School in St. John's. Surely a better location for a new leisure centre would be on the more deprived side of Woking in the Maybury/Sheerwater area. Understand the expected usage of the leisure centre and athletics track would be very high and would include special county-wide events on a regular basis. This indicates constant use of this site thus attracting an enormous amount of traffic and noise and would be out of keeping with the rural aspect of the area.</p>	None stated.	The proposed school at site GB8 and the associated leisure facilities has the benefit of planning approval. The Council is satisfied that it can be sustainably developed. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The representation about the traffic impacts of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3 and 20. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the sites, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed as part of any planning application and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the sites are sustainable. The representation about lack of buses in the area is acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand that will result from the development on the back of the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand, including adequate parking to serve railway stations. Section 20 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper addresses how the transport implications of the proposals are assessed and/or will be addressed. Whilst the Council acknowledges that the development in the area will require traffic mitigation measures, this can be addressed as part of the planning application process. The key requirements of the proposals requests for detailed transport assessment to be carried out to inform any planning application for the development of the site. The Council will work with the County Council to make sure that this is carried to the required standards and any adverse impacts mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
132	Alec	Ashley	GB9	Object to the safeguarding of this site for removal from the Green Belt to allow for future development needs again on	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2 and 1.,	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				the grounds of the loss of green space between Mayford and Woking and the lack of appropriate infrastructure.			of this representation
132	Alec	Ashley	GB10	Object to this land being safeguarded for removed from the Green Belt on the grounds of lack of infrastructure. Access in and out via Hook Hill Lane would be difficult. The lane is extremely narrow with no footpath. It is prone to flooding. Access is further impeded by the narrow railway bridge which has a weight limit and is light controlled. The junction of Hook Hill Lane with Smarts Heath Road is hazardous at times because of parking around the Post Office and traffic from the access road to the Business Centre and Freemantles School opposite. Access via Saunders Lane would add significantly to the volume of traffic in this narrow road and increase the difficulty in joining Smarts Heath Road where traffic builds up due to the bottle neck created by the single file, light controlled railway bridge.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
132	Alec	Ashley	GB11	Object to this land being removed from the Green Belt. Saunders Lane is extremely narrow in parts (sometimes vehicles have to mount the pavement to pass larger vehicles) and liable to flooding; the proposed sized development would significantly increase the volume of traffic. Surrounding roads also have difficulties. Black Horse Cross Roads and the junction of Blackhorse Road and Berry Lane are subject to frequent accidents. The railway arch in Blackhorse Road floods regularly and is a significant bottleneck. The access to Brookwood Lye Road is also hazardous. At Worplesdon Station; parking is restricted and access by foot or cycle is dangerous because of the narrowness and lack of footpaths in Prey Heath Road. The single file bridge over the Bourne in Smarts Heath Lane has a weight restriction and poor sight lines. This whole site has strategic value as the lower part of the Hook Heath Escarpment and has been rejected for development in the past by the Secretary of State for this reason. The land, has been unmanaged by the current owners, is prone to flooding and provides natural drainage for the higher ground; this would be compromised by development. The fields to the north and west of the Mayford Village Hall are still owned by the Council; they are currently used for grazing. The area presently used as a children's play ground and an informal football pitch were given to the people of Mayford for recreational use in exchange for a small portion of Smarts Heath Common. The site suffers from lack of infrastructure with no local Doctors, Dentists and other amenities.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The flood risk implication of the proposals is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5. The Council will ensure that the development of the sites incorporate sufficient green infrastructure and open space to serve the developments.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
132	Alec	Ashley	GB14	This site would suffer from the same problems of access as site 11. Saunders Lane is extremely narrow in parts (sometimes vehicles have to mount the pavement to pass larger vehicles) and liable to flooding; the proposed sized development would significantly increase the volume of traffic. Surrounding roads also have difficulties. Black Horse Cross Roads and the junction of Blackhorse Road and Berry Lane are subject to frequent accidents. The railway arch in Blackhorse Road floods regularly and is a significant bottleneck. The access to Brookwood Lye Road is also hazardous. At Worplesdon Station; parking is restricted and access by foot or cycle is dangerous because of the narrowness and lack of footpaths in Prey Heath Road. The single file bridge over the Bourne in Smarts Heath Lane has	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				a weight restriction and poor sight lines.		discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage	
132	Alec	Ashley	General	<p>Should all these sites be removed from the Green Belt and developed it would join Mayford to Woking and totally overwhelm and destroy the village and its unique atmosphere. This would not be in character with the village which consists of ribbon development, a mixture of character housing with generous gardens reflecting the Nursery and farming heritage of the area. Whilst Mayford should expect some infilling and smaller scale development it should not expect to be destroyed and absorbed into Woking. We hope and trust that the council will not be prejudiced in their decision making by the power and influence of developers who speculatively bought the land and will take into consideration the wishes and local knowledge of the Mayford residents.</p> <p>Please refer also to the response from the Mayford Village Society; we are happy for them to represent our views.</p>	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1. The character of Mayford is already protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The Council is satisfied by the evidence and policies it has that the identity of Mayford and its character will not be undermined by the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1016	W.G.	Ashpitel	GB12	Development will take the roads beyond their capacity, as shown in the Council's analysis. Increasing capacity on surrounding roads is not possible or would not solve the problem.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 7.0, 18.0, 19.0, 20.0, 23.0 and 24.0.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1016	W.G.	Ashpitel	GB13	Development will take the roads beyond their capacity, as shown in the Council's analysis. Increasing capacity on surrounding roads is not possible or would not solve the problem.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 7.0, 18.0, 19.0, 20.0, 23.0 and 24.0.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1016	W.G.	Ashpittel	GB12	Removing this site from the Green Belt is contrary to the Council's local plan for Pyrford.	None stated.	The Council believes that the approach taken in preparing the Site Allocations DPD is consistent with both local and national planning policy. This is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1016	W.G.	Ashpittel	GB13	Removing this site from the Green Belt is contrary to the Council's local plan for Pyrford.	None stated.	The Council believes that the approach taken in preparing the Site Allocations DPD is consistent with both local and national planning policy. This is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1016	W.G.	Ashpittel	GB13	The proposed density is much higher than the surrounding density and will change the setting of Pyrford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1016	W.G.	Ashpittel	GB12	The Marshall parade of shops is only used as top up shopping and regular shopping is done further afield.	None stated.	The existing shops caters for the everyday needs of those living locally.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1016	W.G.	Ashpittel	GB13	The Marshall parade of shops is only used as top up shopping and regular shopping is done further afield.	None stated.	The existing shops caters for the everyday needs of those living locally.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1016	W.G.	