

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	It is unrealistic to think there will be improved health and well being as a result of proposals. The proposal and leisure centre will create more traffic, noise and pollution. There are lots of contradictions in this document.	None stated.	It is not considered that there are any inconsistencies. 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 Site Allocation supports the implementation of policy CS5. With respect to infrastructure, please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Objective 1 Raises various uncertainties regarding the proposed scheme. Including questions on the net number of units , the cost of new homes, the impact on the proposal on existing residents.	None stated.	The site has been identified for a net addition of 250 houses. To clarify, this is in addition to the existing number. Although the actual quantum of housing will be depend on various aspects including design, amenity etc. It is important to differentiate between the Site Allocation DPD and Planning Application process. The DPD is seeking to allocate the land and establishes the principle of development with a list of key requirements to be addressed. Detailed matters will be addressed as part of the planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Objective 13 Queries what plans are there to make residents use composting facilities.	None stated.	This is a detailed matter that will be addressed in the planning application stage. Also note that the Key Requirements requires adequate provision to be made by requiring 'the storage of waste and recyclable materials should be incorporated into the design of the building to minimise street furniture'.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Objective 14 What measures will be taken to ensure the wastewater and sewerage infrastructure have capacity? There is the risk of contamination if the infrastructure is not suitable.	None stated.	This has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.9 and 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Objective 15 It is not realistic to suggest that the proposals would lead to the reduction of car movement.	None stated.	The site is located in a sustainable location and comprises a mixed use scheme that will enable access to local services and facilities. Therefore overall the score is considered to be justified.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Objective 16 Does not consider this is accurate. Residents will still commute elsewhere to work.	None stated.	The site is being proposed for a mixed use redevelopment, therefore it is considered that this will increase opportunities for employment in the area. The score is considered justified.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Objective 17 Confused at what commercial opportunities there are, particularly where local shops are threatened of closure.	None stated.	The site is being proposed for a mixed use redevelopment, therefore it is considered that this will increase opportunities for commercial uses in the area. The score is considered justified.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Objective 2 The residents have not suggested that they want improved walking, cycling, recreation and sporting facilities. A new facility is a waste of money. Money would be better spent on improving facilities and subsidising entry costs. The proposals involve rehousing people, the anxiety this causes would not improve the wellbeing of residents.	None stated.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Objective 3 The site is in the Floodplain. Why is it suggested that flooding will be reduced?	None stated.	Whilst flooding has been has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Site Allocation DPD is supported by a Sequential Test which demonstrates that the majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 1, the small percentage located in Flood Zone 2. The proposed developments on the sites are not considered to be 'highly vulnerable uses'.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Objective 4 Does not find the statements about deprivation or crime to be fair	None stated.	The commentary is based on national statistics known as 'Indices of Multiple deprivation'. Data is collected by central government and provides a overall picture . The Council notes that these statistics are a measure of relative deprivation and not necessarily a measure of affluence, it is accepted that not every person in a	Modify the text in SA assessment:According to the overall index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD, 2010) this

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						highly deprived area will themselves be deprived. Likewise, there will be some deprived people living in the least deprived areas. Nevertheless, the wording of commentary could be improved to make this clear. Although the Council accepts that the index is not an absolute measure of deprivation, it does provide an overall, quantifiable picture of the area, therefore it is considered that the SA scoring is reasonable and consistent. Please also note that the commentary states that it is considered that the overall positive benefits that a likely to result from the redevelopment of the area, will 'outweigh the neutral scoring in terms of some of the other elements of this objective, such as crime reduction.' i.e. It is not expected that development will have any impact on crime in the area, the weighting is neutral	postcode location is identified as being above average in terms of overall deprivation (England) against other neighbourhoods. The Index ranks Sheerwater as one of the most deprived areas in Surrey against the indicators measured in terms of health deprivation and disability, income and employment and education, skills and training levels.
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Objective 5 There are no significant problems accessing services and facilities. Proposals to demolish and rebuild facilities are a waste of money.	None stated.	The scoring against this SA objective has been comprehensively explained in the comments column of the SA. The positive score is because of the net increase of community services and facilities as a result of the proposal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Objective 6 Does not understand the statement for the objective	None stated.	Sites are assessed against the core planning principle to encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Objective 7 It is not realistic to suggest that the proposals will minimise air and noise pollution- this is impossible regardless of what is suggested	None stated.	With regards to the representation on pollution, 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 significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution. The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements including mitigation measures in relation to potential noise, light and air quality; the incorporation of sustainable construction techniques; improved permeability of the site to encourage pedestrian and cycle accessibility. 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
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Objective 9 There is no guarantee that proposals won't impact the canal or natural species	None stated.	The SA acknowledges the proximity of the site to the SSSI and the potential impact it would have and has scored the site accordingly. However, 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. 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:	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
						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.	
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Clear and transparent communication is required to minimise the uncertainties residents have.	None stated.	With regards to consultation on Planning issues, the Council will consult with the community in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement (please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0). With regards to detailed matters relating to the planning application, we will notify the relevant Section of the Council the concerns raised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Concerned about compulsory purchase of homes. Concerned that properties will be undervalued and residents will lose what they have invested in their homes.	None stated.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	There is the option of greenfield land as an alternative to demolishing existing homes	Consider alternatives to demolishing existing homes	As set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 1.0), there is a significant unmet housing need within the borough that needs to be addressed. Overall, about 13 years supply of land could be identified in the urban area to meet housing need. This includes UA32. Future growth to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027 will need to be identified within the Green Belt. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0 paragraph 3.7, Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Concerned about proposals for Sheerwater. Does not consider that there has been a review of potential brownfield sites Concerned that the development area will extend and will this would result in more people losing their homes.	None stated.	The representation regarding alternative sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0,11.0 and 16.0 The DPD identifies development as set out, however this does not preclude development coming forward with an alternative boundary line.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	WBC withdrew plans to rebuild all along Albert Drive. Suspects this was a tactic to keep residents quiet.	None stated.	It is important to differentiate between the Site Allocation DPD and Planning application process. The DPD is seeking to allocate the land and establishes the principle of development with a list of key requirements to be addressed. Detailed matters will be addressed as part of the planning application stage. It is also important to differentiate between the Council as a planning authority and the Council as landowner. These are separate Sections of the Council. The Site Allocation DPD is a planning document.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Considers the proposal to contain too many unexplained elements and demolishing of homes is a waste of money.	None stated.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Considers that the development area for the Sheerwater proposal will change and all the homes there are at risk.	None stated.	The DPD identifies development as set out, however this does not preclude development coming forward with an alternative boundary line.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	The threat to livelihood outweighs any benefits of	None stated.	Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns, the site is	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				the proposed regeneration		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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Improve communications	None stated.	With regards to consultation on Planning issues, the Council will consult with the community in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement (please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1303	Sylvie	Babout	UA32	Some ideas are acceptable but the potential disruption is a real concern.	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 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 require a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage to determine site specific transport mitigation measures, taking into account developments in the vicinity and potential need for highway improvements.</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
1632	M.L.	Badger	General	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.	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</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
						Representor ID 563.	
1632	M.L.	Badger	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.	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
1632	M.L.	Badger	GB9	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.	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
1632	M.L.	Badger	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.	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
1632	M.L.	Badger	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.	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	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>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>	
1632	M.L.	Badger	GB8	Strongly objects to housing proposals. 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
1632	M.L.	Badger	GB9	Strongly objects to housing proposals. 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
1632	M.L.	Badger	GB10	Strongly objects to housing proposals. 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
1632	M.L.	Badger	GB11	Strongly objects to housing proposals. 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
1632	M.L.	Badger	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape 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
1632	M.L.	Badger	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape 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,</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
						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.	
1632	M.L.	Badger	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape 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
1632	M.L.	Badger	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape 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
1632	M.L.	Badger	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. No evidence that flood prevention works on Elm Bridge can cope with additional flood flows.	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
1632	M.L.	Badger	GB9	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. No evidence that flood prevention works on Elm Bridge can cope with additional flood flows.	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
1632	M.L.	Badger	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. No evidence that flood prevention works on Elm Bridge can cope with additional flood flows.	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
1632	M.L.	Badger	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. No evidence that flood prevention works on Elm Bridge can cope with additional flood flows.	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
1632	M.L.	Badger	GB8	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Ministers have stated that there are sufficient brownfield sites to develop, if local planning authorities worked together it would result in joint solutions to joint problems.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.</p> <p>In addition recent reviews of the SHLAA (2014) and the SHMA (2015) do not provide any significant new evidence that would lead the Council to change its policy approach. Whilst there has been further clarification of national policy on Green Belt, there has not been any change of national policy of material significance since the Core Strategy was adopted. In this regard, it will be very difficult for the Council to have a sound 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
						<p>without the release of Green Belt land to meet housing land supply over the entire plan period. Without the Site Allocations DPD, there is the likelihood of uncontrolled speculative development in the Green Belt. The Council can best protect the Green Belt if it can demonstrate that it has identified sufficient land to deliver its development requirements.</p> <p>As part of the preparation of the Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPD, the Council has been working with neighbouring authorities to address strategic cross boundary issues. The Council has set out how it has worked with other authorities in the Duty to Cooperate Statement. Nevertheless the Council is committed to facilitating the delivery of the Core Strategy in full.</p>	
1632	M.L.	Badger	GB9	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Ministers have stated that there are sufficient brownfield sites to develop, if local planning authorities worked together it would result in joint solutions to joint problems.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.</p> <p>In addition recent reviews of the SHLAA (2014) and the SHMA (2015) do not provide any significant new evidence that would lead the Council to change its policy approach. Whilst there has been further clarification of national policy on Green Belt, there has not been any change of national policy of material significance since the Core Strategy was adopted. In this regard, it will be very difficult for the Council to have a sound Site Allocations DPD without the release of Green Belt land to meet housing land supply over the entire plan period. Without the Site Allocations DPD, there is the likelihood of uncontrolled speculative development in the Green Belt. The Council can best protect the Green Belt if it can demonstrate that it has identified sufficient land to deliver its development requirements.</p> <p>As part of the preparation of the Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPD, the Council has been working with neighbouring authorities to address strategic cross boundary issues. The Council has set out how it has worked with other authorities in the Duty to Cooperate Statement. Nevertheless the Council is committed to facilitating the delivery of the Core Strategy in full.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1632	M.L.	Badger	GB10	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Ministers have stated that there are sufficient brownfield sites to develop, if local planning authorities worked together it would result in joint solutions to joint problems.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0. In addition recent reviews of the SHLAA (2014) and the SHMA (2015) do not provide any significant new evidence that would lead the Council to change its policy approach. Whilst there has been further clarification of national policy on Green Belt, there has not been any change of national policy of material significance since the Core Strategy was adopted. In this regard, it will be very difficult for the Council to have a sound Site Allocations DPD without the release of Green Belt land to meet housing land supply over the entire plan period. Without the Site Allocations DPD, there is the likelihood of uncontrolled speculative development in the Green Belt. The Council can best protect the Green Belt if it can demonstrate that it has identified sufficient land to deliver its development requirements. As part of the preparation of the Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPD, the Council has been working with neighbouring authorities to address strategic cross boundary issues. The Council has set out how it has worked with other authorities in the Duty to Cooperate Statement. Nevertheless the Council is committed to facilitating the delivery of the Core Strategy in full.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1632	M.L.	Badger	GB11	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Ministers have stated that there are sufficient brownfield sites to develop, if local planning authorities worked together it would result in joint solutions to joint problems.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.</p> <p>In addition recent reviews of the SHLAA (2014) and the SHMA (2015) do not provide any significant new evidence that would lead the Council to change its policy approach. Whilst there has</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>been further clarification of national policy on Green Belt, there has not been any change of national policy of material significance since the Core Strategy was adopted. In this regard, it will be very difficult for the Council to have a sound Site Allocations DPD without the release of Green Belt land to meet housing land supply over the entire plan period. Without the Site Allocations DPD, there is the likelihood of uncontrolled speculative development in the Green Belt. The Council can best protect the Green Belt if it can demonstrate that it has identified sufficient land to deliver its development requirements.</p> <p>As part of the preparation of the Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPD, the Council has been working with neighbouring authorities to address strategic cross boundary issues. The Council has set out how it has worked with other authorities in the Duty to Cooperate Statement. Nevertheless the Council is committed to facilitating the delivery of the Core Strategy in full.</p>	
1632	M.L.	Badger	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
1632	M.L.	Badger	GB9	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
1632	M.L.	Badger	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. 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
1632	M.L.	Badger	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.	<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</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>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>	
1632	M.L.	Badger	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 field 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
1632	M.L.	Badger	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. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	<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 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
1632	M.L.	Badger	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. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	<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 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
1632	M.L.	Badger	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. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	<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 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
1632	M.L.	Badger	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. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	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. 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
1633	P.K.	Badger	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site.	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.		<p>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 Lancscape 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 lancscape grounds. The Lancscape 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 lancscape 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>	is proposed as a result of this representation
1633	P.K.	Badger	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
1633	P.K.	Badger	GB7	Object to the proposal. 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
1633	P.K.	Badger	GB8	Strongly objects to housing proposals. Rather than using Green Belt land for development, and in turn destroying a community, planning authorities should work alongside neighbouring authorities to solve a shared problem. There is no evidence that this has been done.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding justification for releasing land from the Green Belt has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. In particular, the Council has set out how it has work with neighbouring authorities in paragraph 1.5 and Section 6.0, paragraph 6.2.</p> <p>The representation regarding swallowing up existing communities has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1633	P.K.	Badger	GB9	Strongly objects to housing proposals. Rather than using Green Belt land for development, and in turn destroying a community, planning authorities should work alongside neighbouring authorities to solve a shared problem. There is no evidence that this has been done.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding justification for releasing land from the Green Belt has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. In particular, the Council has set out how it has work with neighbouring authorities in paragraph 1.5 and Section 6.0, paragraph 6.2.</p> <p>The representation regarding swallowing up existing communities has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic</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
						Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.	
1633	P.K.	Badger	GB10	Strongly objects to housing proposals. Rather than using Green Belt land for development, and in turn destroying a community, planning authorities should work alongside neighbouring authorities to solve a shared problem. There is no evidence that this has been done.	None stated.	The representation regarding justification for releasing land from the Green Belt has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. In particular, the Council has set out how it has work with neighbouring authorities in paragraph 1.5 and Section 6.0, paragraph 6.2. The representation regarding swallowing up existing communities has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1633	P.K.	Badger	GB11	Strongly objects to housing proposals. Rather than using Green Belt land for development, and in turn destroying a community, planning authorities should work alongside neighbouring authorities to solve a shared problem. There is no evidence that this has been done.	None stated.	The representation regarding justification for releasing land from the Green Belt has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. In particular, the Council has set out how it has work with neighbouring authorities in paragraph 1.5 and Section 6.0, paragraph 6.2. The representation regarding swallowing up existing communities has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1633	P.K.	Badger	General	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.	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 Represntor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1633	P.K.	Badger	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	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
						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).	
1633	P.K.	Badger	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. 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
1633	P.K.	Badger	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.	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	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>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>	
1633	P.K.	Badger	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. 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).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1633	P.K.	Badger	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
1633	P.K.	Badger	GB8	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
1633	P.K.	Badger	GB9	Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has	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.	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
				been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.		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.	
1633	P.K.	Badger	GB10	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
1633	P.K.	Badger	GB11	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
1633	P.K.	Badger	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. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	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. 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
1633	P.K.	Badger	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. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	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. 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
1633	P.K.	Badger	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. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	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. 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
1633	P.K.	Badger	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. Houses can not be	None stated.	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. 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	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
				built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.		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.	
482	J	Bagley	GB12	Doctors are finding it difficult to cope.	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
482	J	Bagley	GB13	Doctors are finding it difficult to cope.	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
482	J	Bagley	GB12	Values the area for its peacefulness and variety of birdlife. Will we lose this with the proposed 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 that could not be addressed. Nevertheless 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
482	J	Bagley	GB13	Values the area for its peacefulness and variety of birdlife. Will we lose this with the proposed 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 that could not be addressed. Nevertheless 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	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
						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.	
482	J	Bagley	GB12	Parking around the local school and in West Byfleet is a serious concern, together with traffic and related noise, which would increase. Wisley Gardens will be affected by noise and traffic pollution.	None stated.	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 in local areas. It is worth noting that if the sites proposed on Upshot Lane lead to greater intake to the village school from the immediate area, use of the car to access the school would be expected to decrease. The representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0 and in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
482	J	Bagley	GB13	Parking around the local school and in West Byfleet is a serious concern, together with traffic and related noise, which would increase. Wisley Gardens will be affected by noise and traffic pollution.	None stated.	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 in local areas. It is worth noting that if the sites proposed on Upshot Lane lead to greater intake to the village school from the immediate area, use of the car to access the school would be expected to decrease. The representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0 and in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
482	J	Bagley	GB12	We will no longer be able to call Pyrford a village.	None stated.	The lancape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing 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 Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) 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 and design standards in accordance with the environmental and 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
482	J	Bagley	GB13	We will no longer be able to call Pyrford a village.	None stated.	The lancape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing 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 Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) 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 and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, 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 is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	
768	Peter and Irene	Baier	GB4	The infrastructure can not cope and should be sorted out before new development is considered.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
768	Peter and Irene	Baier	GB5	The infrastructure can not cope and should be sorted out before new development is considered.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
768	Peter and Irene	Baier	GB4	Residents rejected the proposals to build houses in Byfleet at the public meeting. The 2013 petition and 2014 questionnaire should be taken into account in any proposals.	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 Represor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
768	Peter and Irene	Baier	GB5	Residents rejected the proposals to build houses in Byfleet at the public meeting. The 2013 petition and 2014 questionnaire should be taken into account in any proposals.	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 Represor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
768	Peter and Irene	Baier	GB4	The priority should be to use brownfield sites and reoccupation of empty properties.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and 16.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
768	Peter and Irene	Baier	GB5	The priority should be to use brownfield sites and reoccupation of empty properties.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and 16.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
768	Peter and Irene	Baier	GB4	It would be a grave mistake to under estimate the strength of feeling in Byfleet towards inappropriate development, as noted by previous planning proposals.	None stated.	The Council note the objection to the proposed allocations. Nevertheless the Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy. Failure to not identify sites for existing and future development needs will likely mean that the Site Allocations DPD will not be found sound.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
768	Peter and Irene	Baier	GB5	It would be a grave mistake to under estimate the strength of feeling in Byfleet towards inappropriate development, as noted by previous planning proposals.	None stated.	The Council note the objection to the proposed allocations. Nevertheless the Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy. Failure to not identify sites for existing and future development needs will likely mean that the Site Allocations DPD will not be found sound.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
768	Peter and Irene	Baier	GB4	Byfleet repeatedly floods and other areas are at risk of flooding. Measures are needed. The surface water drainage system is overloaded and needs to be improved. No new development should be permitted in the area at risk of flooding.	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
768	Peter and Irene	Baier	GB5	Byfleet repeatedly floods and other areas are at risk of flooding. Measures are needed. The surface water drainage system is overloaded and needs to be improved. No new development should be permitted in the area at risk of flooding.	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
768	Peter and Irene	Baier	GB4	Parking is an issue	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 and existing traffic congestion.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
768	Peter and Irene	Baier	GB5	Parking is an issue	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	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
						account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.	