Ashpittel	GB12	The site is a significant distance from Wisley and Pyrford therefore the benefit from increasing the cycle access to these areas is not deliverable.	None stated.	The Council does not consider the point unreasonable, the areas are within reasonable cycling distance and it is merely highlighting that there is opportunity to enhance the links between these areas.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1016	W.G.	Ashpittel	GB13	The site is a significant distance from Wisley and Pyrford therefore the benefit from increasing the cycle access to these areas is not deliverable.	None stated.	The Council does not consider the point unreasonable, the areas are within reasonable cycling distance and it is merely highlighting that there is opportunity to enhance the links between these areas.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1016	W.G.	Ashpittel	GB12	Development will adversely affect the character of Pyrford village and Pyrford Court a nationally registered Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest which is to the west of GB12 and the CAs to the north of GB13, in conflict with Core Strategy policies.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1016	W.G.	Ashpittel	GB12	It is a contradiction to state the site has defensible Green Belt boundary and then state developing on both sides of Upshot Lane as a much larger development opportunity.	None stated.	The intention of this key requirement for site GB13 is to highlight that as both sites are proposed to be allocated for development needs post 2027, there is an opportunity to either develop the sites simultaneously or have regard to each other in terms of overall design (i.e. access, character, landscaping). The Council believes that the proposed safeguarding of these sites will ensure that the Site Allocations DPD is consistent with national planning policy as well as create a defensible Green Belt boundary.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1016	W.G.	Ashpittel	GB13	It is a contradiction to state the site has defensible Green Belt boundary and then state developing on both sides of Upshot Lane as a much larger development opportunity. Sandy Lane to the east of GB 13 is not as strong boundary and the road would be under pressure from development. Furthermore the proposal states the site would form its own identity which contradict the proposal to develop both sites in tandem.	None stated.	The intention of this key requirement for site GB13 is to highlight that as both sites are proposed to be allocated for development needs post 2027, there is an opportunity to either develop the sites simultaneously or have regard to each other in terms of overall design (i.e. access, character, landscaping). The Council believes that the proposed safeguarding of these sites will ensure that the Site Allocations DPD is consistent with national planning policy as well as create a defensible Green Belt boundary.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1371	D.K.	Ashton	GB12	Object to proposals for Pyrford	None stated.	Objection is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1371	D.K.	Ashton	GB13	Object to proposals for Pyrford	None stated.	Objection is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1371	D.K.	Ashton	GB12	The proposals will exacerbate congestion problems in the area on the narrow busy roads.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1371	D.K.	Ashton	GB13	The proposals will exacerbate congestion problems in the area on the narrow busy roads.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
570	Rosalind	Askew	GB11	Mayford is small village mentioned in the Domesday Book and any further addition would lead to the merging of Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
570	Rosalind	Askew	GB11	All of Woking's brownfield site should be used up first.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
570	Rosalind	Askew	GB8	Deeply regrets the Council's decision to allow building on Green Belt land in Mayford. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	Objection noted. The justification for releasing Green Belt land for development and for safeguarding land for development beyond 2027 is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0. and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
570	Rosalind	Askew	GB9	Deeply regrets the Council's decision to allow building on Green Belt land in Mayford. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	Objection noted. The justification for releasing Green Belt land for development and for safeguarding land for development beyond 2027 is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0. and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
570	Rosalind	Askew	GB10	Deeply regrets the Council's decision to allow building on Green Belt land in Mayford. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	Objection noted. The justification for releasing Green Belt land for development and for safeguarding land for development beyond 2027 is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0. and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
570	Rosalind	Askew	GB11	Deeply regrets the Council's decision to allow building on Green Belt land in Mayford. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	Objection noted. The justification for releasing Green Belt land for development and for safeguarding land for development beyond 2027 is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0. and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
570	Rosalind	Askew	GB7	Deeply regrets the Council's decision to allow building on Green Belt land in Mayford. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	Objection noted. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
570	Rosalind	Askew	GB11	The road network is not adequate for the existing houses, and at peak hours the single land bridge over the railway lead to congestions. Saunders Lane is too narrow, risking accidents with the mix of users (horse rider, cyclists) in danger from speeding vehicles.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding speeding should be highlighted to the County Highways Authority.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
570	Rosalind	Askew	GB7	Objects to extending the traveller site, which is not appropriate in a residential area.	None stated.	There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1617	David	Askew	GB7	Extending the site would have a negative impact on the visual amenity and character of the residential area and adjacent SSSI. Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because it is an inappropriate site.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The representation regarding previous planning decisions for the site has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	
1617	David	Askew	GB7	Not satisfied that other areas of the Borough have been adequately considered.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1617	David	Askew	GB7	Object to increasing Traveller pitches in the Green Belt. Mayford already provides local Traveller sites, with most of the boroughs provision in the local area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1617	David	Askew	GB8	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Mayford. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1617	David	Askew	GB9	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Mayford. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1617	David	Askew	GB10	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Mayford. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1617	David	Askew	GB11	Development would destroy the Green Belt and recreational use of the land. It also separates Woking from Mayford.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed allocation on amenity and well being has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the separation between Woking and Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, in particular paragraph 12.2.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1617	David	Askew	GB11	Saunders Lane is narrow, unlit and unsuitable for increased traffic. There is no local transport so potential residents will need their own vehicles. This will make matters worse on Saunders Lane and the A320 and A323.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The existing frequency and accessibility of public transport is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	
1617	David	Askew	GB11	The rising ground is unsuitable for development and prone to flooding which flows down to Saunders Lane and along the footpaths. Development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p> <p>As part of the drainage works that would be required to take place as set out in the Key Requirements in the DPD, there may be the possibility of improving the quality of the existing footpaths to make sure they can be accessed throughout the year. This will need to be considered at the planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1617	David	Askew	GB11	The village has no supporting infrastructure. I am happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representer ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1617	David	Askew	GB10	Already significant traffic on Egley Road. Additional homes and a school in the area will make the situation worse. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges which will not be able to cope with additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1617	David	Askew	GB8	Already significant traffic on Egley Road. Additional homes and a school in the area will make the situation worse. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges which will not be able to cope with additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
1617	David	Askew	GB9	Already significant traffic on Egley Road. Additional homes and a school in the area will make the situation worse. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges which will not be able to cope with additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
707	Vicky	Aston	General	Sport England is concerned that the Council has chosen to allocate playing fields and sports facilities within the Borough for redevelopment without first updating the evidence base. Sport England welcomes the Council's intention to update the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy and it wishes to support the Council with this important piece of work.	None stated.	<p>The Council is notes the concern. The Council has begun the process of updating its Playing Pitch Strategy and is liaising with Sport England to ensure that it carried out in line with the recommend methodology.</p> <p>In relation to the proposed allocation of this site, any development proposal will have to clearly demonstrate to the Council and Sport England that the scheme will comply with both local and national policy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
707	Vicky	Aston	UA32	Sport England objects to the inclusion of the existing playing fields and athletics track within the proposed site area. SE are working with the Council to provide replacement facilities for any that are lost through the regeneration scheme. The	Remove the existing sports facilities including the	<p>The Council attaches great importance to the Borough's sports facilities and playing fields as they have significant benefits to the local community. The Council notes the objection from Sport England regarding including the existing facilities and playing fields within the draft allocation. As set out within the key requirements for the site, the existing athletics track will need to be retained as part of a redevelopment of the site or relocated. The relocation of the</p>	<p>Insert the following as a key requirement:</p> <p>The existing playing</p>

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Council should provide more detailed policies that provide protection for these important community facilities and for their replacement elsewhere in the borough. SE is concerned that the Council has chosen to allocate sports facilities and playing fields without updating its evidence base. SE welcomes that WBC are intending to update the Playing Pitch Strategy and wishes to support the Council with this important piece of work.	playing fields and athletics track from the site allocation. Alternately highlight within the site allocations document where these facilities will be replaced. The document should explain that existing sports facilities will be replaced in line with Paragraph 74 of the NPPF.	<p>facility is a prerequisite to the development of the site. The Council however believe that this key requirement should be enhanced to ensure the continuous use of the facility.</p> <p>The Council note the omission of the existing playing fields in the key requirements. The Council therefore propose to set out in the key requirements that the existing playing fields within the site will be retained, relocated or alternative sports and recreational provision will be provided as set out in paragraph 74 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>fields within the site should be retained or relocated to allow effective public use. Where there is a loss of playing fields, there must be alternative sports and recreational provision provided.</p> <p>Amend the key requirement regarding the Athletics Track to read:</p> <p>Retention of the Athletics Track or to be relocated to an accessible location to allow effective public use. Any relocation should be a prerequisite to the development of the site. There should be a continuous provision of this facility whether it is retained within the site or relocated.</p>
707	Vicky	Aston	GB8	Sport England supports the proposed new sports facilities. If the proposed playing fields also form part of the Green Infrastructure requirement for the new houses, then it may need to be enlarged. SE recommend that the Council urgently updates its Planning Pitch Strategy to determine provision and need across community.	A planning application has already been submitted which includes a replacement floodlit athletics track for the existing facility at Sheerwater and a five court sports hall for use by the community. Details of these facilities should be included in the policy.	<p>The Council notes the support for the sports and leisure facilities at the site.</p> <p>The draft Site Allocations DPD was prepared and published prior to the submission of the planning application for the proposed development at Egley Road (GB8). As per all sites in the DPD, the Council will update the allocations when the Development Management process precedes the plan making process.</p>	Update GB8 to reflect planning permission for new school, leisure centre and sports facilities
1075	Nawal	Atiq	General	<p>Highways England is the responsible highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). In the case of Woking Borough, this relates to the A3 and M25 Junctions 10 and 11.</p> <p>We would be concerned if any material increase in traffic were to occur on the SRN as a result of planned growth in the borough without careful consideration of mitigation measures. The Local Plan should provide the planning policy framework to ensure development cannot progress without</p>	None stated.	The comments are noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>the appropriate infrastructure in place. When considering proposals for growth, impacts on the SRN will need to be identified and mitigated as far as reasonably possible. We will in general support a local authority proposal that considers sustainable measures which manage down demand and reduces the need to travel. Infrastructure improvements on the SRN should only be considered as a last resort.</p> <p>We have reviewed the Development Plan Document (DPD) and we note that the majority of developments would be in Woking, and will unlikely to result in a significant impact on the SRN.</p>			
1075	Nawal	Atiq	GB15	<p>We wish to be consulted on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GB15. Note the developer will contribute to provision of essential transport infrastructure to mitigate the impacts of the development, a detailed TA would take account of nearby developments and a TP to minimise car use of development occupants - GB16 note there is an extant planning permission, that developer will contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure to mitigate the impacts of the development. Note cycling and walking infrastructure and bus stops will be provided, also a TA has been commissioned and look forward to receiving this. Request details of any off-site highway improvements on the A245, to enable us to understand impact on the A3, if any. 	None stated.	The commitment to provide the necessary infrastructure to support the development is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1075	Nawal	Atiq	GB16	<p>We wish to be consulted on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GB15. Note the developer will contribute to provision of essential transport infrastructure to mitigate the impacts of the development, a detailed TA would take account of nearby developments and a TP to minimise car use of development occupants - GB16 note there is an extant planning permission, that developer will contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure to mitigate the impacts of the development. Note cycling and walking infrastructure and bus stops will be provided, also a TA has been commissioned and look forward to receiving this. Request details of any off-site highway improvements on the A245, to enable us to understand impact on the A3, if any. 	None stated.	The commitment to provided necessary infrastructure to serve the development is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1075	Nawal	Atiq	UA34	<p>We would welcome the opportunity to be consulted on the following proposed developments in Woking as they come forward:</p> <p>UA9 Victoria Square, UA16 Woking Railway & Athletic Club, UA17 Poole Road Industrial Estate, UA32 Land within Sheerwater Priority Place, UA34 Forsyth Road Industrial Estate, UA35 Monument Way West Industrial Estate, UA41 Coal Yard/Aggregate Yard, UA49 Camphill Tip. Note that a detailed Transport Assessment will take account of proposed developments in the vicinity and a Travel Plan (TP) will minimise car use of occupants, supporting subsequent formal applications.</p>	None stated.	Comments noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1075	Nawal	Atiq	UA35	<p>We would welcome the opportunity to be consulted on the following proposed developments in Woking as they come forward:</p>	None stated.	Comments noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				UA9 Victoria Square, UA16 Woking Railway & Athletic Club, UA17 Poole Road Industrial Estate, UA32 Land within Sheerwater Priority Place, UA34 Forsyth Road Industrial Estate, UA35 Monument Way West Industrial Estate, UA41 Coal Yard/Aggregate Yard, UA49 Camphill Tip. Note that a detailed Transport Assessment will take account of proposed developments in the vicinity and a Travel Plan (TP) will minimise car use of occupants, supporting subsequent formal applications.			