768	Peter and Irene	Baier	GB4	Some primary school children have to attend schools outside of Byfleet	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
768	Peter and Irene	Baier	GB5	Some primary school children have to attend schools outside of Byfleet	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
768	Peter and Irene	Baier	GB4	The railway and roads are at capacity and are frequently congested or delayed.	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> <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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
768	Peter and Irene	Baier	GB5	The railway and roads are at capacity and are frequently congested or delayed.	None stated.	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).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 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
768	Peter and Irene	Baier	GB4	WBC should challenge the number of new houses the government is imposing on the area. Woking and Byfleet are constrained on all sides and do not have large areas of unused space like other boroughs. The little green space that remains is precious to the local community.	None stated.	The representation regarding the housing target of the Borough has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.1 to 1.8. In addition the representation regarding the well being of residents and amenity value of the Green Belt has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
768	Peter and Irene	Baier	GB5	WBC should challenge the number of new houses the government is imposing on the area. Woking and Byfleet are constrained on all sides and do not have large areas of unused space like other boroughs. The little green space that	None stated.	The representation regarding the housing target of the Borough has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.1 to 1.8. In addition the representation regarding the well being of residents	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
				remains is precious to the local community.		and amenity value of the Green Belt has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0.	
877	David	Bailey	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Against principles of Green Belt policy.	None stated.	The principle of Green Belt development and safeguarding sites for future development needs has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
877	David	Bailey	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Against principles of Green Belt policy.	None stated.	The principle of Green Belt development and safeguarding sites for future development needs has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
877	David	Bailey	GB12	Rural setting of village would be lost.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and Section 23.0. The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development does not have unacceptable impacts on the environment and requires development to be built to high design standards. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
877	David	Bailey	GB13	Rural setting of village would be lost.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development does not have unacceptable impacts on the environment and requires development to be built to high design standards.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
877	David	Bailey	GB12	<p>Pyrford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse.</p> <p>There is already a parking problem</p> <p>The medical facilities are at capacity and there are long waiting times for doctor appointments.</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. 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</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 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 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> <p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</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>	
877	David	Bailey	GB13	Pyrford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There is already a parking problem. The medical facilities are at capacity and there are long waiting times for doctor appointments.	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. The various transport 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. 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</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. 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. 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. Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified. 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>	
958	Sheila	Bailey	GB4	Object to the DPD. Byfleet is losing a lot of its Green Belt, whilst Woking is losing very little.	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
958	Sheila	Bailey	GB5	Object to the DPD. Byfleet is losing a lot of its Green Belt, whilst Woking is losing very little.	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</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
						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). 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.	
958	Sheila	Bailey	GB4	Little consideration has been given to the flooding which will get much worse.	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
958	Sheila	Bailey	GB5	Little consideration has been given to the flooding which will get much worse.	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
958	Sheila	Bailey	GB4	Little consideration has been given to traffic problems which will get much 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
958	Sheila	Bailey	GB5	Little consideration has been given to traffic	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				problems which will get much worse.		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 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. 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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
958	Sheila	Bailey	GB4	Byfleet submitted a 2,500 petition which appears to have been ignored	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 Represor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
958	Sheila	Bailey	GB5	Byfleet submitted a 2,500 petition which appears to have been ignored	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 Represor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1317	David	Bailey	UA29	Object to proposals to build on the backland in Barnsbury Estate. The road network is inadequate and narrow and can not support an increase. There is insufficient services and facilities including: school places, doctors and dentists to accommodate the increase. The facilities and services have reached capacity.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 24.0. 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. Included in the Key Requirements is reference to effective access arrangements to ensure highway safety. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.	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
1317	David	Bailey	UA28	Object to proposals to build on the backland in Barnsbury Estate. The road network is inadequate and narrow and can not support an increase. There is insufficient services and facilities including: school places, doctors and dentists to accommodate the increase. The facilities and services have reached capacity.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, and Section 24.0. 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. Included in the Key Requirements is reference to effective access arrangements to ensure highway safety and the potential for major highway improvements. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1317	David	Bailey	GB8	Object to proposals for housing in GB. Infrastructure has reached capacity in Woking, the area is gridlocked at peak times. The proposed development will exacerbate traffic problems. Does not believe that Woking Station and Worplesdon Station will cope	None stated.	Whilst 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. 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. 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
1317	David	Bailey	GB9	Object to proposals for housing in GB. Infrastructure has reached capacity in Woking, the area is gridlocked at peak times. The proposed development will exacerbate traffic problems. Does not believe that Woking Station and Worplesdon Station will cope	None stated.	Whilst 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. 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. 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
1317	David	Bailey	GB10	Object to proposals for housing in GB. Infrastructure has reached capacity in Woking, the area is gridlocked at peak times. The proposed development will exacerbate traffic problems. Does not believe that Woking Station and Worplesdon Station will cope	None stated.	Whilst 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. 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. 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	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 where feasible.	
1317	David	Bailey	GB11	Object to proposals for housing in GB. Infrastructure has reached capacity in Woking, the area is gridlocked at peak times. The proposed development will exacerbate traffic problems. Does not believe that Woking Station and Worplesdon Station will cope	None stated.	Whilst 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. 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. 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
1317	David	Bailey	GB14	Object to proposals for housing in GB. Infrastructure has reached capacity in Woking, the area is gridlocked at peak times. The proposed development will exacerbate traffic problems. Does not believe that Woking Station and Worplesdon Station will cope	None stated.	<p>Whilst 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. 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.</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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1317	David	Bailey	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas with increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) SSSI. Reconsider plans. The proposals will have a devastating impact on local residents in the borough.	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
1317	David	Bailey	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas with	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) SSSI. Reconsider plans. The proposals will have a devastating impact on local residents in the borough.		Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0In 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.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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
1317	David	Bailey	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas with increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) SSSI. Reconsider plans. The proposals will have a devastating impact on local residents in the borough.	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
1317	David	Bailey	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas with increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) SSSI. Reconsider plans. The proposals will have a devastating impact on local residents in the borough.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0In 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.The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity	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
						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.	
1317	David	Bailey	GB14	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas with increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) SSSI. Reconsider plans. The proposals will have a devastating impact on local residents in the borough.	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
1317	David	Bailey	GB8	The proposal will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking, increasing the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging. Particularly with proposed development in Guildford towards Woking.	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
1317	David	Bailey	GB9	The proposal will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking, increasing the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging. Particularly with proposed development in Guildford towards Woking.	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
1317	David	Bailey	GB10	The proposal will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking, increasing the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging. Particularly with proposed development in Guildford towards Woking.	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
1317	David	Bailey	GB11	The proposal will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking, increasing the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging. Particularly with proposed development in Guildford towards	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
				Woking.			
1317	David	Bailey	GB14	The proposal will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking, increasing the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging. Particularly with proposed development in Guildford towards Woking.	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
1484	Sue	Bailey	GB12	The development planned is far too large. Realises the Council have to build a certain number of new 'affordable houses' but that number is extremely excessive.	None stated.	Comment noted, however these sites were considered amongst the most sustainable when compared against reasonable alternatives, and will be supported by the necessary infrastructure. These issues are detailed further in Sections 1.0, 3.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 23.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1484	Sue	Bailey	GB13	The development planned is far too large. Realises the Council have to build a certain number of new 'affordable houses' but that number is extremely excessive.	None stated.	Comment noted, however these sites were considered amongst the most sustainable when compared against reasonable alternatives, and will be supported by the necessary infrastructure. These issues are detailed further in Sections 1.0, 3.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 23.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1484	Sue	Bailey	GB12	Questions how the area's local infrastructure would cope (traffic, schools and doctors to name a few). It can only just cope as it is.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively 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 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
1484	Sue	Bailey	GB13	Questions how the area's local infrastructure would cope (traffic, schools and doctors to name a few). It can only just cope as it is.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively 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 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
1484	Sue	Bailey	GB12	Does not object to building on the land, but to the amount the Council believes is feasible.	None stated.	Comment noted, however these sites were considered amongst the most sustainable when compared against reasonable alternatives, and will be supported by the necessary infrastructure. These issues are detailed further in Sections 1.0, 3.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 23.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1484	Sue	Bailey	GB13	Does not object to building on the land, but to the amount the Council believes is feasible.	None stated.	Comment noted, however these sites were considered amongst the most sustainable when compared against reasonable alternatives, and will be supported by the necessary infrastructure. These issues are detailed further in Sections 1.0, 3.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 23.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 4. Whilst Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect the purpose of the Green Belt, it also commits the Council to release Green Belt land to meet development requirements of the Core Strategy. The proposal is therefore not contrary to Policy CS6 or the NPPF.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB7	The GBR considered other options to meet future need for pitches including WOK001 and WOK006. There are also sites with capacity to deliver 15 pitches each combined (land at West Hall WGB004a/SHLAAWB019b and south of	None stated.	The 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				High Road WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These are omitted from the DPD with little explanation.			
156	Graham	Baker	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3a 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.	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation needs for Travellers has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 4. Ten Acre Farm is about 3.36ha. 72.05% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. 6.52% in Flood Zone 2 and 5.51% in Flood Zone 3. The Council has carried out a sequential tests to justify the use of the site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Development on the site will be directed to the area of the site with the least risk of flooding, i.e. Flood Zone 1. The is considered an enforceable approach that will be clarified in the allocation. The allocation also includes key requirement to ensure that detailed flood risk assessment is carried out to inform the planning application process for any scheme that will come forward for the delivery of the site. With the specifications set out in the key requirements of the allocation, the Council is satisfied that the site can be developed without significant flood risk to occupiers. It is also not envisaged that the development will exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The site can be developed with no significant adverse impacts on the visual amenity of the area and nearby residents. There are robust policies in the Core Strategy to ensure that this is achieved,	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB10	No Lancape Character Assessment questions the validity of the Green Belt Review, areas of lancape importance NE7/CS24 have been ignored.	None stated.	This issues has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB9	No Lancape Character Assessment questions the validity of the Green Belt Review, areas of lancape 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 lancape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB11	No Lancape Character Assessment questions the validity of the Green Belt Review, areas of lancape importance NE7/CS24 have been ignored.	None stated.	The lancape implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB8	No Lancape Character Assessment questions the validity of the Green Belt Review, areas of lancape importance NE7/CS24 have been ignored.	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 7. The lancape implications of the proposals have been fully taken into account	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB7	Ten Acre Farm does not have the required accessibility, contrary to Woking Core Strategy and SHLAA. Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not close to facilities, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure, poor public transport, and provision of a communal building would not positively enhance the environment, increase openness or contribute to existing character.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively 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).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	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. The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in	None stated.	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. 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	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
				excess of £1.5 million.		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 be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation 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.	
156	Graham	Baker	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	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
156	Graham	Baker	GB8	There was no community involvement in considering what is needed locally in compiling the Green Belt Review. The Mayford Village Character Assessment has not been taken into account; this raised relevant issues. Inadequate account taken of the limitations of the road network, flood plain, status of Mayford, listed buildings, conservation areas, SSSI's and SNCI's.	None stated.	The Council has adequately consulted on the DPD. The approach to consultation on the DPD is comprehensively addressed in Section 6 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has used a range of evidence to inform the DPD including flood risk assessment, transport assessment and a Green Belt boundary review. The list is set out in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Appendix 1 of the DPD is also a list of the evidence that has been used to inform the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB9	There was no community involvement in considering what is needed locally in compiling the Green Belt Review. The Mayford Village Character Assessment has not been taken into account; this raised relevant issues. Inadequate account taken of the limitations of the road network, flood plain, status of Mayford, listed buildings, conservation areas, SSSI's and SNCI's.	None stated.	The council has consulted adequately on the DPD. Details of the approach to on consultation is set out in Section 6 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has taken into account the views of local residents including the Mayford Village Society. However, it has to balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the area as set out in the Core Strategy. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence such as Flood Risk Assessment, Landscape Assessment. The list of evidence is covered in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. They collectively justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB10	There was no community involvement in considering what is needed locally in compiling the Green Belt Review. The Mayford Village Character Assessment has not been taken into account; this raised relevant issues. Inadequate account taken of the limitations of the road network, flood plain, status of Mayford, listed buildings, conservation areas, SSSI's and SNCI's.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that adequate consultation was carried out during the Regulation 18 consultation. This matter is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6. Nevertheless, the Council will also seek to explore better ways of community involvement. A range of evidence, including the Woking Character Study has been used to inform the DPD. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the DPD have been addressed in Sections 20 and 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Flooding is addressed in Section 5 and heritage assets in Section 19. 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	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
						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. All the matters raised have been taken into account.	
156	Graham	Baker	GB11	There was no community involvement in considering what is needed locally in compiling the Green Belt Review. The Mayford Village Character Assessment has not been taken into account; this raised relevant issues. Inadequate account taken of the limitations of the road network, flood plain, status of Mayford, listed buildings, conservation areas, SSSI's and SNCI's.	None stated.	There was adequate consultation of the Council's proposals. The approach to consultation is addressed in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6. The Council has carried out a range of evidence base studies to inform the DPD. Flooding implication are addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Traffic issues are addressed in Section 20 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. Protection of heritage assets is addressed in Section 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	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.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	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. 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.	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
156	Graham	Baker	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	None stated.	The Council has a clear objective to protect environmentally sensitive sites, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally	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 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.		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 Lancape 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. 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 Lancape 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 lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	
156	Graham	Baker	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008. 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.	None stated.	It is intended to allocate the site for a business use. The site is allocated to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. In doing so, the Council need to make sure that the allocation should reflect the extent to which traditional lifestyles can contribute to sustainability. The bullet point will be reworded to clarify this point. The overall justification for the allocation of the site for Travellers accommodation is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	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
156	Graham	Baker	GB10	Infrastructure Factors: 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. Most people drive in the area due to poor public transport, including limited bus services. Many of the roads do not have pavements and are narrow, including the road to Worplesdon Station. Development will exacerbate this. There is a lack of facilities and services at Mayford Centre for the proposed increase in population and would result in people driving to services such as a doctor.	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	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
						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.	
156	Graham	Baker	GB11	Infrastructure Factors: 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. Most people drive in the area due to poor public transport, including limited bus services. Many of the roads do not have pavements and are narrow, including the road to Worplesdon Station. Development will exacerbate this. There is a lack of facilities and services at Mayford Centre for the proposed increase in population and would result in people driving to services such as a doctor.	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. 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
156	Graham	Baker	GB8	Infrastructure Factors: 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. Most people drive in the area due to poor public transport, including limited bus services. Many of the roads do not have pavements and are narrow, including the road to Worplesdon Station. Development will exacerbate this. There is a lack of facilities and services at Mayford Centre for the proposed increase in population and would result in people driving to services such as a doctor.	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	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
						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.	
156	Graham	Baker	GB9	Infrastructure Factors: 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. Most people drive in the area due to poor public transport, including limited bus services. Many of the roads do not have pavements and are narrow, including the road to Worplesdon Station. Development will exacerbate this. There is a lack of facilities and services at Mayford Centre for the proposed increase in population and would result in people driving to services such as a doctor.	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
156	Graham	Baker	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.	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
156	Graham	Baker	GB8	This site should remain in the Green Belt - special circumstances are required by national planning policy but do not exist. Policy clearly states that "housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development." In the absence of special circumstances justifying an exception, there is a presumption against development. Unmet demand does not constitute special circumstances (Brandon Lewis MP Statements) and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt or justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Even should the Council not be able to show a five year supply of residential sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness. Just under 700 proposed dwellings would have a very significant impact on Mayford and change the dynamics and balance of the village.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 23.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB9	This site should remain in the Green Belt - special circumstances are required by national planning policy but do not exist. Policy clearly states that "housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development." In the absence of special circumstances justifying an exception, there is a presumption against development. Unmet demand does not constitute special circumstances (Brandon Lewis MP Statements) and is unlikely to outweigh harm to	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 23.	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 Green Belt or justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Even should the Council not be able to show a five year supply of residential sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness. Just under 700 proposed dwellings would have a very significant impact on Mayford and change the dynamics and balance of the village.			
156	Graham	Baker	GB10	This site should remain in the Green Belt - special circumstances are required by national planning policy but do not exist. Policy clearly states that “housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.” In the absence of special circumstances justifying an exception, there is a presumption against development. Unmet demand does not constitute special circumstances (Brandon Lewis MP Statements) and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt or justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Even should the Council not be able to show a five year supply of residential sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness. Just under 700 proposed dwellings would have a very significant impact on Mayford and change the dynamics and balance of the village.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Core Strategy has been established in the Core Strategy, in particular, Policy CS6. The safeguarding of site to meet development needs beyond 2027 has the strength of national planning policy behind it. In particular, paragraph 85 of the NPPF. Depending on the recent and historic uses of each of the sites, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed as part of any scheme to develop the sites 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB11	This site should remain in the Green Belt - special circumstances are required by national planning policy but do not exist. Policy clearly states that “housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.” In the absence of special circumstances justifying an exception, there is a presumption against development. Unmet demand does not constitute special circumstances (Brandon Lewis MP Statements) and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt or justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Even should the Council not be able to show a five year supply of residential sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness. Just under 700 proposed dwellings would have a very significant impact on Mayford and change the dynamics and balance of the village.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Core Strategy has been established in the Core Strategy, in particular, Policy CS6. The safeguarding of site to meet development needs beyond 2027 has the strength of national planning policy behind it. In particular, paragraph 85 of the NPPF. Depending on the recent and historic uses of each of the sites, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed as part of any scheme to develop the sites 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB10	Landscape and Environmental Factors: Special Protection Areas (SPA) and 400m buffer excluded from the Green Belt Review to protect endangered birds. Prey and Smarts Heaths are Special Sites of Scientific Interest and Important Bird Areas so should also have buffers. Mayford Village Society is pursuing inclusion of these into the Thames Basin Heaths SPA; if successful, will result in 400m buffer in which development is not allowed. Land North of Saunders Lane includes Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance so should not be considered for	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. The Green Belt boundary review report provides the evidence that the proposed allocations in Mayford can be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. Flooding implications	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. Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk.		of the allocations is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 5.	
156	Graham	Baker	GB11	Lancape and Environmental Factors: Special Protection Areas (SPA) and 400m buffer excluded from the Green Belt Review to protect endangered birds. Prey and Smarts Heaths are Special Sites of Scientific Interest and Important Bird Areas so should also have buffers. Mayford Village Society is pursuing inclusion of these into the Thames Basin Heaths SPA; if successful, will result in 400m buffer in which development is not allowed. Land North of Saunders Lane includes Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance so should not be considered for development. Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk.	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. The Green Belt boundary review report provides the evidence that the proposed allocations in Mayford can be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. Flooding implications of the allocations is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 5.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB8	Lancape and Environmental Factors: Special Protection Areas (SPA) and 400m buffer excluded from the Green Belt Review to protect endangered birds. Prey and Smarts Heaths are Special Sites of Scientific Interest and Important Bird Areas so should also have buffers. Mayford Village Society is pursuing inclusion of these into the Thames Basin Heaths SPA; if successful, will result in 400m buffer in which development is not allowed. Land North of Saunders Lane includes Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance so should not be considered for development. Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk.	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. The Green Belt boundary review report provides the evidence that the proposed allocations in Mayford can be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. Flooding implications of the allocations is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 5.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB9	Lancape and Environmental Factors: Special Protection Areas (SPA) and 400m buffer excluded from the Green Belt Review to protect endangered birds. Prey and Smarts Heaths are Special Sites of Scientific Interest and Important Bird Areas so should also have buffers. Mayford Village Society is pursuing inclusion of these into the Thames Basin Heaths SPA; if successful, will result in 400m buffer in which development is not allowed. Land North of Saunders Lane includes Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance so should not be considered for development. Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk.	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. The Green Belt boundary review report provides the evidence that the proposed allocations in Mayford can be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. Flooding implications of the allocations is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 5.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB10	Cross-border considerations - Slyfield Area Regeneration Project has government support to relocate Guildford's sewage treatment works, build 1000 new homes and enlarge the Industrial Estate. Football stadium also planned in Salt Box Road, with traffic impacts. The DPD is based on inaccurate out-of-date traffic models that do not reflect reality of stationary traffic on Smarts Heath Road, Saunders Lane and Egley Road at rush	For these reasons this land should remain in the Green Belt and be protected from development.	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	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
				hours. Development cannot be accommodated by the infrastructure and highway network.		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.	