1075	Nawal	Atiq	UA41	We would welcome the opportunity to be consulted on the following proposed developments in Woking as they come forward: UA9 Victoria Square, UA16 Woking Railway & Athletic Club, UA17 Poole Road Industrial Estate, UA32 Land within Sheerwater Priority Place, UA34 Forsyth Road Industrial Estate, UA35 Monument Way West Industrial Estate, UA41 Coal Yard/Aggregate Yard, UA49 Camphill Tip. Note that a detailed Transport Assessment will take account of proposed developments in the vicinity and a Travel Plan (TP) will minimise car use of occupants, supporting subsequent formal applications.	None stated.	Comments noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1075	Nawal	Atiq	UA49	We would welcome the opportunity to be consulted on the following proposed developments in Woking as they come forward: UA9 Victoria Square, UA16 Woking Railway & Athletic Club, UA17 Poole Road Industrial Estate, UA32 Land within Sheerwater Priority Place, UA34 Forsyth Road Industrial Estate, UA35 Monument Way West Industrial Estate, UA41 Coal Yard/Aggregate Yard, UA49 Camphill Tip. Note that a detailed Transport Assessment will take account of proposed developments in the vicinity and a Travel Plan (TP) will minimise car use of occupants, supporting subsequent formal applications.	None stated.	Comments noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1075	Nawal	Atiq	UA9	We would welcome the opportunity to be consulted on the following proposed developments in Woking as they come forward: UA9 Victoria Square, UA16 Woking Railway & Athletic Club, UA17 Poole Road Industrial Estate, UA32 Land within Sheerwater Priority Place, UA34 Forsyth Road Industrial Estate, UA35 Monument Way West Industrial Estate, UA41 Coal Yard/Aggregate Yard, UA49 Camphill Tip. Note that a detailed Transport Assessment will take account of proposed developments in the vicinity and a Travel Plan (TP) will minimise car use of occupants, supporting subsequent formal applications.	None stated.	Comments noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1075	Nawal	Atiq	UA16	We would welcome the opportunity to be consulted on the following proposed developments in Woking as they come forward:	None stated.	The comments are noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				UA9 Victoria Square, UA16 Woking Railway & Athletic Club, UA17 Poole Road Industrial Estate, UA32 Land within Sheerwater Priority Place, UA34 Forsyth Road Industrial Estate, UA35 Monument Way West Industrial Estate, UA41 Coal Yard/Aggregate Yard, UA49 Camphill Tip. Note that a detailed Transport Assessment will take account of proposed developments in the vicinity and a Travel Plan (TP) will minimise car use of occupants, supporting subsequent formal applications.			
1075	Nawal	Atiq	UA17	We would welcome the opportunity to be consulted on the following proposed developments in Woking as they come forward: UA9 Victoria Square, UA16 Woking Railway & Athletic Club, UA17 Poole Road Industrial Estate, UA32 Land within Sheerwater Priority Place, UA34 Forsyth Road Industrial Estate, UA35 Monument Way West Industrial Estate, UA41 Coal Yard/Aggregate Yard, UA49 Camphill Tip. Note that a detailed Transport Assessment will take account of proposed developments in the vicinity and a Travel Plan (TP) will minimise car use of occupants, supporting subsequent formal applications.	None stated.	The comments are noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1075	Nawal	Atiq	UA32	We would welcome the opportunity to be consulted on the following proposed developments in Woking as they come forward: UA9 Victoria Square, UA16 Woking Railway & Athletic Club, UA17 Poole Road Industrial Estate, UA32 Land within Sheerwater Priority Place, UA34 Forsyth Road Industrial Estate, UA35 Monument Way West Industrial Estate, UA41 Coal Yard/Aggregate Yard, UA49 Camphill Tip. Note that a detailed Transport Assessment will take account of proposed developments in the vicinity and a Travel Plan (TP) will minimise car use of occupants, supporting subsequent formal applications.	None stated.	The comments are noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
420	Neil	Atkins	GB4	Byfleet is historically susceptible to flooding- e.g. Christmas 2013. Any additional housing will exacerbate the flood problems and should be avoided. House insurance prices have already increased steeply, that houses in the area will become uninsurable	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in the Byfleet area and can advise that the Environment Agency are working with relevant partners to develop future Flood Alleviation Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to Local communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
420	Neil	Atkins	GB5	Byfleet is historically susceptible to flooding- e.g. Christmas 2013. Any additional housing will exacerbate the flood problems and should be avoided. House insurance prices have already increased steeply, that houses in the area will become uninsurable	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in the Byfleet area and can advise that the Environment Agency are working with relevant partners to develop future Flood Alleviation Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to Local communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
420	Neil	Atkins	GB15	Byfleet is historically susceptible to flooding- e.g. Christmas 2013. Any additional housing will exacerbate the flood problems and should be avoided. House insurance prices have already increased steeply, that houses in the area will become uninsurable	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in the Byfleet area and can advise that the Environment Agency are working with relevant partners to develop Flood Alleviation Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to Local communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
420	Neil	Atkins	GB16	Byfleet is historically susceptible to flooding- e.g. Christmas 2013. Any additional housing will exacerbate the flood problems and should be avoided. House insurance prices have already increased steeply, that houses in the area will become uninsurable	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in the Byfleet area and can advise that the Environment Agency are working with relevant partners to develop future Flood Alleviation Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to Local communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
420	Neil	Atkins	GB4	Health Centre is West Byfleet is at capacity. Consideration should be given to the provision of medical facilities specifically for Byfleet Village.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
420	Neil	Atkins	GB5	Health Centre is West Byfleet is at capacity. Consideration should be given to the provision of medical facilities specifically for Byfleet Village.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
420	Neil	Atkins	GB15	Health Centre is West Byfleet is at capacity. Consideration should be given to the provision of medical facilities specifically for Byfleet Village.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
420	Neil	Atkins	GB16	Health Centre is West Byfleet is at capacity. Consideration should be given to the provision of medical facilities specifically for Byfleet Village.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
420	Neil	Atkins	GB4	Careful consideration should be given to parking arrangements in the retail centres of Byfleet and West Byfleet to ensure they remain attractive to shoppers. There are current problems associated.	None stated.	The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport, existing traffic congestion and highway safety.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
420	Neil	Atkins	GB5	Careful consideration should be given to parking arrangements in the retail centres of Byfleet and West Byfleet to ensure they remain attractive to shoppers. There are current problems associated.	None stated.	The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport, existing traffic congestion and highway safety.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
420	Neil	Atkins	GB15	Careful consideration should be given to parking arrangements in the retail centres of Byfleet and West Byfleet to ensure they remain attractive to shoppers. There are current problems associated.	None stated.	The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport, existing traffic congestion and highway safety.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
420	Neil	Atkins	GB16	Careful consideration should be given to parking arrangements in the retail centres of Byfleet and West Byfleet to ensure they remain attractive to shoppers. There are current problems associated.	None stated.	The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport, existing traffic congestion and highway safety.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
420	Neil	Atkins	GB4	There are limited school places in Byfleet and West Byfleet. Further consideration regarding provision of educational facilities is required.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
420	Neil	Atkins	GB5	There are limited school places in Byfleet and West Byfleet. Further consideration regarding provision of educational facilities is required.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
420	Neil	Atkins	GB15	There are limited school places in Byfleet and West Byfleet. Further consideration regarding provision of educational facilities is required.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
420	Neil	Atkins	GB16	There are limited school places in Byfleet and West Byfleet. Further consideration regarding provision of educational facilities is required.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
420	Neil	Atkins	GB4	Accessibility between West Byfleet and Byfleet is mainly on the A245. The latest traffic update 2015 demonstrates that the road is at capacity. The single carriageway road between Brooklands Road	A new major road towards the A3 and M25 could	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0 The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>junction to the A3 has limited potential for widening. Frequently occurring incidents on the M25 also has an impact on traffic in the area.</p> <p>A new major road towards the A3 and M25 could help to alleviate traffic problems</p>	help to alleviate traffic problems	<p>Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
420	Neil	Atkins	GB5	<p>Accessibility between West Byfleet and Byfleet is mainly on the A245. The latest traffic update 2015 demonstrates that the road is at capacity.</p> <p>The single carriageway road between Brooklands Road junction to the A3 has limited potential for widening. Frequently occurring incidents on the M25 also has an impact on traffic in the area.</p> <p>A new major road towards the A3 and M25 could help to alleviate traffic problems</p>	A new major road towards the A3 and M25 could help to alleviate traffic problems	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
420	Neil	Atkins	GB15	<p>Accessibility between West Byfleet and Byfleet is mainly on the A245. The latest traffic update 2015 demonstrates that the road is at capacity.</p> <p>The single carriageway road between Brooklands Road junction to the A3 has limited potential for widening. Frequently occurring incidents on the M25 also has an impact on traffic in the area.</p> <p>A new major road towards the A3 and M25 could help to alleviate traffic problems</p>	A new major road towards the A3 and M25 could help to alleviate traffic problems	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
420	Neil	Atkins	GB16	<p>Accessibility between West Byfleet and Byfleet is mainly on the A245. The latest traffic update 2015 demonstrates that the road is at capacity.</p> <p>The single carriageway road between Brooklands Road junction to the A3 has limited potential for widening. Frequently occurring incidents on the M25 also has an impact on traffic in the area.</p> <p>A new major road towards the A3 and M25 could help to alleviate traffic problems</p>	A new major road towards the A3 and M25 could help to alleviate traffic problems	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB4	<p>Byfleet is historically susceptible to flooding- e.g. Christmas 2013.</p> <p>Any additional housing will exacerbate the flood problems and should be avoided. House insurance prices have already increased steeply, that houses in the area will become uninsurable</p>	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in the Byfleet area and can advise that the Environment Agency are working with relevant partners to develop future Flood Alleviation Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to Local communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB5	<p>Byfleet is historically susceptible to flooding- e.g. Christmas 2013.</p> <p>Any additional housing will exacerbate the flood problems and should be avoided. House insurance prices have already increased steeply, that houses in the area will become uninsurable</p>	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in the Byfleet area and can advise that the Environment Agency are working with relevant partners to develop future Flood Alleviation Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to Local communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB15	<p>Byfleet is historically susceptible to flooding- e.g. Christmas 2013.</p> <p>Any additional housing will exacerbate the flood problems and should be avoided. House insurance prices have already increased steeply, that houses in the area will become uninsurable</p>	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in the Byfleet area and can advise that the Environment Agency are working with relevant partners to develop future Flood Alleviation Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to Local communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB16	<p>Byfleet is historically susceptible to flooding- e.g. Christmas 2013.</p>	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in the Byfleet area and can advise that the Environment Agency are working with	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Any additional housing will exacerbate the flood problems and should be avoided. House insurance prices have already increased steeply, that houses in the area will become uninsurable		relevant partners to develop future Flood Alleviation Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to Local communities.	of this representation
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB4	Health Centre is West Byfleet is at capacity. Consideration should be given to the provision of medical facilities specifically for Byfleet Village.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB5	Health Centre is West Byfleet is at capacity. Consideration should be given to the provision of medical facilities specifically for Byfleet Village.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB15	Health Centre is West Byfleet is at capacity. Consideration should be given to the provision of medical facilities specifically for Byfleet Village.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB16	Health Centre is West Byfleet is at capacity. Consideration should be given to the provision of medical facilities specifically for Byfleet Village.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB4	Careful consideration should be given to parking arrangements in the retail centres of Byfleet and West Byfleet to ensure they remain attractive to shoppers. There are current problems associated.	None stated.	The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport, existing traffic congestion and highway safety.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB5	Careful consideration should be given to parking arrangements in the retail centres of Byfleet and West Byfleet to ensure they remain attractive to shoppers. There are current problems associated.	None stated.	The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport, existing traffic congestion and highway safety.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB15	Careful consideration should be given to parking arrangements in the retail centres of Byfleet and West Byfleet to ensure they remain attractive to shoppers. There are current problems associated.	None stated.	The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport, existing traffic congestion and highway safety.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB16	Careful consideration should be given to parking arrangements in the retail centres of Byfleet and West Byfleet to ensure they remain attractive to shoppers. There are current problems associated.	None stated.	The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport, existing traffic congestion and highway safety.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB4	There are limited school places in Byfleet and West Byfleet. Further consideration regarding provision of educational facilities is required.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB5	There are limited school places in Byfleet and West Byfleet. Further consideration regarding provision of educational facilities is required.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB15	There are limited school places in Byfleet and West Byfleet. Further consideration regarding provision of educational facilities is required.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB16	There are limited school places in Byfleet and West Byfleet. Further consideration regarding provision of educational facilities is required.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB4	Accessibility between West Byfleet and Byfleet is mainly on the A245. The latest traffic update 2015 demonstrates that the road is at capacity. The single carriageway road between Brooklands Road junction to the A3 has limited potential for widening. Frequently occurring incidents on the M25 also has an	A new major road towards the A3 and M25 could help to alleviate traffic	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0 The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>impact on traffic in the area. A new major road towards the A3 and M25 could help to alleviate traffic problems</p>	problems	<p>comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB5	<p>Accessibility between West Byfleet and Byfleet is mainly on the A245. The latest traffic update 2015 demonstrates that the road is at capacity. The single carriageway road between Brooklands Road junction to the A3 has limited potential for widening. Frequently occurring incidents on the M25 also has an impact on traffic in the area. A new major road towards the A3 and M25 could help to alleviate traffic problems</p>	A new major road towards the A3 and M25 could help to alleviate traffic problems	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB15	<p>Accessibility between West Byfleet and Byfleet is mainly on the A245. The latest traffic update 2015 demonstrates that the road is at capacity. The single carriageway road between Brooklands Road junction to the A3 has limited potential for widening. Frequently occurring incidents on the M25 also has an impact on traffic in the area. A new major road towards the A3 and M25 could help to alleviate traffic problems</p>	A new major road towards the A3 and M25 could help to alleviate traffic problems	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