156	Graham	Baker	GB11	Cross-border considerations - Slyfield Area Regeneration Project has government support to relocate Guildford's sewage treatment works, build 1000 new homes and enlarge the Industrial Estate. Football stadium also planned in Salt Box Road, with traffic impacts. The DPD is based on inaccurate out-of-date traffic models that do not reflect reality of stationary traffic on Smarts Heath Road, Saunders Lane and Egley Road at rush hours. Development cannot be accommodated by the infrastructure and highway network.	For these reasons this land should remain in the Green Belt and be protected from development.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB8	Cross-border considerations - Slyfield Area Regeneration Project has government support to relocate Guildford's sewage treatment works, build 1000 new homes and enlarge the Industrial Estate. Football stadium also planned in Salt Box Road, with traffic impacts. The DPD is based on inaccurate out-of-date traffic models that do not reflect reality of stationary traffic on Smarts Heath Road, Saunders Lane and Egley Road at rush hours. Development cannot be accommodated by the infrastructure and highway network.	For these reasons this land should remain in the Green Belt and be protected from development.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB9	Cross-border considerations - Slyfield Area Regeneration Project has government support to relocate Guildford's sewage treatment works, build 1000 new homes and enlarge the Industrial Estate. Football stadium also planned in Salt Box Road, with traffic impacts. The DPD is based on inaccurate out-of-date traffic models that do not reflect reality of stationary traffic on Smarts Heath Road, Saunders Lane and Egley Road at rush hours. Development cannot be accommodated by the infrastructure and highway network.	For these reasons this land should remain in the Green Belt and be protected from development.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	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.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	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 remediated.	None stated.	The SHLAA treats all sites in the Green Belt as currently not developable. Green Belt sites will only be released for development through the plan making process. Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further	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
						additional pitches. 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 be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation 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. 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. Overall, the justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet developments needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. see Sections 1, 2 and 4.	
156	Graham	Baker	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 the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches.	None stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	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	Do not include this site in the DPD.	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.	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
				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.			
156	Graham	Baker	GB8	No independently verified evidence to demonstrate Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for development. Over-reliance on the call for sites, so sites that might be available were not identified if not put forward. Expect in the case of Ten Acre Farm where the Council approached the land owner directly.	None stated.	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 Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB9	No independently verified evidence to demonstrate Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for development. Over-reliance on the call for sites, so sites that might be available were not identified if not put forward. Expect in the case of Ten Acre Farm where the Council approached the land owner directly.	None stated.	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 Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB10	No independently verified evidence to demonstrate Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for development. Over-reliance on the call for sites, so sites that might be available were not identified if not put forward. Expect in the case of Ten Acre Farm where the Council approached the land owner directly.	None stated.	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
156	Graham	Baker	GB11	No independently verified evidence to demonstrate Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for development. Over-reliance on the call for sites, so sites that might be available were not identified if not put forward. Expect in the case of Ten Acre Farm where the Council approached the land owner directly.	None stated.	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
156	Graham	Baker	GB9	<p>The GBBRs weakness is that only sites put forward have been considered and therefore not a true reflection of Woking as a whole. Many unanswered questions about how parcels of land were selected based on the criteria.</p> <p>The Green Belt Review makes analytical comparisons, the ranking or grading of each site in terms of suitability to each relevant factor appears to be rather subjective and the final grading or ranking of sites is therefore rather arbitrary.</p> <p>There must be transparent reasons as to why Parcel 20 is preferred over other Parcels. 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> <p>The GBR does not address in detail why existing established key settlements cannot develop more</p>	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and consistently applied in the review. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has used a range of evidence to inform the DPD as set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic. The collectively 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
				significantly elsewhere.			
156	Graham	Baker	GB8	<p>The GBBRs weakness is that only sites put forward have been considered and therefore not a true reflection of Woking as a whole. Many unanswered questions about how parcels of land were selected based on the criteria.</p> <p>The Green Belt Review makes analytical comparisons, the ranking or grading of each site in terms of suitability to each relevant factor appears to be rather subjective and the final grading or ranking of sites is therefore rather arbitrary.</p> <p>There must be transparent reasons as to why Parcel 20 is preferred over other Parcels. 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> <p>The GBR does not address in detail why existing established key settlements cannot develop more significantly elsewhere.</p>	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review is a comprehensive review of land parcels across the Green Belt. The methodology used to carry it out is robust and consistently applied. The Council has used a range of evidence to inform the DPD and they collective justify the allocations. Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in Section 13 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB10	<p>The GBBRs weakness is that only sites put forward have been considered and therefore not a true reflection of Woking as a whole. Many unanswered questions about how parcels of land were selected based on the criteria. The Green Belt Review makes analytical comparisons, the ranking or grading of each site in terms of suitability to each relevant factor appears to be rather subjective and the final grading or ranking of sites is therefore rather arbitrary. There must be transparent reasons as to why Parcel 20 is preferred over other Parcels. 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. The GBR does not address in detail why existing established key settlements cannot develop more significantly elsewhere.</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 robustness of the Green Belt boundary review report is addressed in 10 of the Issues and Matters Topic paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
156	Graham	Baker	GB11	<p>The GBBRs weakness is that only sites put forward have been considered and therefore not a true reflection of Woking as a whole. Many unanswered questions about how parcels of land were selected based on the criteria.</p> <p>The Green Belt Review makes analytical comparisons, the ranking or grading of each site in terms of suitability to each relevant factor appears to be rather subjective and the final grading or ranking of sites is therefore rather arbitrary.</p> <p>There must be transparent reasons as to why Parcel 20 is preferred over other Parcels. 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> <p>The GBR does not address in detail why existing</p>	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied in carrying out the review. This matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10. Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Council's Issues and Matter 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
				established key settlements cannot develop more significantly elsewhere.			
176	Benjamin	Baker	GB7	Strongly object to the proposal to increase the number of Traveller Pitches on this land. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford. Any increase in caravans would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife.	None stated.	The SHLAA treats all sites in the Green Belt as currently not developable. Green Belt sites will only be released for development through the plan making process. 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. 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 be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation 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. 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. Overall, the justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet developments needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. see Sections 1, 2 and 4. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
176	Benjamin	Baker	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. Please reconsider, plans will have devastating effect on this unique, historic village. I	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	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
				support the views of Mayford Village Society.		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.	
176	Benjamin	Baker	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. Please reconsider, plans will have devastating effect on this unique, historic village. I support the views of Mayford Village Society.	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
176	Benjamin	Baker	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. Please reconsider, plans will have devastating effect on this unique, historic village. I support the views of Mayford Village Society.	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	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
						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.	
176	Benjamin	Baker	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. Please reconsider, plans will have devastating effect on this unique, historic village. I support the views of Mayford Village Society.	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
176	Benjamin	Baker	GB11	I strongly object to the proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Building on any one will make Mayford a suburb of Woking, increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt.	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 lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the lancape 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
176	Benjamin	Baker	GB8	I strongly object to the proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Building on any one will make Mayford a suburb of Woking, increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt.	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 lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape 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	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
						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.	
176	Benjamin	Baker	GB9	I strongly object to the proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Building on any one will make Mayford a suburb of Woking, increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt.	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 lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape 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
176	Benjamin	Baker	GB10	I strongly object to the proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Building on any one will make Mayford a suburb of Woking, increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
176	Benjamin	Baker	GB10	No consideration given to the impact on the local road network, which already has queues at peak times and single track bridges. There will be more cars and traffic and risk to pedestrians and cyclists where there no paths or cycle lanes. Worplesdon station is crowded at peak times, serving commuters, school children and students.	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	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 are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage	
176	Benjamin	Baker	GB11	No consideration given to the impact on the local road network, which already has queues at peak times and single track bridges. There will be more cars and traffic and risk to pedestrians and cyclists where there no paths or cycle lanes. Worplesdon station is crowded at peak times, serving commuters, school children and students.	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
176	Benjamin	Baker	GB8	No consideration given to the impact on the local road network, which already has queues at peak times and single track bridges. There will be more cars and traffic and risk to pedestrians and cyclists where there no paths or cycle lanes. Worplesdon station is crowded at peak times, serving commuters, school children and students.	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
176	Benjamin	Baker	GB9	No consideration given to the impact on the local road network, which already has queues at peak times and single track bridges. There will be more cars and traffic and risk to pedestrians and cyclists where there no paths or cycle lanes. Worplesdon station is crowded at peak times,	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,	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
				serving commuters, school children and students.		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	
181	Charlotte	Baker	GB7	Strongly object to the proposal to increase the number of Traveller Pitches on this land. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford. Any increase in caravans would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife.	None stated.	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. 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 be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation 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. 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. Overall, the justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet developments needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. see Sections 1, 2 and 4. 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	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
						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.	
181	Charlotte	Baker	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected heathlands (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) due to the proximity of the development. Please reconsider, plans will have devastating effects on this historic village. I support the views of Mayford Village Society.	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
181	Charlotte	Baker	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. Please reconsider, plans will have devastating effect on this unique, historic village. I support the views of Mayford Village Society.	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
181	Charlotte	Baker	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	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.	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. Please reconsider, plans will have devastating effect on this unique, historic village. I support the views of Mayford Village Society.		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.	
181	Charlotte	Baker	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. Please reconsider, plans will have devastating effect on this unique, historic village. I support the views of Mayford Village Society.	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
181	Charlotte	Baker	GB11	I strongly object to the proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Building on any one will make Mayford a suburb of Woking, increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt.	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
181	Charlotte	Baker	GB8	I strongly object to the proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Building on any one will	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters	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
				make Mayford a suburb of Woking, increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt.		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.	of this representation
181	Charlotte	Baker	GB9	I strongly object to the proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Mayford village is in the Domesday Book and will be desecrated. The Council has dismissed the Green Belt purpose to preserve the setting and character of historic towns. No proof that the Council has exhausted all brown sites first.	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 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. 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
181	Charlotte	Baker	GB10	I strongly object to the proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Building on any one will make historic Mayford a suburb of Woking, increasing the possibility of Woking and Guildford merging, contrary to Green Belt policy.	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. The implications of the proposals on the physical separation between Woking and Guildford is addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
181	Charlotte	Baker	GB11	No consideration given to the impact on the local road network, which already has queues at peak times and single track bridges. There will be more cars and traffic and risk to pedestrians and cyclists where there no paths or cycle lanes. Worplesdon station is crowded at peak times,	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,	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
				serving commuters, school children and students.		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	
181	Charlotte	Baker	GB8	No consideration given to the impact on the local road network, which already has queues at peak times and single track bridges. There will be more cars and traffic and risk to pedestrians and cyclists where there no paths or cycle lanes. Worplesdon station is crowded at peak times, serving commuters, school children and students.	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
181	Charlotte	Baker	GB9	No consideration given to the impact on the local road network, which already has queues at peak times and single track bridges. There will be more cars and traffic and risk to pedestrians and cyclists where there no paths or cycle lanes. Worplesdon station is crowded at peak times, serving commuters, school children and students.	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	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
						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	
181	Charlotte	Baker	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network with narrow lanes and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also few pedestrian footpaths or cycle lanes.	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
182	Mark	Baker	GB7	Strongly object to the proposal to increase the number of Traveller Pitches on this land. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford. Any increase in caravans would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife.	None stated.	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. 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 be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation 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. 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. Overall, the justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet developments needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. see Sections 1, 2 and 4. 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	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
						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.	
182	Mark	Baker	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected heathlands (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) due to the proximity of the development. Please reconsider, plans will have devastating effects on this historic village. I support the views of Mayford Village Society.	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
182	Mark	Baker	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. Please reconsider, plans will have devastating effect on this unique, historic village. I support the views of Mayford Village Society.	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
182	Mark	Baker	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. Please reconsider, plans will have devastating effect on this unique, historic village. I support the views of Mayford Village Society.	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	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
						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.	
182	Mark	Baker	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. Please reconsider, plans will have devastating effect on this unique, historic village. I support the views of Mayford Village Society.	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
182	Mark	Baker	GB11	I strongly object to the proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Building on any one will make Mayford a suburb of Woking, increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt.	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 lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the lancape 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
182	Mark	Baker	GB8	I strongly object to the proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Building on any one will make Mayford a suburb of Woking, increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt.	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 lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape	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
						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.	
182	Mark	Baker	GB9	I strongly object to the proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Building on any one will make Mayford a suburb of Woking, increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt.	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
182	Mark	Baker	GB10	I strongly object to proposed housing. Development of GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 will result in Mayford becoming a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
182	Mark	Baker	GB10	No consideration given to the impact on the local road network, which already has queues at peak times and single track bridges. There will be more cars and traffic and risk to pedestrians and cyclists where there no paths or cycle lanes. Worplesdon station is crowded at peak times, serving commuters, school children and students.	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	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
						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	
182	Mark	Baker	GB11	No consideration given to the impact on the local road network, which already has queues at peak times and single track bridges. There will be more cars and traffic and risk to pedestrians and cyclists where there no paths or cycle lanes. Worplesdon station is crowded at peak times, serving commuters, school children and students.	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
182	Mark	Baker	GB8	No consideration given to the impact on the local road network, which already has queues at peak times and single track bridges. There will be more cars and traffic and risk to pedestrians and cyclists where there no paths or cycle lanes. Worplesdon station is crowded at peak times, serving commuters, school children and students.	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	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 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	
182	Mark	Baker	GB9	No consideration given to the impact on the local road network, which already has queues at peak times and single track bridges. There will be more cars and traffic and risk to pedestrians and cyclists where there no paths or cycle lanes. Worplesdon station is crowded at peak times, serving commuters, school children and students.	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
475	M	Baker	GB12	The village's infrastructure will not cope with any further large expansion, considering Wisley airfield's 2,000 new homes. Newark Lane will be an impossible rat-run and refers to the 7.42 am train journey from Woking to London being the worst in the country.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.3, 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0. The issue raised about train capacity 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
475	M	Baker	GB13	The village's infrastructure will not cope with any further large expansion, considering Wisley airfield's 2,000 new homes. Newark Lane will be an impossible rat-run and refers to the 7.42 am train journey from Woking to London being the worst in the country.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.3, 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0. The issue raised about train capacity 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
475	M	Baker	GB12	Questions the need for separate developments all over the borough, and whether a new town development outside Woking e.g. Witney in Oxfordshire, where there is ample land, on or land at the ex-Traditions golf course would be	None stated.	This suggestion is noted and the new town concept is being taken forward in some locations across the country, to meet demand in those areas. However, this does not negate the need for the Council to meet its housing requirement, as set in the Core Strategy, highlighted at the start of the draft DPD and in Section	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
				better.		1.0 and 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Furthermore, the Council's evidence suggests that the sites in Pyrford are in sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives (see Section 9.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper). The Council also has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. It should be noted that many golf courses will also be designated as Green Belt, and would have been assessed as part of the Green Belt Review (see Section 10.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper). The fact they are used as golf courses wouldn't mean they are any more suitable for development than other Green Belt land. Also availability of these sites, in current use as golf courses, would need to be considered.	
475	M	Baker	GB13	Questions the need for separate developments all over the borough, and whether a new town development outside Woking e.g. Witney in Oxfordshire, where there is ample land, on or land at the ex-Traditions golf course would be better.	None stated.	This suggestion is noted and the new town concept is being taken forward in some locations across the country, to meet demand in those areas. However, this does not negate the need for the Council to meet its housing requirement, as set in the Core Strategy, highlighted at the start of the draft DPD and in Section 1.0 and 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Furthermore, the Council's evidence suggests that the sites in Pyrford are in sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives (see Section 9.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper). The Council also has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. It should be noted that many golf courses will also be designated as Green Belt, and would have been assessed as part of the Green Belt Review (see Section 10.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper). The fact they are used as golf courses wouldn't mean they are any more suitable for development than other Green Belt land. Also availability of these sites, in current use as golf courses, would need to be considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
475	M	Baker	GB12	Pyrford is a very old village with unique history and culture, footpaths, buildings and views, and a tight community. It is essential to maintain its special character and setting, or we will again lose something very precious.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing 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 Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) 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 and design standards in accordance with the environmental and 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. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. Landscape and heritage are covered in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0 and 19.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
475	M	Baker	GB13	Pyrford is a very old village with unique history and culture, footpaths, buildings and views, and a tight community. It is essential to maintain its special character and setting, or we will again lose something very precious.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing 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 Pyrford. However, it 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
						<p>expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) 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 and design standards in accordance with the environmental and 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> <p>The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. Landscape and heritage are covered in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0 and 19.0.</p>	
475	M	Baker	GB12	It will be necessary to re-design all the roads around Pyrford and this side of Woking, especially if the West Byfleet and Byfleet developments go ahead.	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
475	M	Baker	GB13	It will be necessary to re-design all the roads around Pyrford and this side of Woking, especially if the West Byfleet and Byfleet developments go ahead.	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
475	M	Baker	GB12	How can schools and health services cope with such hugely increased numbers? They are already under pressure.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed 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
475	M	Baker	GB13	How can schools and health services cope with such hugely increased numbers? They are already under pressure.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed 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
475	M	Baker	GB12	Imagines chaos that will ensue should development go ahead. Our experience to date on re-piping the gas mains on Old Woking Road is not good.	None stated.	The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out that utility providers, including gas providers, will respond to demand from additional development, as set in the Council's Development Plan. The Council will also continue to engage with them as this and future plans develop. Unfortunately the delivery of projects to increase capacity by providers is not controlled by Woking Borough Council, although it will seek to ensure these works cause minimal disruption in future.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
475	M	Baker	GB13	Imagines chaos that will ensue should development go ahead. Our experience to date on re-piping the gas mains on Old Woking Road is not good.	None stated.	The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out that utility providers, including gas providers, will respond to demand from additional development, as set in the Council's Development Plan. The Council will also continue to engage with them as this and future plans develop. Unfortunately the delivery of projects to increase capacity by providers is not controlled by Woking Borough Council, although it will seek to ensure these works cause minimal disruption in future.	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
475	M	Baker	GB12	Raises awareness of pinch-points i.e. getting into Ripley from Newark Lane, and the lack of advanced thinking exercised in re-building the two bridges in Newark Lane between Pyrford and Ripley. They are still the same width.	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
475	M	Baker	GB13	Raises awareness of pinch-points i.e. getting into Ripley from Newark Lane, and the lack of advanced thinking exercised in re-building the two bridges in Newark Lane between Pyrford and Ripley. They are still the same width.	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
475	M	Baker	GB12	Notwithstanding the above, objects to the proposals for a number of reasons, the first being that the government's stated Green Belt purposes are completely negated by the proposals, in particular regarding urban sprawl and small villages merging into one.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 15.0 and 12.0, and for justification for the release of Green Belt land, as background to the Council's approach, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
475	M	Baker	GB13	Notwithstanding the above, objects to the proposals for a number of reasons, the first being that the government's stated Green Belt purposes are completely negated by the proposals, in particular regarding urban sprawl and small villages merging into one.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 15.0 and 12.0, and for justification for the release of Green Belt land, as background to the Council's approach, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
475	M	Baker	GB12	Asks why no-one thought of implications of immigration as part of the Government's strategy and points to the current governments lack of intention to deal with the issue. Despite this, we are where we are and the above is a weak rationale for nimbyism.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. In any case, it is not for the local authority (and even less so for this planning document) to grapple with national immigration issues, but to address the development needs and requirements set in its own local development plan. 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
475	M	Baker	GB13	Asks why no-one thought of implications of immigration as part of the Government's strategy and points to the current governments lack of intention to deal with the issue. Despite this, we are where we are and the above is a weak rationale for nimbyism.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. In any case, it is not for the local authority (and even less so for this planning document) to grapple with national immigration issues, but to address the development needs and requirements set in its own local development plan. 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
475	M	Baker	GB12	This is a much bigger problem than outlined. We believe that the hierarchy on Woking Council will be as vociferous in saying 'No' to the government as they were in saying 'Yes to global warming.	None stated.	Objection noted. 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. In addition, any development will be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy and the policies set in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, due for examination in May 2016.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
475	M	Baker	GB13	This is a much bigger problem than outlined. We believe that the hierarchy on Woking Council will be as vociferous in saying 'No' to the government as they were in saying 'Yes to global warming.	None stated.	Objection noted. 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. In addition, any development will be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy and the policies set in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, due for examination in May 2016.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
560	Graham	Baker	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS6	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and	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 section 9 of the NPPF. These set out limited circumstances where development is considered appropriate in the Green Belt.	stated.	Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	of this representation
560	Graham	Baker	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
560	Graham	Baker	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
560	Graham	Baker	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
560	Graham	Baker	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
560	Graham	Baker	GB7	There is a presumption against such	The site should be removed	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.	from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9 -1.12 and Section 4.0.	is proposed as a result of this representation
560	Graham	Baker	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 Lancape 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 lancape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
560	Graham	Baker	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
560	Graham	Baker	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 lancape 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	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
						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.	