428	Patricia	Atkins	GB16	<p>Accessibility between West Byfleet and Byfleet is mainly on the A245. The latest traffic update 2015 demonstrates that the road is at capacity.</p> <p>The single carriageway road between Brooklands Road junction to the A3 has limited potential for widening. Frequently occurring incidents on the M25 also has an impact on traffic in the area.</p> <p>A new major road towards the A3 and M25 could help to alleviate traffic problems</p>	A new major road towards the A3 and M25 could help to alleviate traffic problems	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1000	Shirley	Atkins	GB10	Object to housing development on the site. A huge increase in population would change the character of Mayford and the infrastructure could not support this.	None stated.	<p>The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>In addition, this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 7.0, 20.0, 23.0 and 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1000	Shirley	Atkins	GB11	Object to housing development on the site. A huge increase in population would change the character of Mayford and the infrastructure could not support this.	None stated.	<p>The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>In addition, this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 7.0, 20.0, 23.0 and 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1000	Shirley	Atkins	GB14	Object to housing development on the site. A huge increase in population would change the character of Mayford and the infrastructure could not support this.	None stated.	<p>The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>In addition, this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 7.0, 20.0, 23.0 and 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1000	Shirley	Atkins	GB8	<p>Reconsider the plans as they will have a devastating impact on the residents. Mayford was mentioned in the Domesday Book and will end up becoming a gridlocked suburb.</p> <p>Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	
1000	Shirley	Atkins	GB9	Reconsider the plans as they will have a devastating impact on the residents. Mayford was mentioned in the Domesday Book and will end up becoming a gridlocked suburb. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1000	Shirley	Atkins	GB10	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worplesdon Station but there are no pavements.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1000	Shirley	Atkins	GB11	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worplesdon Station but there are no pavements.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1000	Shirley	Atkins	GB14	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worplesdon Station but there are no pavements.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1000	Shirley	Atkins	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths due to proximity of development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1000	Shirley	Atkins	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths due to proximity of development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
1000	Shirley	Atkins	GB14	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths due to proximity of development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1000	Shirley	Atkins	GB8	No Green Belt between Woking and Mayford would remain, changing Mayford from a village to "south Woking". This goes against previous Planning Committee policies to preserve Mayford's character, beauty and safety. Goes against the purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1000	Shirley	Atkins	GB9	No Green Belt between Woking and Mayford would remain, changing Mayford from a village to "south Woking". This goes against previous Planning Committee policies to preserve Mayford's character, beauty and safety. Goes against the purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1000	Shirley	Atkins	GB7	Object to increasing the number of pitches on this site. Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1000	Shirley	Atkins	GB7	Any increase in the present site of five caravans would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and also increase risk to wildlife due to increased number of domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	
1429	Paul	Atkins	GB10	The DPD map shows the large proportion of growth that is planned to be dumped on Mayford, without consideration of how the population will access already over-burdened services. The plans will increase current problems for all residents, both existing and incoming and destroy a long-established village in the process. Urges the Council to discard these destructive and poorly supported plans. Mayford Village Society fully represent my views on the DPD.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 and 23.0. Also, the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1429	Paul	Atkins	GB11	The DPD map shows the large proportion of growth that is planned to be dumped on Mayford, without consideration of how the population will access already over-burdened services. The plans will increase current problems for all residents, both existing and incoming and destroy a long-established village in the process. Urges the Council to discard these destructive and poorly supported plans. Mayford Village Society fully represent my views on the DPD.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 and 23.0. Also, the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1429	Paul	Atkins	GB10	The infrastructure in the village is not suitable to accommodate extra demand from new development. There have been recent problems with sewage leaks along Saunders Lane, presumably due to lack of capacity. There are also insufficient medical services, including GP and hospital care. There appear to be no plans to increase domestic services or medical services in the area, to cater for the extra demand.	None stated.	This sewage flooding event is noted. However, the Council plans to ensure adequate local infrastructure is delivered to support new development and to help avoid this sort of problem in future. The approach to infrastructure provision is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. Flood risk more generally is addressed in Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1429	Paul	Atkins	GB11	The infrastructure in the village is not suitable to accommodate extra demand from new development. There have been recent problems with sewage leaks along Saunders Lane, presumably due to lack of capacity. There are also insufficient medical services, including GP and hospital care. There appear to be no plans to increase domestic services or medical services in the area, to cater for the extra demand.	None stated.	This sewage flooding event is noted. However, the Council plans to ensure adequate local infrastructure is delivered to support new development and to help avoid this sort of problem in future. The approach to infrastructure provision is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. Flood risk more generally is addressed in Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1429	Paul	Atkins	GB10	Objects to the proposals, which will fill the gap between Woking and Mayford and effectively remove the village as a separate location with inevitable loss of identity and community. It will also lead to the merging of Woking and Guildford, which was the whole point of establishing Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 12.0 and 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1429	Paul	Atkins	GB11	Objects to the proposals, which will fill the gap between Woking and Mayford and effectively remove the village as a separate location with inevitable loss of identity and community. It will also lead to the merging of Woking and Guildford, which was the whole point of establishing Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 12.0 and 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1429	Paul	Atkins	GB10	Recognises the need for new homes but we shouldn't just build houses on land conveniently owned by developers.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 9.0, 10.0, 11.0 and 13.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
							of this representation