560	Graham	Baker	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
560	Graham	Baker	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
560	Graham	Baker	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
560	Graham	Baker	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
560	Graham	Baker	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
560	Graham	Baker	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
560	Graham	Baker	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
560	Graham	Baker	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
560	Graham	Baker	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
560	Graham	Baker	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, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
560	Graham	Baker	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
560	Graham	Baker	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.	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 Lancap 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 lancap grounds. The Lancap Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. 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. 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
560	Graham	Baker	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 lancap 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
755	Carole	Baker	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
755	Carole	Baker	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.	None 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 lancap 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	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
						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.	
755	Carole	Baker	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.	<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 Lancap 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 lancap grounds. The Lancap 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 lancap 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
755	Carole	Baker	GB7	Object as the proposal will have a negative impact on the village and set a precedent for further Green Belt development. Object to the proposal which are not more than 500m from their property.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the character of the area has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>The sites identified around Mayford are safeguarded for future development needs post 2027. By safeguarding land the Council believes it is consistent with the NPPF. The Council's response to safeguarding land is set out in Section 2.0. By allocating sites for this and the next plan period, the Council believe it will make sure that development will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.</p> <p>Objection to GB7 is noted.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
755	Carole	Baker	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and	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
				Section 9 of the NPPF.		Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3	of this representation
755	Carole	Baker	GB8	Strongly object. The size and impact of the proposed development are massive and disproportional to anything else being tabled. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
755	Carole	Baker	GB9	Strongly object. The size and impact of the proposed development are massive and disproportional to anything else being tabled. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
755	Carole	Baker	GB10	Strongly object. The size and impact of the proposed development are massive and disproportional to anything else being tabled. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
755	Carole	Baker	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
755	Carole	Baker	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 Lancape 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 lancape grounds. The Lancape 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
755	Carole	Baker	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.	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB9	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.	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
755	Carole	Baker	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.	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
755	Carole	Baker	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.	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	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	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
						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.	
755	Carole	Baker	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	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
755	Carole	Baker	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
755	Carole	Baker	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.	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
755	Carole	Baker	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
755	Carole	Baker	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
755	Carole	Baker	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB9	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	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.	
755	Carole	Baker	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
755	Carole	Baker	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB8	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.	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB9	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.	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB10	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.	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB11	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.	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
755	Carole	Baker	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB9	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
755	Carole	Baker	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
755	Carole	Baker	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
755	Carole	Baker	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. In the absence of any Special Circumstances being demonstrated, there is a presumption against development. Unmet demand does not constitute	For the reasons stated above the land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. In addition, 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	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
				special circumstances, this was made clear by Brandon Lewis MP. It is therefore considered that even should the Council not be able to demonstrate a five year supply of residential sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness to amount to the very special circumstance to justify the development in the Green Belt. Considering the number of proposed dwellings at just under 700, this would have a very significant impact on Mayford and completely change the dynamics and balance of the existing village.		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.	
755	Carole	Baker	GB9	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. In the absence of any Special Circumstances being demonstrated, there is a presumption against development. Unmet demand does not constitute special circumstances, this was made clear by Brandon Lewis MP. It is therefore considered that even should the Council not be able to demonstrate a five year supply of residential sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness to amount to the very special circumstance to justify the development in the Green Belt. Considering the number of proposed dwellings at just under 700, this would have a very significant impact on Mayford and completely change the dynamics and balance of the existing village.	For the reasons stated above the land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. In addition, 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
755	Carole	Baker	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. In the absence of any Special Circumstances being demonstrated, there is a presumption against development. Unmet demand does not constitute special circumstances, this was made clear by Brandon Lewis MP. It is therefore considered that even should the Council not be able to demonstrate a five year supply of residential sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness to amount to the very special circumstance to justify the development in the Green Belt. Considering the number of proposed dwellings at just under 700, this would have a very significant impact on Mayford and completely change the dynamics and balance of the existing village.	For the reasons stated above the land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. In addition, 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
755	Carole	Baker	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. In the absence of any Special Circumstances being	For the reasons stated above the land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. In addition, 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	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
				demonstrated, there is a presumption against development. Unmet demand does not constitute special circumstances, this was made clear by Brandon Lewis MP. It is therefore considered that even should the Council not be able to demonstrate a five year supply of residential sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness to amount to the very special circumstance to justify the development in the Green Belt. Considering the number of proposed dwellings at just under 700, this would have a very significant impact on Mayford and completely change the dynamics and balance of the existing village.		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.	
755	Carole	Baker	GB7	<p>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.</p> <p>The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.</p>	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>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
755	Carole	Baker	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB7	Due to the flood risk on the site, the development will have to be located closer to the road frontage which will have an adverse impact 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
755	Carole	Baker	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 Lancap 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</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
						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 lancape setting of the area.	
755	Carole	Baker	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.	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. 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 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. 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 lancape 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
755	Carole	Baker	GB7	The site is contaminated and sites must not be located on contaminated land. It was rejected in the GBBR as it is contaminated. In line with guidance, Traveller sites should be decontaminated before use. This is expensive and should only be considered if development is viable.	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB7	Allocated sites must be deliverable and in line with CS14, must contain adequate infrastructure and onsite utilities. There is little infrastructure on the site at present, including drainage. Acoustic barriers will be required due to the close proximity of the railway line. Pitches will have to be raised	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	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
				due to flood risk. The costs of preparing the site are likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.		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 lancape 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.	
755	Carole	Baker	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB8	The GBBR proposes to change the boundaries of the Green Belt without a Lancaple Character Assessment. This questions the validity of the review and suggests why areas of lancaple importance NE7/CS24 have been ignored.	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB9	The GBBR proposes to change the boundaries of the Green Belt without a Lancaple Character Assessment. This questions the validity of the review and suggests why areas of lancaple importance NE7/CS24 have been ignored.	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB10	The GBBR proposes to change the boundaries of the Green Belt without a Lancaple Character Assessment. This questions the validity of the review and suggests why areas of lancaple importance NE7/CS24 have been ignored.	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB11	The GBBR proposes to change the boundaries of the Green Belt without a Lancaple Character Assessment. This questions the validity of the review and suggests why areas of lancaple importance NE7/CS24 have been ignored.	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
755	Carole	Baker	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.	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB9	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.		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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
755	Carole	Baker	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.	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
755	Carole	Baker	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.	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008. 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.	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
755	Carole	Baker	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.	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	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
						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.	
755	Carole	Baker	GB9	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.	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
755	Carole	Baker	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.	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
755	Carole	Baker	GB11	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA)	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
				traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.		(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.	of this representation
755	Carole	Baker	GB7	Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	The representation has been 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
755	Carole	Baker	General	Over-reliance on the call for sites, so sites that might be available were not identified if not put forward. Expect in the case of Ten Acre Farm where the Council approached the land owner directly.	None stated.	It is correct that the Council carries out an annual 'Call for sites' in order to identify sites that are available for development. This process identifies sites throughout the Borough that are available immediately and in the medium to long term. As part of this process, the Council notify land owners registered on its mailing list as well as hosts regular Developers Forums to inform developers and land agents about the Council's scheme of work and evidence gathering processes. Although a Call for sites usually takes place in Spring/Summer each year, the Council will accept any updates on existing or new sites at any time in order to make sure its evidence base is up to date. It should be noted that the Call for sites is not the only method of identifying sites for potential development schemes. The Council has an up to date Strategic Housing Market Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and Employment Land Review (ELR) which are based on existing building stock and its condition, site planning history as well as desktop studies. 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
755	Carole	Baker	GB8	There was no community involvement and consideration of what is needed locally in the GBBR. The Mayford Village Character Assessment was ignored. The GBBR does not take into account local factors such as infrastructure, flooding, heritage and conservation and environmental designations. These should all reflect on the suitability of Mayford for releasing Green Belt land.	None stated.	It is correct that there was no community involvement or consultation on the Green Belt boundary review. This is a technical piece of evidence that does not allocate sites for development, it makes recommendations for the Council to consider. In line with planning legislation, the Council does not have to consult with the community on evidence documents as they do not set policy. As part of the site selection process, the document discounted all sites within absolute constraints including functional flood plains and European designated wildlife conservation and habitat areas.	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
						It should be noted that the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document that the Council has used to identify and select sites for the Site Allocations DPD. The representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0.	
755	Carole	Baker	GB9	There was no community involvement and consideration of what is needed locally in the GBBR. The Mayford Village Character Assessment was ignored. The GBBR does not take into account local factors such as infrastructure, flooding, heritage and conservation and environmental designations. These should all reflect on the suitability of Mayford for releasing Green Belt land.	None stated.	<p>It is correct that there was no community involvement or consultation on the Green Belt boundary review. This is a technical piece of evidence that does not allocate sites for development, it makes recommendations for the Council to consider. In line with planning legislation, the Council does not have to consult with the community on evidence documents as they do not set policy.</p> <p>As part of the site selection process, the document discounted all sites within absolute constraints including functional flood plains and European designated wildlife conservation and habitat areas. It should be noted that the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document that the Council has used to identify and select sites for the Site Allocations DPD. The representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
755	Carole	Baker	GB10	There was no community involvement and consideration of what is needed locally in the GBBR. The Mayford Village Character Assessment was ignored. The GBBR does not take into account local factors such as infrastructure, flooding, heritage and conservation and environmental designations. These should all reflect on the suitability of Mayford for releasing Green Belt land.	None stated.	<p>It is correct that there was no community involvement or consultation on the Green Belt boundary review. This is a technical piece of evidence that does not allocate sites for development, it makes recommendations for the Council to consider. In line with planning legislation, the Council does not have to consult with the community on evidence documents as they do not set policy. As part of the site selection process, the document discounted all sites within absolute constraints including functional flood plains and European designated wildlife conservation and habitat areas. It should be noted that the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document that the Council has used to identify and select sites for the Site Allocations DPD. The representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
755	Carole	Baker	GB11	There as no community involvement and consideration of what is needed locally in the GBBR. The Mayford Village Character Assessment was ignored. The GBBR does not take into account local factors such as infrastructure, flooding, heritage and conservation and environmental designations. These should all reflect on the suitability of Mayford for releasing Green Belt land.	None stated.	<p>It is correct that there was no community involvement or consultation on the Green Belt boundary review. This is a technical piece of evidence that does not allocate sites for development, it makes recommendations for the Council to consider. In line with planning legislation, the Council does not have to consult with the community on evidence documents as they do not set policy.</p> <p>As part of the site selection process, the document discounted all sites within absolute constraints including functional flood plains and European designated wildlife conservation and habitat areas. It should be noted that the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document that the Council has used to identify and select sites for the Site Allocations DPD. The representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
755	Carole	Baker	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
755	Carole	Baker	General	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
755	Carole	Baker	General	The GBBRs weakness is that only sites put forward have been considered and therefore not a true reflection of Woking as a whole. Many	None stated.	The representation regarding the methodology of the Green Belt boundary review has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0. The representation	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>unanswered questions about how parcels of land were selected based on the criteria.</p> <p>The Green Belt Review makes analytical comparisons, the ranking or grading of each site in terms of suitability to each relevant factor appears to be rather subjective and the final grading or ranking of sites is therefore rather arbitrary.</p> <p>There must be transparent reasons as to why Parcel 20 is preferred over other Parcels.</p> <p>WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt.</p> <p>The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.</p> <p>The GBR does not address in detail why existing established key settlements cannot develop more significantly elsewhere.</p>		<p>regarding the ownership of land has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</p> <p>As noted in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Green Belt boundary review is only one evidence base document the Council has used in identifying suitable sites in the Green Belt for development and safeguarding. The full list of evidence is set out in Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations DPD.</p>	
755	Carole	Baker	GB8	<p>There are significant development proposals in Guildford as well as in south Woking. Additional traffic on roads that are already at capacity will cause gridlock. The DPD is based on inaccurate and out-of-date traffic models that do not reflect the day to day traffic volumes in the local area. The removal of the Green Belt sites cannot be accommodated by the existing infrastructure and highways network and so must be removed from the DPD.</p>	Remove the site from the DPD.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
755	Carole	Baker	GB9	<p>There are significant development proposals in Guildford as well as in south Woking. Additional traffic on roads that are already at capacity will cause gridlock. The DPD is based on inaccurate and out-of-date traffic models that do not reflect the day to day traffic volumes in the local area. The removal of the Green Belt sites cannot be accommodated by the existing infrastructure and highways network and so must be removed from the DPD.</p>	Remove the site from the DPD.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
755	Carole	Baker	GB10	<p>There are significant development proposals in Guildford as well as in south Woking. Additional traffic on roads that are already at capacity will cause gridlock. The DPD is based on inaccurate and out-of-date traffic models that do not reflect the day to day traffic volumes in the local area. The removal of the Green Belt sites cannot be accommodated by the existing infrastructure and highways network and so must be removed from the DPD.</p>	Remove the site from the DPD.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
755	Carole	Baker	GB11	<p>There are significant development proposals in Guildford as well as in south Woking. Additional traffic on roads that are already at capacity will cause gridlock. The DPD is based on inaccurate and out-of-date traffic models that do not reflect the day to day traffic volumes in the local area. The removal of the Green Belt sites cannot be accommodated by the existing infrastructure and highways network and so must be removed from the DPD.</p>	Remove the site from the DPD.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
755	Carole	Baker	GB8	<p>Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from</p>	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing	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 station.		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.	of this representation
755	Carole	Baker	GB9	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
755	Carole	Baker	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
755	Carole	Baker	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
835	Scott	Baker	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.	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.	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. 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 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. 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	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
						conformity with the relevant policies of the NPPF and Core Strategy.	
835	Scott	Baker	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
835	Scott	Baker	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008. 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.	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.	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
835	Scott	Baker	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.	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>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</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
						impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area.	
835	Scott	Baker	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.	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.	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
835	Scott	Baker	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.	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.	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
835	Scott	Baker	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	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.	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
835	Scott	Baker	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. The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	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.	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 lancape 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
835	Scott	Baker	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.	The site should not be included 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
835	Scott	Baker	GB7	Other sites identified in the Green Belt Boundary Review for Traveller accommodation have been omitted from the DPD.	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.	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
835	Scott	Baker	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	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				and character of the area.	reasons stated above.		
835	Scott	Baker	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.	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.	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
835	Scott	Baker	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.	The DPD uses the term from the GBR of 'intensification' of Ten Acre Farm which is incorrect. The TTA term of 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD proposal.	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
835	Scott	Baker	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.	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.	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
835	Scott	Baker	GB7	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.	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>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 Lancap 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 lancap grounds. The Lancap 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</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>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>	
898	Dawn	Baker	GB7	Object to increasing number of pitches on the site. More pitches would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area. Increased risk to wildlife due to increased domestic animals.	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 Lancape 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 lancape grounds. The Lancape 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 lancape 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
898	Dawn	Baker	GB8	Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of 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
898	Dawn	Baker	GB9	Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of 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
898	Dawn	Baker	GB10	Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of 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
898	Dawn	Baker	GB11	Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of 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>	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
						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.	
898	Dawn	Baker	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths.	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. 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
898	Dawn	Baker	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths.	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. 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
						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).	
898	Dawn	Baker	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths.	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. 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
898	Dawn	Baker	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths.	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. 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	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. 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).	
898	Dawn	Baker	GB8	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.	Reconsider the plans.	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 Represenator ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
898	Dawn	Baker	GB9	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.	Reconsider the plans.	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 Represenator ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
898	Dawn	Baker	GB10	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.	Reconsider the plans.	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 Represenator ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
898	Dawn	Baker	GB11	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.	Reconsider the plans.	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 Represenator ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
898	Dawn	Baker	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. 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 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
898	Dawn	Baker	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. 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 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
898	Dawn	Baker	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. 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. 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
898	Dawn	Baker	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. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. 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 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
943	Jackie	Baker	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.	<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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
943	Jackie	Baker	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.	<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>	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 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>	
943	Jackie	Baker	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
943	Jackie	Baker	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 Policy H (?) 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
943	Jackie	Baker	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 How 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 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 Lancape 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	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>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 lancape setting of the area.</p>	
943	Jackie	Baker	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.	<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. 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 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. 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 lancape 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
943	Jackie	Baker	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.	<p>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.</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
943	Jackie	Baker	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
943	Jackie	Baker	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
943	Jackie	Baker	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. 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
943	Jackie	Baker	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
943	Jackie	Baker	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. 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
943	Jackie	Baker	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.	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
943	Jackie	Baker	GB7	Pitches would have to be raised clear of any flood risk. Quotes cost of similar sites. The costs of	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				preparation of Ten Acre Farm as a Traveller site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	stated.	paragraph 4.10. 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.	of this representation
943	Jackie	Baker	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
943	Jackie	Baker	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
943	Jackie	Baker	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. The DPD uses the term from the GBR of 'intensification' of Ten Acre Farm which is incorrect. The TTA term of 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD proposal.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
943	Jackie	Baker	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, paragraph 1.9 and 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
943	Jackie	Baker	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, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
943	Jackie	Baker	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
943	Jackie	Baker	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 street scene.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, in particular paragraph 4.3 and 4.8.</p> <p>It is important to note, the Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites' 2008 guidance does recommend a maximum of 15 pitches per site to ensure a comfortable living environment and also allows for easy management. Nevertheless, the maximum of 15 pitches per site is guidance and is not a prescribed limit. The Council is aware of other Gypsy and Traveller sites in adjoining boroughs and elsewhere in the country which exceed this recommended limit, where there is no known amenity issues or management issues.</p> <p>Please note that Development Plan Policies, including those in the Core Strategy and emerging Development Management Policies will also need to be met.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
943	Jackie	Baker	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.	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
1093	Russel	Baker	GB13	I object. Question the point of Green Belt if councils can override the protection. I move to this area of beauty and accessible countryside. I will stand up to any developers with force to STOP this development which will bring ruin. The Council should rebuild where redevelopment is needed, there are many. If properties do not, people simply cannot live here and will go elsewhere. I will not go on, this will probably not be read by anyone with any passion for its protection. It is merely the number of objections that need to be registered. I hope the Council will stop this before there is a public demonstration and outcry.	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	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.	