1429	Paul	Atkins	GB11	Recognises the need for new homes but we shouldn't just build houses on land conveniently owned by developers.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 9.0, 10.0, 11.0 and 13.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1429	Paul	Atkins	GB10	Public transport in Mayford is very poor, particularly with regard to the single bus route through the village. There is insufficient car parking space at Worplesdon station, which is full by 8.15 weekday mornings, and inadequate walking routes to the station, with no footpaths or proper lighting. There appear to be no plans to improve public transport to support the extra population.	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1429	Paul	Atkins	GB11	Public transport in Mayford is very poor, particularly with regard to the single bus route through the village. There is insufficient car parking space at Worplesdon station, which is full by 8.15 weekday mornings, and inadequate walking routes to the station, with no footpaths or proper lighting. There appear to be no plans to improve public transport to support the extra population.	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1429	Paul	Atkins	GB10	With the 381 new houses planned estimates 1,100 people with 762 more cars. The area is accessible from Woking only by crossing the railway line at narrow points and serious congestion will be inevitable. There appear to be no plans to improve the road network to support the extra traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1429	Paul	Atkins	GB11	With the 381 new houses planned estimates 1,100 people with 762 more cars. The area is accessible from Woking only by crossing the railway line at narrow points and serious congestion will be inevitable. There appear to be no plans to improve the road network to support the extra traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1526	Robert	Atkins	GB10	The NPPF only allows release of land from the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances. WBC is only required for find sites for 550 homes in the Green Belt from 2022 to 2027, but have gone further by identifying sites for an additional 1200 homes from 2027-2040. There is no evidence that this additional development will be required.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0, and for background, Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1526	Robert	Atkins	GB11	The NPPF only allows release of land from the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances. WBC is only required for find sites for 550 homes in the Green Belt from 2022 to 2027, but have gone further by identifying sites for an additional 1200 homes from 2027-2040. There is no evidence that this additional development will be required.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0, and for background, Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1526	Robert	Atkins	GB10	Saunders Lane and Hook Hill Lane are already used as short cuts and the proposal will lead to dangerous levels of congestion, particularly at peak hours. It will not cope with the additional traffic from a new housing estate.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. It should be noted that the Transport Assessment, which informs these allocation, takes into account traffic displacement (as a result of the proposed sites) on local roads.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1526	Robert	Atkins	GB10	Saunders Lane and Hook Hill Lane are already used as short cuts and the proposal will lead to dangerous levels of congestion, particularly at peak hours. It will not cope with the additional traffic from a new housing estate.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. It should be noted that the Transport Assessment, which informs these allocation, takes into account traffic displacement (as a result of the proposed sites) on local roads.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1526	Robert	Atkins	GB11	Saunders Lane and Hook Hill Lane are already used as short cuts and the proposal will lead to dangerous levels of congestion, particularly at peak hours. It will not cope with the additional traffic from a new housing estate.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. It should be noted that the Transport Assessment, which informs these allocation, takes into account traffic displacement (as a result of the proposed sites) on local roads.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1526	Robert	Atkins	GB11	Saunders Lane and Hook Hill Lane are already used as short cuts and the proposal will lead to dangerous levels of	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. It should be noted that the Transport Assessment, which informs these allocation, takes into account traffic displacement (as a result	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				congestion, particularly at peak hours. It will not cope with the additional traffic from a new housing estate.		of the proposed sites) on local roads.	of this representation
1526	Robert	Atkins	GB10	The proposed housing densities of 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) are excessive when compared to the average in Hook Heath (5.5dph) and even less in Fishers Hill Conservation Area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1526	Robert	Atkins	GB11	The proposed housing densities of 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) are excessive when compared to the average in Hook Heath (5.5dph) and even less in Fishers Hill Conservation Area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1526	Robert	Atkins	GB10	This land should remain in the Green Belt. The purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between individual towns and villages. Building on this land will do the opposite, filling the only green space between housing on Hook Heath Road, Hook Hill Lane and Saunders Lane.	The land should remain in the Green Belt	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. Justification for the release of Green Belt land and for safeguarding sites for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1526	Robert	Atkins	GB11	This land should remain in the Green Belt. The purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between individual towns and villages. Building on this land will do the opposite, filling the only green space between housing on Hook Heath Road, Hook Hill Lane and Saunders Lane.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. Justification for the release of Green Belt land and for safeguarding sites for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
649	John	Attrill	GB12	Emissions from a further 500+ [cars] will have a negative impact on the environment.	None stated.	The potential increase in air pollution has been considered with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. This document is available for viewing online on the Council's website. The sites identified for allocation have the potential to reduce the reliance on the private car and therefore associated vehicle emissions, by promoting walking and cycling and contributing to improved public transport. Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design states that proposals for new development must be designed to avoid significant harm to the environment and general amenity resulting from noise. In addition, the submitted Development Management Policies DPD has specific policies relating to pollution (DM5 Environmental Pollution and DM6 Air and Water Quality). In combination with the existing and emerging policies, the proposed land use for the site is not expected to generate a significant amount of air pollution above the existing baseline condition.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
649	John	Attrill	GB13	Emissions from a further 500+ [cars] will have a negative impact on the environment.	None stated.	The potential increase in air pollution has been considered with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. This document is available for viewing online on the Council's website. The sites identified for allocation have the potential to reduce the reliance on the private car and therefore associated vehicle emissions, by promoting walking and cycling and contributing to improved public transport. Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design states that proposals for new development must be designed to avoid significant harm to the environment and general amenity resulting from noise. In addition, the submitted Development Management Policies DPD has specific policies relating to pollution (DM5 Environmental Pollution and DM6 Air and Water Quality). In combination with the existing and emerging policies, the proposed land use for the site is not expected to generate a significant amount of air pollution above the existing baseline condition.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
649	John	Attrill	GB12	Environment -the views from Sandy Lane are beautiful and unique in the area, and the proposed development will spoil this area of tranquillity.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
649	John	Attrill	GB13	Environment -the views from Sandy Lane are beautiful and unique in the area, and the proposed development will spoil this area of tranquillity.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features	
649	John	Attrill	GB12	Surrounding roads are already severely congested for extended periods of the day, and a further 500+ cars will have a huge negative impact on this, blighting residents. Due to limited space along these roads, there is no room for further expansion.	None stated.	The Council does not consider that the proposed allocation of this site will have an adverse impact on noise pollution. Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design states that proposals for new development must be designed to avoid significant harm to the environment and general amenity resulting from noise. In addition, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD has a specific policy relating to noise and light pollution (DM7). In combination with the existing and emerging policies, the proposed land use for the site is not expected to generate a significant amount of noise pollution above the existing baseline condition.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
649	John	Attrill	GB13	Surrounding roads are already severely congested for extended periods of the day, and a further 500+ cars will have a huge negative impact on this, blighting residents. Due to limited space along these roads, there is no room for further expansion.	None stated.	<p>The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