1093	Russel	Baker	GB12	I object. Question the point of Green Belt if councils can override the protection. I move to this area of beauty and accessible countryside. I will stand up to any developers with force to STOP this development which will bring ruin. The Council should rebuild where redevelopment is needed, there are many. If properties do not, people simply cannot live here and will go elsewhere. I will not go on, this will probably not be read by anyone with any passion for its protection. It is merely the number of objections that need to be registered. I hope the Council will stop this before there is a public demonstration and outcry.	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 Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. Of the objectively assessed housing need of 517 dwellings per year, the Council has a housing requirement to deliver 292 dwelling. Every year there is a significant unmet need of about 300 dwellings. It is important that the Council identifies sufficient land to meet at least its housing requirement.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1201	Brian	Baker	GB7	I strongly object. 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.	Request that you reconsider your above plans	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 Section 1, 2, 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1201	Brian	Baker	GB10	I strongly object to proposed housing. Development of GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, merging these and resulting in the loss of Mayford's character and individuality.	Request that you reconsider your above plans	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 Mayford and has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals do not significantly impact on the overall purpose and integrity of the Green Belt. It has also carried out an assessment of the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. This is set out in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, The Council is satisfied that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford and/or Woking will not be undermined. The character of Mayford is already protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1201	Brian	Baker	GB11	I strongly object to proposed housing. Development of GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, merging these and resulting in the loss of Mayford's character and individuality.	Request that you reconsider your above plans	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 Mayford and has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals do not significantly impact on the overall purpose and integrity of the Green Belt. It has also carried out an assessment of the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. This is set out in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, The Council is satisfied that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford and/or Woking will not be undermined. The character of Mayford is already protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1201	Brian	Baker	GB14	I strongly object to proposed housing. Development of GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, merging these and resulting in the loss of Mayford's character and individuality.	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 Mayford and has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals do not significantly impact on the overall purpose and integrity of the Green Belt. It has also carried out an assessment of the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. This is set out in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, The Council is satisfied that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford and/or Woking will not be undermined. The character of Mayford is already protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1201	Brian	Baker	GB8	I strongly object to proposed housing.	Request that you reconsider	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Development of GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, merging these and resulting in the loss of Mayford's character and individuality.	your above plans	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 Mayford and has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals do not significantly impact on the overall purpose and integrity of the Green Belt. It has also carried out an assessment of the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. This is set out in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, The Council is satisfied that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford and/or Woking will not be undermined. The character of Mayford is already protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	is proposed as a result of this representation
1201	Brian	Baker	GB9	I strongly object to proposed housing. Development of GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, merging these and resulting in the loss of Mayford's character and individuality.	Request that you reconsider your above plans	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 Mayford and has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals do not significantly impact on the overall purpose and integrity of the Green Belt. It has also carried out an assessment of the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. This is set out in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, The Council is satisfied that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford and/or Woking will not be undermined. The character of Mayford is already protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1201	Brian	Baker	GB10	Mayford's transport and highways infrastructure is limited. Development would require disproportionate capital costs and overburdened facilities. Request that you reconsider the plans which would have a devastating effect on Mayford village.	Request that you reconsider your above plans	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	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
						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	
1201	Brian	Baker	GB8	Mayford's transport and highways infrastructure is limited. Development would require disproportionate capital costs and overburdened facilities. Request that you reconsider the plans which would have a devastating effect on Mayford village.	Request that you reconsider your above plans	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1201	Brian	Baker	GB9	Mayford's transport and highways infrastructure is limited. Development would require disproportionate capital costs and overburdened facilities. Request that you reconsider the plans which would have a devastating effect on Mayford village.	Request that you reconsider your above plans	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 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1201	Brian	Baker	GB11	Mayford's transport and highways infrastructure is limited. Development would require disproportionate capital costs and overburdened facilities. Request that you reconsider the plans which would have a devastating effect on Mayford village.	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	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>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. 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.</p>	
1201	Brian	Baker	GB14	Mayford's transport and highways infrastructure is limited. Development would require disproportionate capital costs and overburdened facilities. Request that you reconsider the plans which would have a devastating effect on Mayford village.	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. 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</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
						Management Policies DPD has robust policies to ensure that development does not lead to unacceptable pollution that cannot be mitigated. 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	
1201	Brian	Baker	GB7	To do so would destroy the existing delicate balance between all concerned, fail to safeguard the integrity of adjacent common land, a unique community asset.	Request that you reconsider your above plans	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
1402	Joyce	Baker	GB12	Fin it strange that there are proposed school improvement to Pyrford C of E Primary at the same time as these proposals. This lea me to believe the decision is already made and our objections are for nothing.	None stated.	The proposals for the school would be to meet need for school places, further addressed in Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The draft Site Allocations proposals are not yet decided (hence the consultation process) and all representations will be dually considered with regard to the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and relevant planning regulations. The next stages of the process are detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0, paragraph 6.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1402	Joyce	Baker	GB13	Fin it strange that there are proposed school improvement to Pyrford C of E Primary at the same time as these proposals. This lea me to believe the decision is already made and our objections are for nothing.	None stated.	The proposals for the school would be to meet need for school places, further addressed in Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The draft Site Allocations proposals are not yet decided (hence the consultation process) and all representations will be dually considered with regard to the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and relevant planning regulations. The next stages of the process are detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0, paragraph 6.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1402	Joyce	Baker	GB12	Opposes the proposal. We need to keep out villages, and not as extensions of the nearest towns.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town, or lead to it merging with Woking. It should be noted that the proposed sites are on the outer edge of Pyrford, to the south. The west and northern parts of the village are already joined to West Byfleet and the proposals do not affect this. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1402	Joyce	Baker	GB13	Opposes the proposal. We need to keep out villages, and not as extensions of the nearest	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking	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
				towns.		Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town, or lead to it merging with Woking. It should be noted that the proposed sites are on the outer edge of Pyrford, to the south. The west and northern parts of the village are already joined to West Byfleet and the proposals do not affect this. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	of this representation
1653	L, M	Baker	GB10	Objects. The preservation and enjoyment of Green Belt is important. It prevent sprawl and maintains open spaces between towns and villages. It 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.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1653	L, M	Baker	GB11	Objects. The preservation and enjoyment of Green Belt is important. It prevent sprawl and maintains open spaces between towns and villages. It 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.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1653	L, M	Baker	GB14	Objects. The preservation and enjoyment of Green Belt is important. It prevent sprawl and maintains open spaces between towns and villages. It 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.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1653	L, M	Baker	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The housing identified between 2027-2040 is not required and is not exceptional circumstances. WBC should argue that Green Belt is important and resisting future requirements to build on this land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1653	L, M	Baker	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The housing identified between 2027-2040 is not required and is not exceptional circumstances. WBC should argue that Green Belt is important and resisting future requirements to build on this land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1653	L, M	Baker	GB14	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The housing identified between 2027-2040 is not required and is not exceptional circumstances. WBC should argue that Green Belt is important and resisting future requirements to build on this land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1653	L, M	Baker	GB10	Development would change the character of the rural area and our enjoyment of living here. This would be reflected in any future sale price of our house.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. As noted by the National Planning Practice Guidance, planning is concerned with land use in the public interest, so that the protection of purely private interests such as the impact of a development on the value of a neighbouring property could not be material considerations. Nevertheless through robust design policies and guidance, the proposed site allocation is not expected to have a long term negative impact on the character of the local 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
1653	L, M	Baker	GB10	The GBBR was not subject to consultation. Flaws include 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 travel times to WTC are not realistic.	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
1653	L, M	Baker	GB11	The GBBR was not subject to consultation. Flaws include 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 travel times to WTC are not realistic.	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
1653	L, M	Baker	GB10	The proposed housing densities are significantly	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				higher than the average density of Hook Heath and there is no justification for this. 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.		Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0. 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 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).	is proposed as a result of this representation
1653	L, M	Baker	GB11	The proposed housing densities are significantly higher than the average density of Hook Heath and there is no justification for this. 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.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0. 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 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	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
						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).	
1653	L, M	Baker	GB14	Removal of the site from the Green Belt is not necessary as there is no change of use planned. There is no exceptional circumstance to remove it from the Green Belt. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society and HHRA who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	As noted within the draft Site Allocations DPD reasoned justification, the site is proposed to be released from the Green Belt in assist in ensuring a strong defensible Green Belt boundary in the future. If sites GB8 (Nursery Land adjacent to Egley Road) and GB10 (Land to the north east of Saunders Lane) are removed from the Green Belt post-2027, site GB14 will be surrounded by land designated as urban area. This isolated pocket of Green Belt land would therefore not create a strong defensible Green Belt boundary in the future. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563 and the Hook Heath Resident Association under Representor ID 1298.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1653	L, M	Baker	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. 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 addition, the Council 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. 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. 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. There is no doubt that the development of the sites in Mayford will increase the population of the area. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1653	L, M	Baker	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	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition, the Council 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	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
				make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.		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. 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. 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. There is no doubt that the development of the sites in Mayford will increase the population of the area. 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.	
1653	L, M	Baker	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. 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 addition, the Council 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. 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. 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. There is no doubt that the development of the sites in Mayford will increase the population of the area. 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	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 development.	
1653	L, M	Baker	GB14	Want to preserve the rural nature of the area and the proposals will be detrimental to this.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. The draft allocation is to remove the site from the Green Belt to be used for Green Infrastructure. The draft DPD clearly states that due to the topography of the site, it is unsuitable for built development. Therefore the proposed allocation will retain the rural nature of the area.</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
1653	L, M	Baker	GB10	Want to preserve the rural nature of the area and the proposals will be detrimental to this.	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 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
1653	L, M	Baker	GB11	Want to preserve the rural nature of the area and the proposals will be detrimental to this.	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 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
1653	L, M	Baker	GB10	The proposed site conflicts with CS24.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1653	L, M	Baker	GB11	The proposed site conflicts with CS24.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1653	L, M	Baker	GB14	The proposed site conflicts with CS24.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB7	<p>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. The TAA suggests the site and its immediate surrounding be explored for potential future expansion. The DPD incorrectly uses the term 'intensification'. This site was never envisaged to be expanded outside the owners' immediate family. The Council has set aside GBR recommendations. No independently verified evidence demonstrating Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development or why sites listed in</p>	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	<p>The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.</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 Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included whilst others excluded. Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres are the ONLY proposed sites.			
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 4. Whilst Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect the purpose of the Green Belt, it also commits the Council to release Green Belt land to meet development requirements of the Core Strategy. The proposal is therefore not contrary to Policy CS6 or the NPPF.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3a 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.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation needs for Travellers has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 4. Ten Acre Farm is about 3.36ha. 72.05% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. 6.52% in Flood Zone 2 and 5.51% in Flood Zone 3. The Council has carried out a sequential tests to justify the use of the site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Development on the site will be directed to the area of the site with the least risk of flooding, i.e. Flood Zone 1. The is considered an enforceable approach that will be clarified in the allocation. The allocation also includes key requirement to ensure that detailed flood risk assessment is carried out to inform the planning application process for any scheme that will come forward for the delivery of the site. With the specifications set out in the key requirements of the allocation, the Council is satisfied that the site can be developed without significant flood risk to occupiers. It is also not envisaged that the development will exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The site can be developed with no significant adverse impacts on the visual amenity of the area and nearby residents. There are robust policies in the Core Strategy to ensure that this is achieved,	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB7	The GBR considered other options to meet future need for pitches including WOK001 and WOK006. There are also sites with capacity to deliver 15 pitches each combined (land at West Hall WGB004a/SHLAABW019b and south of High Road WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These are omitted from the DPD with little explanation.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The 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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB9	Without a Lancap Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why areas of lancape importance have been ignored.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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 lancape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB11	Without a Lancap Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why areas of lancape importance have been ignored.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	The lancape implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB8	Without a Lancap Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why areas of lancape importance have been ignored.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	The lancape implications of the proposals is comprehensively assessed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB10	Without a Lancap Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why areas of lancape importance have been ignored.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB8	Over-reliance on the call for sites, so sites that might be available were not identified if not put forward. Expect in the case of Ten Acre Farm where the Council approached the land owner directly.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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 call for sites had been used to inform the preparation of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. There are other studies such as the Green Belt boundary review that take a comprehensive approach to assessing all land parcels in the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. In accordance with national policy, the availability of land is however a material consideration in site selection.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB9	Over-reliance on the call for sites, so sites that might be available were not identified if not put forward. Expect in the case of Ten Acre Farm where the Council approached the land owner directly.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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 call for sites had been used to inform the preparation of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. There are other studies such as the Green Belt boundary review that take a comprehensive approach to assessing all land parcels in the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. In accordance with national policy, the availability of land is however a material consideration in site selection.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB10	Over-reliance on the call for sites, so sites that might be available were not identified if not put forward. Expect in the case of Ten Acre Farm where the Council approached the land owner directly.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB11	Over-reliance on the call for sites, so sites that might be available were not identified if not put forward. Expect in the case of Ten Acre Farm where the Council approached the land owner directly.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	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.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The representation has been 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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB7	Ten Acre Farm does not have the required accessibility, contrary to Woking Core Strategy and SHLAA. Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not close to facilities, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure, poor public transport, and provision of a communal building would not positively enhance the environment, increase openness or contribute to existing character.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. 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).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	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. The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	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. 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 be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation 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	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
						effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (Policy CS24).	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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 lancape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancape 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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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 lancape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancape 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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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 lancape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancape 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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission).	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB11	There was no community involvement and consideration of what is needed locally in the	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in	The Council approach to consultation on the Site Allocations DPD is comprehensively set out in the Council's Issues and Matters	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
				GBBR. The Mayford Village Character Assessment was ignored. The GBBR does not take into account local factors such as infrastructure, flooding, heritage, conservation and environmental designations. These should all reflect on the suitability of Mayford for releasing Green Belt land.	the Green Belt and protected from development.	Topic Paper. See Section 6. The Council is satisfied that there was appropriate consultation on the proposals, and will continue to do so in the future before the plan is submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination. The infrastructure and traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 and 20 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a range of evidence base studies to inform the DPD. This include Flood Risk Assessment - see Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Lancap Assessment - see Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper and Heritage Assets - see Section 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB10	There was no community involvement and consideration of what is needed locally in the GBBR. The Mayford Village Character Assessment was ignored. The GBBR does not take into account local factors such as infrastructure, flooding, heritage, conservation and environmental designations. These should all reflect on the suitability of Mayford for releasing Green Belt land.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	The Council has carried out a comprehensive consultation on its proposals in the DPD. this matter is addressed in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. The Council has carried out a range of studies to inform the DPD. Infrastructure matters are covered in Section 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Flooding in Section 5. Heritage assets in Section 19. Also there robust policies to protect the character of Mayford, in particular, Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB8	There was no community involvement and consideration of what is needed locally in the GBBR. The Mayford Village Character Assessment was ignored. The GBBR does not take into account local factors such as infrastructure, flooding, heritage, conservation and environmental designations. These should all reflect on the suitability of Mayford for releasing Green Belt land.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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 lancap implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancap 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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB9	There was no community involvement and consideration of what is needed locally in the GBBR. The Mayford Village Character Assessment was ignored. The GBBR does not take into account local factors such as infrastructure, flooding, heritage, conservation and environmental designations. These should all reflect on the suitability of Mayford for releasing Green Belt land.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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 lancap implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancap 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	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
						Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	
235	Carole	Baker Baker	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	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	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>	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB7	Ten Acre Farm borders two environmentally sensitive sites. Development will adversely impact these and cannot be adequately mitigated - Smarts Heath Common (Special Sites of Scientific Interest and an "Important Bird Area") and the Hoe Stream (Site of Nature Conservation Importance, linking habitat corridor to other SNCI sites).	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The Council has a clear objective to protect environmentally sensitive sites, 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 Lancape 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. 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	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
						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 Lancape 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 lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	
235	Carole	Baker Baker	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.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB11	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB8	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB9	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	It is intended to allocate the site for a business use. The site is allocated to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. In doing so, the Council need to make sure that the allocation should reflect the extent to which traditional lifestyles can contribute to sustainability. The bullet point will be reworded to clarify this point. The overall justification for the allocation of the site for Travellers accommodation is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	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 land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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	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
						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.	
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a "Local Centre", however other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure in the form of shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities, or schools. Residents living on any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	<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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a "Local Centre", however other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure in the form of shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities, or schools. Residents living on any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	<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. 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</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
						demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a "Local Centre", however other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure in the form of shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities, or schools.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	<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 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB7	<p>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.</p> <p>The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.</p>	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	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.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	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.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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	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
						investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
235	Carole	Baker Baker	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 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.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	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.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	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.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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	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
						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.	
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB9	This site should remain in the Green Belt - special circumstances are required by national planning policy but do not exist. Policy clearly states that “housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.” In the absence of special circumstances justifying an exception, there is a presumption against development. Unmet demand does not constitute special circumstances (Brandon Lewis MP Statements) and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt or justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Even should the Council not be able to show a five year supply of residential sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness. Just under 700 proposed dwellings would have a very significant impact on Mayford and change the dynamics and balance of the village.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB8	This site should remain in the Green Belt - special circumstances are required by national planning policy but do not exist. Policy clearly states that “housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.” In the absence of special circumstances justifying an exception, there is a presumption against development. Unmet demand does not constitute special circumstances (Brandon Lewis MP Statements) and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt or justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Even should the Council not be able to show a five year supply of residential sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness. Just under 700 proposed dwellings would have a very significant impact on Mayford and change the dynamics and balance of the village.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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 justification for the use of Green Belt land to meet the specific needs of Traveller is addressed in detail in Section 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in special circumstances. This has not been proven by the Council, especially as Policy and the Minister states that unmet housing need including for Traveller sites does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. There is a presumption against development. This is a material consideration in planning decisions. Development would have a very significant impact on Mayford village.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not significantly undermine the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB11	This site should remain in the Green Belt - special circumstances are required by national planning policy but do not exist. Policy clearly	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 23.	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 “housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.” In the absence of special circumstances justifying an exception, there is a presumption against development. Unmet demand does not constitute special circumstances (Brandon Lewis MP Statements) and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt or justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Even should the Council not be able to show a five year supply of residential sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness. Just under 700 proposed dwellings would have a very significant impact on Mayford and change the dynamics and balance of the village.	from development.		
235	Carole	Baker Baker	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.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	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.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	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.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	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.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	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 remediated.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The SHLAA treats all sites in the Green Belt as currently not developable. Green Belt sites will only be released for development through the plan making process. 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. 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	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
						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 be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation 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. 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. Overall, the justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet developments needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. see Sections 1, 2 and 4.	
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB10	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB11	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB8	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted .	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB9	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted .	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB8	The GBBRs weakness is that only sites put forward have been considered and therefore not a true reflection of Woking as a whole. Many unanswered questions about how parcels of land	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and consistently applied. The Council has used a range of evidence to support the DFPD as comprehensively addressed in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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
				were selected based on the criteria. The Green Belt Review makes analytical comparisons, the ranking or grading of each site in terms of suitability to each relevant factor appears to be rather subjective and the final grading or ranking of sites is therefore rather arbitrary. There must be transparent reasons as to why Parcel 20 is preferred over other Parcels. 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. The GBR does not address in detail why existing established key settlements cannot develop more significantly elsewhere.		evidence collectively support the allocation of the sites. Ownership of land has not influence the selection of sites. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Council's Issues and Matter 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.	
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB11	<p>The GBBRs weakness is that only sites put forward have been considered and therefore not a true reflection of Woking as a whole. Many unanswered questions about how parcels of land were selected based on the criteria.</p> <p>The Green Belt Review makes analytical comparisons, the ranking or grading of each site in terms of suitability to each relevant factor appears to be rather subjective and the final grading or ranking of sites is therefore rather arbitrary. There must be transparent reasons as to why Parcel 20 is preferred over other Parcels. 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> <p>The GBR does not address in detail why existing established key settlements cannot develop more significantly elsewhere.</p>	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied. This matter has been addressed in detail in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 11. Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. This matter has also been addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield land 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. This particular issue is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB9	<p>The GBBRs weakness is that only sites put forward have been considered and therefore not a true reflection of Woking as a whole. Many unanswered questions about how parcels of land were selected based on the criteria.</p> <p>The Green Belt Review makes analytical comparisons, the ranking or grading of each site in terms of suitability to each relevant factor appears to be rather subjective and the final grading or ranking of sites is therefore rather arbitrary. There must be transparent reasons as to why Parcel 20 is preferred over other Parcels. 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> <p>The GBR does not address in detail why existing established key settlements cannot develop more significantly elsewhere.</p>	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied in the review. This is addressed in detail in Section 10 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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 proposals. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The overall 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 Section 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB10	The GBBRs weakness is that only sites put forward have been considered and therefore not a true reflection of Woking as a whole. Many	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected	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	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
				unanswered questions about how parcels of land were selected based on the criteria. The Green Belt Review makes analytical comparisons, the ranking or grading of each site in terms of suitability to each relevant factor appears to be rather subjective and the final grading or ranking of sites is therefore rather arbitrary. There must be transparent reasons as to why Parcel 20 is preferred over other Parcels. 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. The GBR does not address in detail why existing established key settlements cannot develop more significantly elsewhere.	from development.	Topic Paper. See Section 10. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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 to meet the need over the entire plan period. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB11	There are significant development proposals in Guildford as well as in south Woking. Additional traffic on roads that are already at capacity will cause gridlock. The DPD is based on inaccurate and out-of-date traffic models that do not reflect the day to day traffic volumes in the local area. The removal of the Green Belt sites cannot be accommodated by the existing infrastructure and highways network and so must be removed from the DPD.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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. 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
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB10	There are significant development proposals in Guildford as well as in south Woking. Additional traffic on roads that are already at capacity will cause gridlock. The DPD is based on inaccurate and out-of-date traffic models that do not reflect the day to day traffic volumes in the local area. The removal of the Green Belt sites cannot be accommodated by the existing infrastructure and highways network and so must be removed from the DPD.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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	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 in the area.	
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB8	There are significant development proposals in Guildford as well as in south Woking. Additional traffic on roads that are already at capacity will cause gridlock. The DPD is based on inaccurate and out-of-date traffic models that do not reflect the day to day traffic volumes in the local area. The removal of the Green Belt sites cannot be accommodated by the existing infrastructure and highways network and so must be removed from the DPD.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
235	Carole	Baker Baker	GB9	There are significant development proposals in Guildford as well as in south Woking. Additional traffic on roads that are already at capacity will cause gridlock. The DPD is based on inaccurate and out-of-date traffic models that do not reflect the day to day traffic volumes in the local area. The removal of the Green Belt sites cannot be accommodated by the existing infrastructure and highways network and so must be removed from the DPD.	The land designated GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 should remain in the Green Belt and protected from development.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
847	Vicki	Baldwin	GB4	Are brownfield surveys carried out before looking at Green Belt proposals. I believe the answer is no. Stop and think about what is proposed and how it will effect residents lives.	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
847	Vicki	Baldwin	GB5	Are brownfield surveys carried out before looking at Green Belt proposals. I believe the answer is no. Stop and think about what is proposed and how it will effect residents lives.	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
847	Vicki	Baldwin	GB4	Object to building on Green Belt, it should be preserved especially when there is other land available.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
847	Vicki	Baldwin	GB5	Object to building on Green Belt, it should be preserved especially when there is other land available.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
847	Vicki	Baldwin	GB4	The Byfleet petition has been ignored despite over 2000 people wanting the Green Belt to be preserved.	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 Represor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
847	Vicki	Baldwin	GB5	The Byfleet petition has been ignored despite over 2000 people wanting the Green Belt to be preserved.	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 Represor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
847	Vicki	Baldwin	GB4	There are long waiting times for doctor appointments.	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	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
						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.	
847	Vicki	Baldwin	GB5	There are long waiting times for doctor appointments.	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
847	Vicki	Baldwin	GB4	The existing infrastructure is at capacity including schools.	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
847	Vicki	Baldwin	GB5	The existing infrastructure is at capacity including schools.	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
847	Vicki	Baldwin	GB4	The Green Belt land in Byfleet floods. Development will increase flood risk to others.	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
847	Vicki	Baldwin	GB5	The Green Belt land in Byfleet floods. Development will increase flood risk to others.	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
847	Vicki	Baldwin	GB4	The road network is congested and the A245 is gridlocked. Until this is addressed, development can not take place. A private school at Broadoaks will increase traffic and congestion on A245.	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 should be noted that the draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate Broadoaks for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
847	Vicki	Baldwin	GB5	The road network is congested and the A245 is	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				gridlocked. Until this is addressed, development can not take place. A private school at Broadoaks will increase traffic and congestion on A245.		<p>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 should be noted that the draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate Broadoaks for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</p>	is proposed as a result of this representation
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	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.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 4. Whilst Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect the purpose of the Green Belt, it also commits the Council to release Green Belt land to meet development requirements of the Core Strategy. The proposal is therefore not contrary to Policy CS6 or the NPPF.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB7	The GBR considered other options to meet future need for pitches including WOK001 and WOK006. There are also sites with capacity to deliver 15 pitches each combined (land at West Hall WGB004a/SHLAABW019b and south of High Road WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These are omitted from the DPD with little explanation.	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.	The 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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3a 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.	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.	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation needs for Travellers has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 4. Ten Acre Farm is about 3.36ha. 72.05% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. 6.52% in Flood Zone 2 and 5.51% in Flood Zone 3. The Council has carried out a sequential tests to justify the use of the site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Development on the site will be directed to the area of the site with the least risk of flooding, i.e. Flood Zone 1. The is considered an enforceable approach that will be clarified in the allocation. The allocation also includes key requirement to ensure that detailed flood risk assessment is carried out to inform the planning application process for any scheme that will come forward for the delivery of the site. With the specifications set out in the key requirements of the allocation, the Council is satisfied that the site can be developed without	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
						significant flood risk to occupiers. It is also not envisaged that the development will exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The site can be developed with no significant adverse impacts on the visual amenity of the area and nearby residents. There are robust policies in the Core Strategy to ensure that this is achieved,	
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB7	Ten Acre Farm does not have the required accessibility, contrary to Woking Core Strategy and SHLAA. Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not close to facilities, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure, poor public transport, and provision of a communal building would not positively enhance the environment, increase openness or contribute to existing character.	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.	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. 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. The comment about the poor level of public transport services in the area 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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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. The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	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.	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. 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 be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation 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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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	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.	The representation has been 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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.	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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB7	Ten Acre Farm borders two environmentally sensitive sites. Development will adversely impact these and cannot be adequately mitigated - Smarts Heath Common (Special Sites of Scientific Interest and an "Important Bird Area") and the Hoe Stream (Site of Nature Conservation Importance, linking habitat corridor to other SNCI sites).	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.	The Council has a clear objective to protect environmentally sensitive sites, 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 Lancape 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. 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 Lancape 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 lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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. 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 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.	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
				<p>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>			
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB7	<p>The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008. 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>	<p>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.</p>	<p>It is intended to allocate the site for a business use. The site is allocated to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. In doing so, the Council need to make sure that the allocation should reflect the extent to which traditional lifestyles can contribute to sustainability. The bullet point will be reworded to clarify this point. The overall justification for the allocation of the site for Travellers accommodation is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p>	<p>No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation</p>
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB7	<p>Pitches at the site would have a health and safety risk for children playing close to the Hoe Stream. It will also result in more debris in the water and could result in uncontrolled flooding.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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. There is no evidence to suggest that there will be health and safety issues for children playing near the Hoe Stream or children activities will result in more debris in the water.</p>	<p>No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation</p>
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB10	<p>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 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 field either side of the school later on.</p>	<p>None stated.</p>	<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. 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. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	<p>No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation</p>
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB11	<p>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 Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on field either side later on.</p>	<p>None stated.</p>	<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</p>	<p>No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation</p>

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>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. 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. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on either side later on.	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. 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. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB9	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 Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on either side later on.	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. 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. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of 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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, 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 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. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This issue is 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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, 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 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. 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	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
						Green Belt. The ownership of land has not influenced the allocation of sites. This particular matter is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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 Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. 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 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. I strongly object to development of GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Any housing will fill the open green space between Mayford and Woking, altering the character of the village and impacting residents. Mayford has strong historical importance and was listed in the Domesday Book. The GBBR incorrectly dismisses this, saying Woking is not considered to have particularly strong historical character. The Council should preserve and promote the history of the Borough not destroy it through excessive 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. 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. 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. It is not envisaged that the development will undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield sites as set in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, 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	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	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
				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.		Matters Topic Paper. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the identity of Mayford or its separation from Guildford. 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.	
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB11	Concern for road public safety, dangerous to walk in the road to/from Worplesdon Station as cars speed.	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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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.	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.	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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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	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
						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.	
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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 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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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	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	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 Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with roads unable to handle additional traffic.		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.	
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB10	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB11	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB8	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB9	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancaple Importance" (Policy CS24). Without a Lancaple Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancaple importance has 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 lancaple as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancaple 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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancaple Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancaple Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancaple importance has 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 lancaple as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancaple 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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancaple	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by 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
				Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored.		Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of lancape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancape 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.	of this representation
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has 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 lancape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancape 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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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 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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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. Also see Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB7	No independently verified evidence demonstrating Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development or why sites listed in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included whilst others excluded. Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres are the ONLY proposed sites.	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.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a	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
						Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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 remediated.	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.	The SHLAA treats all sites in the Green Belt as currently not developable. Green Belt sites will only be released for development through the plan making process. 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. 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 be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation 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. 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. Overall, the justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet developments needs of the area 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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with urban area sites considered before those in the Green Belt.	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.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB7	The TAA suggests the site and its immediate surrounding be explored for potential future expansion. The DPD incorrectly uses the term 'intensification'. This site was never envisaged to be expanded outside Mr Lee's immediate family. The Council has set aside GBR recommendations.	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.	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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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	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	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
				isolated unless they have a vehicle.		<p>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>	
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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. 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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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</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
						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.	
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	GB9	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. 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
1130	Richard	Baranowicz	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.	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.	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	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
						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	
42	Neil	Barclay	GB7	Moved to Mayford because it is semi-rural, it would cause great loss if this was to disappear. A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites. Sites in the urban area should be considered before the Green Belt. As no urban sites are being considered the argument there are no other sites identified or considered suitable is questioned.	None stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB7	Where no sites are available in the urban area, priority will be given to the edge of the urban area with good access to jobs, 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB7	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate space for related business activities. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road which includes two Grade Two listed buildings in close proximity to the site. Travellers related business activities are out of keeping with the 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB7	Traveller sites should not have unacceptable adverse impact on visual amenity and character. The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath SSSI.	None stated.	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 Lancape 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 lancape grounds. The Lancape 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 lancape 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	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 conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity	
42	Neil	Barclay	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. 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	National Policy states Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances", which hasn't been proven by the Council. According to the policy, housing need does not justify the harm to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	The justification to release Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1, 2, and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that the Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan.	None stated.	This matter is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. An assessment of brownfield land has been undertaken.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	The Green Belt Review is incorrect to dismiss Woking as not having historical character when accessing the Green Belt Purpose. Mayford does have 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford, not only "important" as stated in the Green Belt Review.	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. This matter 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 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield, resulting in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposals will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	The Council states land available for development is more "viable" for removal from the Green Belt, but 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach, identifying areas of land not to be considered due to a number of constraints, but then recommending land that contained these constraints (Mayford included).	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 to inform the DPD. They collectively justify the allocation of the sites. The list of evidence is addressed in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	The Brett & Associates Report rejected the 10 Acre Site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This issue is 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	SPAs and the 400m buffers around then were not considered in the Green Belt Review to protect endangered birds. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated by Bird Life International as "Important Bird Areas" therefore buffers around them should also be applied for the same reason.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath into the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which if successful will result in a 400m development buffer zone prohibiting development.	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 Smarts Heath as SPS. it is not yet designated and the 400m zone cannot apply. Nevertheless, the Council attaches significant importance to the protection of SSSIs and has robust policies such as Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy to help achieve this objective.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (Policy CS24).	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 lancape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancape 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	The validity of Green Belt Review is questioned without a Lancape Character Assessment and suggests why areas of lancape importance (NE7/CS24) have been ignored.	None stated.	The Council carried out a lancape character assessment, and the DPD has been appropriately informed by lancape sensitivity assessment. This issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	The proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary make it a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment, contrary to the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary".	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	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>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. 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.</p>	
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	It is misleading to suggest a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area, if the school is a precursor to housing on the either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The school has planning permission. The Council has always been clear that the Egley Road site is allocated for a school and residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	Might support the development of a new school, just not on the current proposal site.	None stated.	The school and the leisure centre already had planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land proposed will increase surface water and increase flood risk.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	Mayford was recommended in the Green Belt Review on the basis of the ease of access to Woking Town Centre. Travel time was estimated at 7 minutes using Google Maps. At peak time 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network. Roads are narrow, unlit and few pedestrian footpaths. At peak hours traffic is gridlocked. This will be further adversely affected by traffic from 550 new homes being built on Mayford's boundary at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park and from the proposed school for Egley Road.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	Mayford has very poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	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	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 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.	
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible and pedestrian footpath access is unlit. The car park is full by 07:30.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	There are three single line bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. The bridges on Smarts Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane service the proposed development area and cannot handle additional traffic. The third services Worplesdon station and would notice a major increase in congestion.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a Local Centre however it is missing supporting infrastructure including shops, medical facilities and schools. New residents	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	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
				would be isolated without a car.		<p>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>	
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	The housing will infill the green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford – the whole purpose of the Green Belt. No consideration has been given for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement to Woking, or the impact on the character of the Village.	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. 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	No consideration has been given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure resulting from increased population. More people equal more cars and strain on transport infrastructure. There are no plans to upgrade the roads (some without pavements) or railway bridges (all single lane) or robust solutions to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses cannot just be built in areas with no supporting infrastructure – there will be gridlock. Prey Heath Road will become very dangerous from increased traffic to Worplesdon station and people walking on the road.	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. 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	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 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	
42	Neil	Barclay	GB8	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath. Please reconsider your plans which will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village.	Reconsider your plans.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	National Policy states Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in “exceptional circumstances”, which hasn’t been proven by the Council. According to the policy, housing need does not justify the harm 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that the Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan.	None stated.	This matter is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. An assessment of brownfield land has been undertaken.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	The Green Belt Review is incorrect to dismiss Woking as not having historical character when accessing the Green Belt Purpose. Mayford does have 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford, not only “important” as stated in the Green Belt Review.	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	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
						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.	
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield, resulting in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposals will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	The Council states land available for development is more “viable” for removal from the Green Belt, but 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach, identifying areas of land not to be considered due to a number of constraints, but then recommending land that contained these constraints (Mayford included).	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and consistently applied in the review. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has used a range of evidence as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper to inform the DPD. They collectively justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	The Brett & Associates Report rejected the 10 Acre Site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This issue is 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	SPAs and the 400m buffers around then were not considered in the Green Belt Review to protect endangered birds. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated by Bird Life International as “Important Bird Areas” therefore buffers around them should also be applied for the same reason.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath into the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which if successful will result in a 400m development buffer zone prohibiting development.	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 Smarts Heath as SPS. it is not yet designated and the 400m zone cannot apply. Nevertheless, the Council attaches significant importance to the protection of SSSIs and has robust policies such as Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy to help achieve this objective.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance” (Policy CS24).	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 lancape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancape 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	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
						from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	The validity of Green Belt Review is questioned without a Lancap Character Assessment and suggests why areas of Lancap importance (NE7/CS24) have been ignored.	None stated.	The issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Lancap implications of the proposals are fully taken into account.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	The proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary make it a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment, contrary to the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary".	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	It is misleading to suggest a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area, if the school is a precursor to housing on the field 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	Might support the development of a new school, just not on the current proposal site.	None stated.	The school and the leisure centre already had planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land proposed will increase surface water and increase flood risk.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	Mayford was recommended in the Green Belt Review on the basis of the ease of access to Woking Town Centre. Travel time was estimated at 7 minutes using Google Maps. At peak time 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network. Roads are narrow, unlit and few pedestrian footpaths. At peak hours traffic is gridlocked. This will be further adversely affected by traffic from 550 new homes being built on Mayford's boundary at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park and from the proposed school for Egley Road.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	Mayford has very poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible and pedestrian footpath access is unlit. The car park is full by 07:30.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	There are three single line bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. The bridges on Smarts Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane service the proposed development area and cannot handle additional traffic. The third services Worplesdon station and would notice a major increase in congestion.	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	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 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	
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a Local Centre however it is missing supporting infrastructure including shops, medical facilities and schools. New residents would be isolated without a car.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	The housing will infill the green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford – the whole purpose of the Green Belt. No consideration has been given for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement to Woking, or the impact on the character of the Village.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	No consideration has been given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure resulting from increased population. More people equal more cars and strain on transport infrastructure. There are no plans to upgrade the roads (some without pavements) or railway bridges (all single lane) or	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. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with 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
				robust solutions to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses cannot just be built in areas with no supporting infrastructure – there will be gridlock. Prey Heath Road will become very dangerous from increased traffic to Worplesdon station and people walking on the road.		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.	
42	Neil	Barclay	GB9	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath. Please reconsider your plans which will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village.	Reconsider your plans.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	National Policy states Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in “exceptional circumstances”, which hasn’t been proven by the Council. According to the policy, housing need does not justify the harm to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that the Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan.	None stated.	This matter is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. An assessment of brownfield land has been undertaken.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	The Green Belt Review is incorrect to dismiss Woking as not having historical character when accessing the Green Belt Purpose. Mayford does have 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford, not only “important” as stated in the Green Belt Review.	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	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
						provides a strong policy basis to protect the character of Mayford.	
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield, resulting in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposals will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	The Council states land available for development is more "viable" for removal from the Green Belt, but the ownership status of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	The ownership of land has had no influence in selecting preferred sites for allocation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach, identifying areas of land not to be considered due to a number of constraints, but then recommending land that contained these constraints (Mayford included).	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	The Brett & Associates Report rejected the 10 Acre Site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This issue is 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	SPAs and the 400m buffers around them were not considered in the Green Belt Review to protect endangered birds. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated by Bird Life International as "Important Bird Areas" therefore buffers around them should also be applied for the same reason.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath into the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which if successful will result in a 400m development buffer zone prohibiting development.	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 Smarts Heath as SPS. it is not yet designated and the 400m zone cannot apply. Nevertheless, the Council attaches significant importance to the protection of SSSIs and has robust policies such as Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy to help achieve this objective.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" (Policy CS24).	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 lancap as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancap 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	The validity of Green Belt Review is questioned without a Lancap Character Assessment and suggests why areas of lancap importance (NE7/CS24) have been ignored.	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	The proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary make it a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment, contrary to the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary".	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	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>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. 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.</p>	
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	It is misleading to suggest a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area, if the school is a precursor to housing on the other 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	Might support the development of a new school, just not on the current proposal site.	None stated.	The school and the leisure centre already had planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land proposed will increase surface water and increase flood risk.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	Mayford was recommended in the Green Belt Review on the basis of the ease of access to Woking Town Centre. Travel time was estimated at 7 minutes using Google Maps. At peak time 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network. Roads are narrow, unlit and few pedestrian footpaths. At peak hours traffic is gridlocked. This will be further adversely affected by traffic from 550 new homes being built on Mayford's boundary at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park and from the proposed school for Egley Road.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	Mayford has very poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	The infrastructure and traffic implication of the proposals are addressed in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic	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
						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.	of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible and pedestrian footpath access is unlit. The car park is full by 07:30.	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. 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	There are three single line bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. The bridges on Smarts Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane service the proposed development area and cannot handle additional traffic. The third services Worplesdon station and would notice a major increase in congestion.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a Local Centre however it is missing supporting infrastructure including shops, medical facilities and schools. New residents would be isolated without a car.	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	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>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>	
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	The housing will infill the green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford – the whole purpose of the Green Belt. No consideration has been given for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement to Woking, or the impact on the character of the Village.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	No consideration has been given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure resulting from increased population. More people equal more cars and strain on transport infrastructure. There are no plans to upgrade the roads (some without pavements) or railway bridges (all single lane) or robust solutions to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses cannot just be built in areas with no supporting infrastructure – there will be gridlock. Prey Heath Road will become very dangerous from increased traffic to Worplesdon station and people walking on the road.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB10	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath. Please reconsider your plans which will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village.	Reconsider your plans.	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	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 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.	
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	National Policy states Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in “exceptional circumstances”, which hasn’t been proven by the Council. According to the policy, housing need does not justify the harm 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that the Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan.	None stated.	This matter is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. An assessment of brownfield land has been undertaken.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	The Green Belt Review is incorrect to dismiss Woking as not having historical character when accessing the Green Belt Purpose. Mayford does have 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford, not only “important” as stated in the Green Belt Review.	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 lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield, resulting in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposals will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	The Council states land available for development is more “viable” for removal from the Green Belt, but 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 the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach, identifying areas of land not to be considered due to a number of constraints, but then recommending land that contained these constraints (Mayford included).	None stated.	The methodology for the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied. The Council has used a range of evidence base studies to inform the DPD. They collectively justify the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	The Brett & Associates Report rejected the 10 Acre Site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This issue is 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	SPAs and the 400m buffers around then were not	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				considered in the Green Belt Review to protect endangered birds. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated by Bird Life International as "Important Bird Areas" therefore buffers around them should also be applied for the same reason.		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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath into the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which if successful will result in a 400m development buffer zone prohibiting development.	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 Smarts Heath as SPS. it is not yet designated and the 400m zone cannot apply. Nevertheless, the Council attaches significant importance to the protection of SSSIs and has robust policies such as Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy to help achieve this objective.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" (Policy CS24).	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 lancap as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancap 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	The validity of Green Belt Review is questioned without a Lancap Character Assessment and suggests why areas of lancap importance (NE7/CS24) have been ignored.	None stated.	The lancap implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	The proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary make it a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment, contrary to the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary".	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. 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	It is misleading to suggest a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area, if the school is a precursor to housing on fiel 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	Might support the development of a new school, just not on the current proposal site.	None stated.	The school and the leisure centre already had planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land proposed will increase surface water and increase flood risk.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	Mayford was recommended in the Green Belt Review on the basis of the ease of access to Woking Town Centre. Travel time was estimated at 7 minutes using Google Maps. At peak time 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network. Roads are narrow, unlit and few pedestrian footpaths. At peak hours traffic is gridlocked. This will be further adversely affected by traffic from 550 new homes being built on Mayford's boundary at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park and from the proposed school for Egley Road.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	Mayford has very poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible and pedestrian footpath access is unlit. The car park is full by 07:30.	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	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
						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	
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	There are three single line bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. The bridges on Smarts Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane service the proposed development area and cannot handle additional traffic. The third services Worplesdon station and would notice a major increase in congestion.	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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a Local Centre however it is missing supporting infrastructure including shops, medical facilities and schools. New residents would be isolated without a car.	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	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 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.	
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	The housing will infill the green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford – the whole purpose of the Green Belt. No consideration has been given for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement to Woking, or the impact on the character of the Village.	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 lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape 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
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	No consideration has been given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure resulting from increased population. More people equal more cars and strain on transport infrastructure. There are no plans to upgrade the roads (some without pavements) or railway bridges (all single lane) or robust solutions to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses cannot just be built in areas with no supporting infrastructure – there will be gridlock. Prey Heath Road will become very dangerous from increased traffic to Worplesdon station and people walking on the road.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
42	Neil	Barclay	GB11	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath. Please reconsider your plans which will have a	Reconsider your plans.	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	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
				devastating impact to Mayford as a Village.		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.	
988	David	Barker	GB8	Flooding	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
988	David	Barker	GB8	Increased Crime	None stated.	There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed land uses for the draft allocation will result in an increase in crime. However 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
988	David	Barker	GB8	Increased Noise	None stated.	As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the scheme will not generate a significant amount of noise pollution that will be to the detriment of local residents or the general environment. 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. Nevertheless the Council has robust policies in place that mitigate the impact of noise pollution on the environment and general amenity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
988	David	Barker	GB8	Increased Volume of Traffic would affect the environment	None stated.	The representation 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 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. The Council has constructively and positively been 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 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.	
988	David	Barker	GB8	Loss of Arable and Amenity land	None stated.	As part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA. The Council accepts that the removal of this site from the Green Belt will result in a reduction of the amount of Green Belt and amenity land. 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 land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest. Through the proposed allocation of GB14 for green infrastructure purposes as well as a number of proposed SANG sites (GB17-GB22), the Council believes that there will be a number of open amenity spaces across the borough as a result of the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
988	David	Barker	GB8	Loss of Green Fiel and Escarpment Feature	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 green fiel.</p> <p>As noted within the Green Belt boundary review and the key requirements in the draft Site Allocations DPD, the escarpment around Mayford will be an important lancape consideration in the preparation of any development scheme. This will make sure that the integrity of the escarpment is not undermined.</p> <p>Further information regarding the impact on lancape is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green</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
						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 land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	
988	David	Barker	GB8	Object to releasing Green Belt Green Belt protects countryside and wildlife for now and future generations.	None stated.	The representation regarding the release of Green Belt land for development needs has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. 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 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. 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 land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
988	David	Barker	GB8	Pollution	None stated.	<p>New recreation space will incorporate floodlighting which will increase light pollution. However 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 site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
988	David	Barker	GB8	Suggests exploring other possible Brownfield	Explore other possible	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				sites as per Government Directives. Aware that representations received will be made public.	brownfield sites	Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 11.0. The representations received from the Regulation 18 consultation will be made publically accessible both online and at Civic Offices.	is proposed as a result of this representation
988	David	Barker	GB8	Wildlife protection	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
988	David	Barker	GB8	Woking and Mayford should not be merged	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
989	Anne	Barker	GB8	Archaeology (suggested field nearest to Hillside has possible value)	None stated.	This site is not considered to contain any areas of High Archaeological Potential. Nevertheless Core Strategy Policy CS20 states that on all development sites over 0.4 hectares an archaeological evaluation and investigation will be necessary if in the opinion of the County Archaeologist, an archaeological assessment demonstrates that the site has archaeological potential. This will therefore need to be taken into consideration at the planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
989	Anne	Barker	GB8	Flooding	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
989	Anne	Barker	GB8	Increased Crime	None stated.	There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed land uses for the draft allocation will result in an increase in crime. However 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.	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
989	Anne	Barker	GB8	Increased Noise	None stated.	<p>As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the scheme will not generate a significant amount of noise pollution that will be to the detriment of local residents or the general environment. 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>Nevertheless the Council has robust policies in place that mitigate the impact of noise pollution on the environment and general amenity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
989	Anne	Barker	GB8	Increased Volume of Traffic would affect the environment	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. The various transport 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. 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
989	Anne	Barker	GB8	Loss of Arable and Amenity land	None stated.	<p>As part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA.</p> <p>The Council accepts that the removal of this site from the Green Belt will result in a reduction of the amount of Green Belt and amenity land. 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</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>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 land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>Through the proposed allocation of GB14 for green infrastructure purposes as well as a number of proposed SANG sites (GB17-GB22), the Council believes that there will be a number of open amenity spaces across the borough as a result of the DPD.</p>	
989	Anne	Barker	GB8	Loss of Green Fiel and Escarpment Feature	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 green fiel. As noted within the Green Belt boundary review and the key requirements in the draft Site Allocations DPD, the escarpment around Mayford will be an important lancape consideration in the preparation of any development scheme. This will make sure that the integrity of the escarpment is not undermined.Further information regarding the impact on lancape is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.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 land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
989	Anne	Barker	GB8	Object to releasing Green Belt Green Belt protects countryside and wildlife for now and future generations.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the release of Green Belt land for development needs has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</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</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>Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>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 land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	
989	Anne	Barker	GB8	Pollution	None stated.	<p>New recreation space will incorporate floodlighting which will increase light pollution. However 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. The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
989	Anne	Barker	GB8	Suggests exploring other possible Brownfield sites as per Government Directives. Aware that representations received will be made public.	Explore other possible brownfield sites	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 11.0.</p> <p>The representations received from the Regulation 18 consultation will be made publically accessible both online and at Civic Offices.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
989	Anne	Barker	GB8	Wildlife protection	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</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. 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).	
989	Anne	Barker	GB8	Woking and Mayford should not be merged	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
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB8	Concerned about the release of GB land	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The collective evidence of the Council as highlighted in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB9	Concerned about the release of GB land	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The collective evidence of the Council as highlighted in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB10	Concerned about the release of GB land	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The collective evidence of the Council as highlighted in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB11	Concerned about the release of GB land	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The collective evidence of the Council as highlighted in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB14	Concerned about the release of GB land	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The collective evidence of the Council as highlighted in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB10	The sites are special to locals in Hook Heath and Mayford. Particularly GB11 and GB10, which provide accessible open space. People use Mayford Common for walking, dog walking, jogging, and ball games. Very few accessible open space otherwise (Whitmore Common and Horsell Common not within walking distance)	None stated.	Based on the available evidence, the sites will make a significant contribution towards meeting the housing requirement of the area. The site can be developed without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt and/or the character of Mayford and Hook Heath. The justification for the release of the sites for development is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The development of the sites will incorporate adequate green infrastructure to serve the needs of the community. This is a key requirement set out clearly in the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB11	The sites are special to locals in Hook Heath and Mayford. Particularly GB11 and GB10, which provide accessible open space. People use Mayford Common for walking, dog walking, jogging, and ball games. Very few accessible open space otherwise	None stated.	Based on the available evidence, the sites will make a significant contribution towards meeting the housing requirement of the area. The site can be developed without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt and/or the character of Mayford and Hook Heath. The justification for the release of the sites for development is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The development of the sites will incorporate adequate green	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
				(Whitmore Common and Horsell Common not within walking distance)		infrastructure to serve the needs of the community. This is a key requirement set out clearly in the proposals.	
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB8	Understands the need for meeting the need identified in the Core Strategy GB sites i.e. 550 between 2022-27. Questions why there is a need to go beyond this i.e. 1200 homes for 2027-40 ?	None stated.	The justification for the safeguarded sites is comprehensively addressed in Section 2 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB8	The GB ad to the quality of life in Woking.	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 local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB8	The GB Acts as a barrier between Woking Town, Mayford Village, Sutton Green and Old Woking. Without the GB Woking merge into one city	None stated.	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of these areas. The Council has carried out an assessment of the lancape capacity of the proposed sites to accommodate change, and it is not envisage that the lancape setting of the areas will be significantly undermined. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB8	Existing rush hour traffic is very bad. Particularly - going into Woking-from Egley Rd into Old Woking -from Woking to Guildford along the A320. -Wych Hill Lane, -Hook Heath Rd -Hook Heath Avenue - Saunders Lane, -Hook Hill Lane (across the weak bridge!) Hook Heath Rd has also already increased over the last 10 years, often with cars speeding along. A new school and more housing will make the situation worse	None stated.	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
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB8	Increased traffic must have negative impacts on health, e.g. the respiratory system.	None stated.	The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. 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.	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 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. In addition, 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 Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.</p>	
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB8	<p>Increased traffic is also a safety concern, there is a lack of pavements along the roads and this is one of the reasons why residents walk on the Common land</p>	None stated.	<p>The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. 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. In addition, 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 Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB8	<p>The average density in Fisher Hill Conservation Area and Hook Heath is 5.5 or less dph. 30dph is not consistent with this.</p> <p>What will this mean for Hook Heath and Mayford</p>	None stated.	<p>Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of 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
				Village?			
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB8	Residents frequently visit the shops in Mayford and the cafe, pet shop and garden centre in the Wyedale Garden Centre. All of these might disappear.	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
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB8	Requests that other sites, with lesser impact and which could also regenerate parts of Woking be considered instead.	None stated.	The sites are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives as evidenced in the Sustainability Appraisal Report. The Council has assessed the capacity of brownfield sites 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. 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
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB9	Understands the need for meeting the need identified in the Core Strategy GB sites i.e. 550 between 2022-27. Questions why there is a need to go beyond this i.e. 1200 homes for 2027-40 ?	None stated.	The justification for the safeguarded sites is comprehensively addressed in Section 2 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB9	The GB ad to the quality of life in Woking.	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 local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB9	The GB Acts as a barrier between Woking Town, Mayford Village, Sutton Green and Old Woking. Without the GB Woking merge into one city	None stated.	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of these areas. The Council has carried out an assessment of the lancape capacity of the proposed sites to accommodate change, and it is not envisage that the lancape setting of the areas will be significantly undermined. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB9	<p>Existing rush hour traffic is very bad. Particularly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -going into Woking -from Egley Rd into Old Woking -from Woking to Guildford along the A320. -Wych Hill Lane, -Hook Heath Rd -Hook Heath Avenue 	None stated.	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	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>-Saunders Lane,</p> <p>-Hook Hill Lane (across the weak bridge!)</p> <p>Hook Heath Rd has also already increased over the last 10 years, often with cars speeding along.</p> <p>A new school and more housing will make the situation worse</p>		<p>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>	
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB9	Increased traffic must have negative impacts on health, e.g. the respiratory system.	None stated.	<p>The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. 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. In addition, 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 Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB9	Increased traffic is also a safety concern, there is a lack of pavements along the roads and this is one of the reasons why residents walk on the Common land	None stated.	<p>The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. 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</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
						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. In addition, 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 Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.	
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB9	The average density in Fisher Hill Conservation Area and Hook Heath is 5.5 or less dph. 30dph is not consistent with this. What will this mean for Hook Heath and Mayford Village?	None stated.	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB9	Residents frequently visit the shops in Mayford and the cafe, pet shop and garden centre in the Wyedale Garden Centre. All of these might disappear.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB9	Requests that other sites, with lesser impact and which could also regenerate parts of Woking be considered instead.	None stated.	The sites are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives as evidenced in the Sustainability Appraisal Report. The Council has assessed the capacity of brownfield sites 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. 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
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB10	Understands the need for meeting the need identified in the Core Strategy GB sites i.e. 550 between 2022-27. Questions why there is a need to go beyond this i.e. 1200 homes for 2027-40 ?	None stated.	The justification for the safeguarded sites is comprehensively addressed in Section 2 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB10	The GB ad to the quality of life in Woking.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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 local people.	is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB10	The GB Acts as a barrier between Woking Town, Mayford Village, Sutton Green and Old Woking. Without the GB Woking merge into one city	None stated.	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of these areas. The Council has carried out an assessment of the lancape capacity of the proposed sites to accommodate change, and it is not envisage that the lancape setting of the areas will be significantly undermined. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB10	Existing rush hour traffic is very bad. Particularly -going into Woking -from Egley Rd into Old Woking -from Woking to Guildford along the A320. -Wych Hill Lane, -Hook Heath Rd -Hook Heath Avenue -Saunders Lane, -Hook Hill Lane (across the weak bridge!) Hook Heath Rd has also already increased over the last 10 years, often with cars speeding along. A new school and more housing will make the situation worse	None stated.	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. It is important to note that the school already has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB10	Increased traffic must have negative impacts on health, e.g. the respiratory system.	None stated.	The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. 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	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
						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. In addition, 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 Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.	
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB10	Increased traffic is also a safety concern, there is a lack of pavements along the roads and this is one of the reasons why residents walk on the Common land	None stated.	The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. 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. In addition, 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 Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB10	The average density in Fisher Hill Conservation Area and Hook Heath is 5.5 or less dph. 30dph is not consistent with this. What will this mean for Hook Heath and Mayford Village?	None stated.	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB10	Residents frequently visit the shops in Mayford and the cafe, pet shop and garden centre in the Wyedale Garden Centre. All of these might	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	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
				disappear.		<p>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>	
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB10	Requests that other sites, with lesser impact and which could also regenerate parts of Woking be considered instead.	None stated.	The sites are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives as evidenced in the Sustainability Appraisal Report. The Council has assessed the capacity of brownfield sites 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. 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
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB11	Understands the need for meeting the need identified in the Core Strategy GB sites i.e. 550 between 2022-27. Questions why there is a need to go beyond this i.e. 1200 homes for 2027-40 ?	None stated.	The justification for the safeguarded sites is comprehensively addressed in Section 2 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB11	The GB ad to the quality of life in Woking.	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 local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB11	The GB Acts as a barrier between Woking Town, Mayford Village, Sutton Green and Old Woking. Without the GB Woking merge into one city	None stated.	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of these areas. The Council has carried out an assessment of the landscape capacity of the proposed sites to accommodate change, and it is not envisage that the landscape setting of the areas will be significantly undermined. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB11	<p>Existing rush hour traffic is very bad. Particularly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -going into Woking -from Egley Rd into Old Woking -from Woking to Guildford along the A320. -Wych Hill Lane, -Hook Heath Rd -Hook Heath Avenue -Saunders Lane, -Hook Hill Lane (across the weak bridge!) 	None stated.	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	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>Hook Heath Rd has also already increased over the last 10 years, often with cars speeding along.</p> <p>A new school and more housing will make the situation worse</p>		<p>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.</p>	
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB11	Increased traffic must have negative impacts on health, e.g. the respiratory system.	None stated.	<p>The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. 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. In addition, 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 Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB11	Increased traffic is also a safety concern, there is a lack of pavements along the roads and this is one of the reasons why residents walk on the Common land	None stated.	<p>The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. 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</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
						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. In addition, 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 Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.	
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB11	The average density in Fisher Hill Conservation Area and Hook Heath is 5.5 or less dph. 30dph is not consistent with this. What will this mean for Hook Heath and Mayford Village?	None stated.	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB11	Residents frequently visit the shops in Mayford and the cafe, pet shop and garden centre in the Wyedale Garden Centre. All of these might disappear.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
79	Christine	Barker-Goldie	GB11	Requests that other sites, with lesser impact and which could also regenerate parts of Woking be considered instead.	None stated.	The sites are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives as evidenced in the Sustainability Appraisal Report. The Council has assessed the capacity of brownfield sites 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. 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
35	Jon	Barnes	GB12	Concerns raised about the GB review have been ignored The surrounding countryside around Pyrford is a natural asset, providing open space and natural	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
35	Jon	Barnes	GB12	<p>vista. Object to development of the site</p> <p>The existing infrastructure cannot support increased population and traffic.</p> <p>Traffic problems were highlighted in relation to a smaller development proposal. Proposals for GB development is larger and would increase problems</p>	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. 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. 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
35	Jon	Barnes	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 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
35	Jon	Barnes	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
35	Jon	Barnes	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
35	Jon	Barnes	GB13	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. 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
35	Jon	Barnes	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
35	Jon	Barnes	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
437	Lionel	Barnes	GB12	Object to proposal site. Concerned that development proposals will have a serious impact the local infrastructure, including	None stated.	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.	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
				on roads and local utilities which already suffer during peak periods. (specific example provided)		<p>See Section 3.0, paragraph; 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>	
437	Lionel	Barnes	GB13	Object to proposal site. Concerned that development proposals will have a serious impact the local infrastructure, including on roads and local utilities which already suffer during peak periods. (specific example provided)	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. 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</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 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.	
437	Lionel	Barnes	GB13	The main concern is the damage the development proposal will cause. The approach along Pyrford Common Road towards Pyrford/Woking is that of unbroken countryside. This will be lost as a result of the proposals. The site should be protected for future generations.	None stated.	<p>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 lancape 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 lancape 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 lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
437	Lionel	Barnes	GB12	The main concern is the damage the development proposal will cause. The approach along Pyrford Common Road towards Pyrford/Woking is that of unbroken countryside. This will be lost as a result of the proposals. The site should be protected for future generations.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
437	Lionel	Barnes	GB12	The proposals is totally unacceptable. The Government might see itself in a different position by the late twenties and find the concept of new towns in appropriate locations a potential alternative to the safeguarded sites.	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
437	Lionel	Barnes	GB13	The proposals is totally unacceptable. The Government might see itself in a different position by the late twenties and find the concept of new towns in appropriate locations a potential alternative to the safeguarded sites.	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
437	Lionel	Barnes	GB13	The same objections to GB12 also apply to GB13. GB13 is not identified in the GBBR and it is queried why the site has been included.	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
561	Pat	Barnes	GB12	Danger that without suitable development [affordable housing for younger people and those wishing to downsize] Pyrford will become a village of older people with no health facilities and a poor bus service.	None stated.	The Council will seek to ensure that any planning application at the site provides a mix of housing, including affordable housing, that caters to the diverse housing needs of the Borough's residents. This is currently required by Core Strategy policies CS11, CS12 and CS13. If development comes forward in the period from 2027-2040, which it is safeguarded for, it should meet the development needs of the Borough at that time, as set out in the Development Plan. With regard to health facilities, 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	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
						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 point about the bus service 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. 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.	
561	Pat	Barnes	GB13	Danger that without suitable development [affordable housing for younger people and those wishing to downsize] Pyrford will become a village of older people with no health facilities and a poor bus service.	None stated.	The Council will seek to ensure that any planning application at the site provides a mix of housing, including affordable housing, that caters to the diverse housing needs of the Borough's residents. This is currently required by Core Strategy policies CS11, CS12 and CS13. If development comes forward in the period from 2027-2040, which it is safeguarded for, it should meet the development needs of the Borough at that time, as set out in the Development Plan. With regard to health facilities, 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 point about the bus service 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. 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
561	Pat	Barnes	GB12	There must be infill sites around Pyrford - there are 3 golf courses and fiel with ponies/ horses in them. The old school and playground is empty.	None stated.	Smaller, infill sites within the urban area are generally either already being used, are developed and/or do not provide the amount to land needed to meet the Borough's housing need. This part of the representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 9.0, 10.0 and 11.0. It should be noted that many golf courses and other fiel used for grazing of horses or ponies will also be designated as Green Belt, and would have been assessed as part of the Green Belt Review. The fact they are used as golf courses or for grazing wouldn't mean they are any more suitable for development than other Green Belt land. Also availability of these sites, in current use as stated, would need to be considered with regard to whether they are deliverable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
561	Pat	Barnes	GB13	There must be infill sites around Pyrford - there are 3 golf courses and fiel with ponies/ horses in them. The old school and playground is empty.	None stated.	Smaller, infill sites within the urban area are generally either already being used, are developed and/or do not provide the amount to land needed to meet the Borough's housing need. This part of the representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 9.0, 10.0 and 11.0. It should be noted that many golf courses and other fiel used for grazing of horses or ponies will also be designated as 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
						and would have been assessed as part of the Green Belt Review. The fact they are used as golf courses or for grazing wouldn't mean they are any more suitable for development than other Green Belt land. Also availability of these sites, in current use as stated, would need to be considered with regard to whether they are deliverable.	
561	Pat	Barnes	GB12	Objects to the proposal. However states that there needs to be more affordable housing in Pyrford, especially for younger people and those wanting to downsize and remain in Pyrford. Otherwise it will become a village of older people with no health facilities and a poor bus service.	None stated.	The Council will seek to ensure that any planning application at the site provides a mix of housing, including affordable housing, that caters to the diverse housing needs of the Borough's residents. This is currently required by Core Strategy policies CS11, CS12 and CS13. If development comes forward in the period from 2027-2040, which it is safeguarded for, it should meet the development needs of the Borough at that time, as set out in the Development Plan. With regard to health facilities, 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 point about the bus service 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. 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
561	Pat	Barnes	GB13	Objects to the proposal. However states that there needs to be more affordable housing in Pyrford, especially for younger people and those wanting to downsize and remain in Pyrford. Otherwise it will become a village of older people with no health facilities and a poor bus service.	None stated.	The Council will seek to ensure that any planning application at the site provides a mix of housing, including affordable housing, that caters to the diverse housing needs of the Borough's residents. This is currently required by Core Strategy policies CS11, CS12 and CS13. If development comes forward in the period from 2027-2040, which it is safeguarded for, it should meet the development needs of the Borough at that time, as set out in the Development Plan. With regard to health facilities, 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 point about the bus service 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. 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
1563	Rita M	Baroux	GB8	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Mayford.	None stated.	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	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
						by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	
1563	Rita M	Baroux	GB9	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Mayford.	None stated.	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
1563	Rita M	Baroux	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Mayford.	None stated.	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
1563	Rita M	Baroux	GB11	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Mayford.	None stated.	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
1563	Rita M	Baroux	GB8	Housing will increase the risk of surface water flooding which can have an impact on adjacent properties and land.	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
1563	Rita M	Baroux	GB9	Housing will increase the risk of surface water flooding which can have an impact on adjacent properties and land.	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
1563	Rita M	Baroux	GB10	Housing will increase the risk of surface water flooding which can have an impact on adjacent properties and land.	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
1563	Rita M	Baroux	GB11	Housing will increase the risk of surface water flooding which can have an impact on adjacent properties and land.	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
1563	Rita M	Baroux	GB7	Woking already has several Traveller sites in the area and additional pitches would not comply with Green Belt purposes.	None stated.	This representation has been 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
1563	Rita M	Baroux	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot.	None stated.	<p>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.</p> <p>The difficulties in accessing Worplesdon Station have been noted and 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
1563	Rita M	Baroux	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot.	None stated.	<p>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.</p> <p>The difficulties in accessing Worplesdon Station have been noted and 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</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 and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
1563	Rita M	Baroux	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot.	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. The difficulties in accessing Worplesdon Station have been noted and 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
1563	Rita M	Baroux	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot.	None stated.	<p>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.</p> <p>The difficulties in accessing Worplesdon Station have been noted and 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
1563	Rita M	Baroux	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much 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</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
						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.	
1563	Rita M	Baroux	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse.	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 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1563	Rita M	Baroux	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse.	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 the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements 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
						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 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.	
1563	Rita M	Baroux	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse.	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 transport 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1563	Rita M	Baroux	General	The proposals would substantially alter Mayford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				and although sympathetic to Housing Needs, feels that preservation of the Green Belt should be the first priority. Therefore strongly objects to housing on all of the Green Belt sites.		Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 23.0.	is proposed as a result of this representation
431	Adam	Barrett	GB4	There is a shortage of owner occupiers in the area. Will assurances be made that no buy to let landlords would be allowed to buy these houses?	None stated.	Unfortunately there is no local mechanism which restricts the purchase of homes by buy to rent landlords. However the issue is recognised by Central Government, who have proposed tax increases to landlords of buy to rent properties in order to curtail the problem. The tax increase will be phased in from 2017 and fully implemented by 2020	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
431	Adam	Barrett	GB5	There is a shortage of owner occupiers in the area. Will assurances be made that no buy to let landlords would be allowed to buy these houses?	None stated.	Unfortunately there is no local mechanism which restricts the purchase of homes by buy to rent landlords. However the issue is recognised by Central Government, who have proposed tax increases to landlords of buy to rent properties in order to curtail the problem. The tax increase will be phased in from 2017 and fully implemented by 2020	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
431	Adam	Barrett	GB4	Object to the release of GB in Byfleet. The road and rail infrastructure will not cope with the increase in traffic. Infrastructure capacity will need to be looked at.	Consider infrastructure capacity	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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
431	Adam	Barrett	GB5	Object to the release of GB in Byfleet. The road and rail infrastructure will not cope with the increase in traffic. Infrastructure capacity will need to be looked at.	Consider infrastructure capacity	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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
431	Adam	Barrett	GB4	If development goes ahead a full ecological assessment should be undertaken	None stated.	The key requirements for the proposal site requires that an ecological survey be conducted to determine the levels of biodiversity and require positive contributions be made.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
431	Adam	Barrett	GB5	If development goes ahead a full ecological assessment should be undertaken	None stated.	The key requirements for the proposal site requires that an ecological survey be conducted to determine the levels of biodiversity and require positive contributions be made.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
431	Adam	Barrett	GB4	Object to the removal of GB. Many people voted Tory to block this development out.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
431	Adam	Barrett	GB5	Object to the removal of GB. Many people voted Tory to block this development out.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
431	Adam	Barrett	GB4	Questions the need for a private school as oppose to a large secondary school- which would be more beneficial to the general community	None stated.	With respect to school provision, this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8 In addition, the planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that is separate from the proposals in the draft Site Allocation DPD. In the draft Site Allocation DPD, the Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development 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
						<p>include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly.</p> <p>The planning application is being considered in advance of the Site Allocation DPD for the site and therefore will be assessed on its own merits.</p>	
431	Adam	Barrett	GB5	Questions the need for a private school as oppose to a large secondary school- which would be more beneficial to the general community	None stated.	<p>With respect to school provision, this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8</p> <p>In addition, the planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that is separate from the proposals in the draft Site Allocation DPD. In the draft Site Allocation DPD, the Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly.</p> <p>The planning application is being considered in advance of the Site Allocation DPD for the site and therefore will be assessed on its own merits.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
600	Samantha	Barrett	GB15	It [the area] will not be the same without the land and with so many extra people.	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. 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. 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 land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
600	Samantha	Barrett	GB16	It [the area] will not be the same without the land and with so many extra people.	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>	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 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.</p> <p>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 land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	
600	Samantha	Barrett	GB12	It [the area] will not be the same without the land and with so many extra people.	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. 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. 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 land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
600	Samantha	Barrett	GB13	It [the area] will not be the same without the land and with so many extra people.	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>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.</p> <p>Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green</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
						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 land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	
600	Samantha	Barrett	SA Tables Green Belt sites	Objects	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
600	Samantha	Barrett	GB15	Local infrastructure (Parvis Rd, schools and doctors) is already stretched.	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 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. 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. 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. Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on 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
						back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.	
600	Samantha	Barrett	GB16	Local infrastructure (Parvis Rd, schools and doctors) is already stretched.	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. 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. 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. 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. Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
600	Samantha	Barrett	GB12	Local infrastructure (Parvis Rd, schools and doctors) is already stretched.	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. 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</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>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. 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. 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. Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p>	
600	Samantha	Barrett	GB13	Local infrastructure (Parvis Rd, schools and doctors) is already stretched.	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. 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</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 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 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. 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. Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p>	
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	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.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 4. Whilst Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect the purpose of the Green Belt, it also commits the Council to release Green Belt land to meet development requirements of the Core Strategy. The proposal is therefore not contrary to Policy CS6 or the NPPF.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB7	The GBR considered other options to meet future need for pitches including WOK001 and WOK006. There are also sites with capacity to deliver 15 pitches each combined (land at West Hall WGB004a/SHLAABW019b and south of High Road WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These are omitted from the DPD with little explanation.	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.	The 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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3a 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.	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.	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation needs for Travellers has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 4. Ten Acre Farm is about 3.36ha. 72.05% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. 6.52% in Flood Zone 2 and 5.51% in Flood Zone 3. The Council has carried out a sequential tests to justify the use of the site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Development on the site 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
						be directed to the area of the site with the least risk of flooding, i.e. Flood Zone 1. The is considered an enforceable approach that will be clarified in the allocation. The allocation also includes key requirement to ensure that detailed flood risk assessment is carried out to inform the planning application process for any scheme that will come forward for the delivery of the site. With the specifications set out in the key requirements of the allocation, the Council is satisfied that the site can be developed without significant flood risk to occupiers. It is also not envisaged that the development will exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The site can be developed with no significant adverse impacts on the visual amenity of the area and nearby residents. There are robust policies in the Core Strategy to ensure that this is achieved,	
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB7	Ten Acre Farm does not have the required accessibility, contrary to Woking Core Strategy and SHLAA. Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not close to facilities, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure, poor public transport, and provision of a communal building would not positively enhance the environment, increase openness or contribute to existing character.	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.	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 lancape 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 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. The comment about the poor level of public transport services in the area 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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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. The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	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.	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. 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 be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape	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
						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.	
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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	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.	The representation has been 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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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.	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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB7	Ten Acre Farm borders two environmentally sensitive sites. Development will adversely impact these and cannot be adequately mitigated - Smarts Heath Common (Special Sites of Scientific Interest and an "Important Bird Area") and the Hoe Stream (Site of Nature Conservation Importance, linking habitat corridor to other SNCI sites).	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.	The Council has a clear objective to protect environmentally sensitive sites, 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 Lancape 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. 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 Lancape 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 lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB7	The site is adjacent to 22 houses, including heritage assets. Development should comply with CS14, CS24 and the PPFTS in that it should	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12	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	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>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>	pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area	
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008. 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.	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.	It is intended to allocate the site for a business use. The site is allocated to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. In doing so, the Council need to make sure that the allocation should reflect the extent to which traditional lifestyles can contribute to sustainability. The bullet point will be reworded to clarify this point. The overall justification for the allocation of the site for Travellers accommodation is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB7	Pitches at the site would have a health and safety risk for children playing close to the Hoe Stream. It will also result in more debris in the water and could result in uncontrolled flooding.	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.	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. There is no evidence to suggest that there will be health and safety issues for children playing near the Hoe Stream or children activities will result in more debris in the water.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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. 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 field either side of the school later on.	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. 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. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from 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
				defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on either side later on.		<p>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. 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. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	of this representation
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on either side later on.	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. 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. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB9	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 Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on either side later on.	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>	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
						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. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.	
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, 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 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. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This issue is 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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, 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	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. 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	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
				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.		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. The ownership of land has not influenced the allocation of sites. This particular matter is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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 Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. 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 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. I strongly object to development of GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Any housing will fill the open green space between Mayford and Woking, altering the character of the village and impacting residents. Mayford has strong historical importance and was listed in the Domesday Book. The GBBR incorrectly dismisses this, saying Woking is not considered to have particularly strong historical character. The Council should preserve and promote the history of the Borough not destroy it through excessive 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. 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. 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. It is not envisaged that the development will undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield sites as set in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, 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	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	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 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.		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 - see Section 11 of the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper for detailed response to this particular issue. 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. This particular matter is addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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.	
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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.	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.	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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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 congestion and travel time can be substantially longer. There is poor public transport, a limited	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	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
				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.		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.	
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB10	There are significant development proposals in	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.		Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	is proposed as a result of this representation
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB11	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB8	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB9	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" (Policy CS24). Without a Lancap Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancap importance has 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 lancap as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancap 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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancap Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancap importance has 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 lancap as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancap 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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancap Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancap importance has 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 lancap as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancap 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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by 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
				Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancap Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancap importance has been ignored.		Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of lancap as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancap 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.	of this representation
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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 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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB9		None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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		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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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. Also see Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB7	No independently verified evidence demonstrating Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development or why sites listed in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included whilst others excluded. Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres are the ONLY proposed sites.	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.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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 remediated.	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.	The SHLAA treats all sites in the Green Belt as currently not developable. Green Belt sites will only be released for development through the plan making process. 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. 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	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
						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 be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape 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. 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. Overall, the justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet developments needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. see Sections 1, 2 and 4.	
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with urban area sites considered before those in the Green Belt.	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.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB7	The TAA suggests the site and its immediate surrounding be explored for potential future expansion. The DPD incorrectly uses the term 'intensification'. This site was never envisaged to be expanded outside Mr Lee's immediate family. The Council has set aside GBR recommendations.	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.	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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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.	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	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>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>	
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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. 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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	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</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>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>	
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB9	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. 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
1159	Richard	Bartlett	GB7	<p>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.</p> <p>The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.</p>	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.	<p>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</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
						remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable	
270	Neil	Batchelor	GB8	Concerned about increased flooding	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
270	Neil	Batchelor	GB8	Keep Green Belt for the purpose it was intended for. To protect the countryside, wildlife and for future generations	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to the Green Belt in line with Government priorities. The reason for the proposed release of small areas within the Green Belt 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
270	Neil	Batchelor	GB8	Concerned about increased noise	None stated.	Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with 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 also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM7 Noise and Light pollution. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
270	Neil	Batchelor	GB8	Concerned about increased traffic	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly 3.6 and Section 20.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
270	Neil	Batchelor	GB8	Concerned about increased pollution	None stated.	Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with 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 also has draft policies in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) to ensure a healthy built environment, including Policies DM5-DM8 to mitigate against various types of pollution. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
270	Neil	Batchelor	GB8	Suggests consideration of other brownfield sites	Consider alternative brownfield sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 16.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1103	C E.A.	Bates	GB12	2) Pyrford Primary School and others nearby are already under pressure. This will not be alleviated by this and other proposed developments.	None stated.	The infrastructure provision to support the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1103	C E.A.	Bates	GB13	2) Pyrford Primary School and others nearby are already under pressure. This will not be alleviated by this and other proposed developments.	None stated.	The infrastructure provision to support the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1103	C E.A.	Bates	GB12	3) GP appointments in West Byfleet are already oversubscribed, this can only worsen.	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
1103	C E.A.	Bates	GB13	3) GP appointments in West Byfleet are already oversubscribed, this can only worsen.	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	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. 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.	
1103	C E.A.	Bates	GB12	4) The Green Belt between villages/towns is essential to maintain their identity. The development will not enhance the look and feel of Pyrford. The development in Sheerwater will also influence some of the points made above. Councils must find areas for development but spreading houses around the county rather than building sprawling estates in villages would be better. We are not against smaller sensible development not on Green Belt but this has been ill thought out.	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 development in Sheerwater will make a significant contribution towards meeting the development needs of the area. However, the need to release Green Belt land will still be necessary.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1103	C E.A.	Bates	GB13	4) The Green Belt between villages/towns is essential to maintain their identity. The development will not enhance the look and feel of Pyrford. The development in Sheerwater will also influence some of the points made above. Councils must find areas for development but spreading houses around the county rather than building sprawling estates in villages would be better. We are not against smaller sensible development not on Green Belt but this has been ill thought out.	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 development in Sheerwater will significantly contribute to housing requirement of the area. However, because of the scale of the need, Green Belt land will still be needed to meet development needs.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1103	C E.A.	Bates	GB12	We object to development of Green Belt field adjoining Upshot Lane. 1) The local road infrastructure is under great strain especially at rush hour. Old Woking Road is already extremely busy. Development and traffic incidents on M25/A3 will bring gridlock. It is illogical to add to congestion with even more homes and cars.	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	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
						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.	
1103	C E.A.	Bates	GB13	We object to development of Green Belt fiel adjoining Upshot Lane. 1) The local road infrastructure is under great strain especially at rush hour. Old Woking Road is already extremely busy. Development and traffic incidents on M25/A3 will bring gridlock. It is illogical to add to congestion with even more homes and cars.	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
1436	Dominic	Batstone	UA18	It's a dump so needs demolishing	None stated.	Support for the comprehensive redevelopment of the site is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	Introduction	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	Simplify.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	Purpose	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	Simplify.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	How the Site Allocations are structured	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	Simplify.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	Overview of the Site allocation Proposal Sites	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find	Simplify.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, 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
				anything. Objects to every single point.		consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	
1436	Dominic	Batstone	Identifying sites for allocation	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	Simplify.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	How sites will bring forward the development planned by the Core Strategy	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	Simplify.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	Proposals Map	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	Simplify.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	Developing in accordance with the Site Allocations	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	Simplify.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	Implementation and Monitoring of the Site Allocations	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	Simplify.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	UA1	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	Simplify.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	UA2	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	Simplify.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	UA3	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	Simplify.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

[illegible]

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	
1436	Dominic	Batstone	UA13	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	Simplify.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	UA14	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	Simplify.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	UA15	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	Simplify.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	UA16	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	Simplify.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	UA17	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	Simplify.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	UA19	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	None stated.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	UA20	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	None stated.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	UA21	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	None stated.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	UA22	The consultation is structured so that most of