649	John	Attrill	GB12	These points show a compelling case against development, and trusts the Council will act in the interest of the environment and local community by scrapping the proposed development plans.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 6.0 and 7.0</p> <p>In addition, During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
649	John	Attrill	GB13	Local infrastructure (schools and public services) are already overloaded and will be unable to cope with demand from new development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in terms of infrastructure and school places in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, and for school places, paragraph 3.8. In terms of health services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
649	John	Attrill	GB12	These points show a compelling case against development, and trusts the Council will act in the interest of the environment and local community by scrapping the proposed development plans.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 6.0 and 7.0</p> <p>In addition, During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
649	John	Attrill	GB13	These points show a compelling case against development, and trusts the Council will act in the interest of the environment and local community by scrapping the proposed development plans.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 6.0 and 7.0</p> <p>In addition, During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
649	John	Attrill	GB12	Strongly objects to the proposal, due to safety of pedestrians, cyclists and motorists on busy roads where the majority of vehicles significantly exceed speed limits. The proposed development will add significantly to the current level of unacceptably high risk.	None stated.	<p>The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
649	John	Attrill	GB13	Strongly objects to the proposal, due to safety of pedestrians, cyclists and motorists on busy roads where the majority of vehicles significantly exceed speed limits. The proposed development will add significantly to the current level of unacceptably high risk.	None stated.	<p>The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
942	Julian	Austin	GB4	<p>The National Grid provides the electricity transmissions for the Borough, this link provides information on the assets: http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/</p> <p>The site is crossed by overhead high voltage electricity line. Objects to the requirement of the site to explore the viability of moving the lines underground, as National Grid always seeks to retain existing overhead lines in situ. Proposals require special justification to alter lines as there are significant technical, cost and environmental challenges associated. Proposals are only supported if development will not take place without the change and the proposal meets a given criteria, this site fails to satisfy National Grid's criteria. Therefore this policy text should be removed and replaced with a reference to National Grid's 'a sense of place, design guidelines for development near high voltage overhead lines' guidelines.</p> <p>[Appendices - 1 maps of the sites; 2 National Grid's Undergrounding policy</p> <p>National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning its networks.</p>	'explore the viability of moving existing high voltage power lines and pylon infrastructure underground'. It is recommended that the Site profiles for GB4 and GB5 are revised to remove the above text, and this is replaced with reference to the 'Sense of Place' guidelines to allow for the successful master planning of the sites.	<p>This is noted. The key requirements will be amended to make reference to 'A sense of place' - design guidelines for development near high voltage overhead lines.</p> <p>Reference to moving the high voltage lines underground will be deleted.</p> <p>The Council welcomes continued cooperation and engagement with utility providers throughout the preparation of the DPD.</p>	<p>Delete:</p> <p>Explore the viability of moving existing high voltage power lines and pylon infrastructure underground.</p> <p>Add:</p> <p>Due to the existing high voltage power lines/pylons. Proposals should refer to National Grid's 'A Sense of Place' Guidance for development near high voltage overhead lines.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
942	Julian	Austin	GB5	<p>The National Grid provides the electricity transmissions for the Borough, this link provides information on the assets: http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/</p> <p>The site is crossed by overhead high voltage electricity line. Objects to the requirement of the site to explore the viability of moving the lines underground, as National Grid always seeks to retain existing overhead lines in situ. Proposals require special justification to alter lines as there are significant technical, cost and environmental challenges associated. Proposals are only supported if development will not take place without the change and the proposal meets a given criteria, this site fails to satisfy National Grid's criteria. Therefore this policy text should be removed and replaced with a reference to National Grid's 'a sense of place, design guidelines for development near high voltage overhead lines' guidelines.</p> <p>[Appendices - 1 maps of the sites; 2 National Grid's Undergrounding policy</p> <p>National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning its networks.</p>	'explore the viability of moving existing high voltage power lines and pylon infrastructure underground'. It is recommended that the Site profiles for GB4 and GB5 are revised to remove the above text, and this is replaced with reference to the 'Sense of Place' guidelines to allow for the successful master planning of the sites.	<p>This is noted. The key requirements will be amended to make reference to 'A sense of place' - design guidelines for development near high voltage overhead lines.</p> <p>Reference to moving the high voltage lines underground will be deleted.</p> <p>The Council welcomes continued cooperation and engagement with utility providers throughout the preparation of the DPD.</p>	<p>Delete:</p> <p>Explore the viability of moving existing high voltage power lines and pylon infrastructure underground.</p> <p>Add:</p> <p>Due to the existing high voltage power lines/pylons. Proposals should refer to National Grid's 'A Sense of Place' Guidance for development near high voltage overhead lines.</p>
411	Chris	Axe	GB4	<p>Would like information on road and infrastructure provision to be made available.</p> <p>Parvis Road is often gridlocked and generally busy at rush hour.</p>	Information on road and infrastructure provision should be made available	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure, congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
411	Chris	Axe	GB5	<p>Would like information on road and infrastructure provision to be made available.</p> <p>Parvis Road is often gridlocked and generally busy at rush hour.</p>	Information on road and infrastructure provision should be made available	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure, congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
813	J W	Aylmer	GB4	Object to removal of Green Belt land in Byfleet. The A245 is gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
813	J W	Aylmer	GB5	Object to removal of Green Belt land in Byfleet. The A245 is gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
813	J W	Aylmer	GB4	The schools are at capacity	None stated.	The representation regarding education provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
813	J W	Aylmer	GB5	The schools are at capacity	None stated.	The representation regarding education provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
813	J W	Aylmer	GB4	Byfleet has no medical facilities at present and West Byfleet facilities are at capacity.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
813	J W	Aylmer	GB5	Byfleet has no medical facilities at present and West Byfleet facilities are at capacity.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
813	J W	Aylmer	GB4	No police station in Byfleet and the office at St Marys Day Centre is unmanned.	None stated.	This is noted by the Council. The Council has consulted with the Police Service during the preparation of the DPD and they have raised no concerns regarding the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
813	J W	Aylmer	GB5	No police station in Byfleet and the office at St Marys Day Centre is unmanned.	None stated.	This is noted by the Council. The Council has consulted with the Police Service during the preparation of the DPD and they have raised no concerns regarding the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
813	J W	Aylmer	GB4	The sewage system is inadequate and overflow. Flooding is more of a problem now in Byfleet due to new housing being built.	None stated.	The representation regarding sewage and flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.10 and Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
813	J W	Aylmer	GB5	The sewage system is inadequate and overflow. Flooding is more of a problem now in Byfleet due to new housing being built.	None stated.	The representation regarding sewage and flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.10 and Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
813	J W	Aylmer	GB4	The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored. Byfleet is getting more gridlocked everyday.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
813	J W	Aylmer	GB5	The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored. Byfleet is getting more gridlocked everyday.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation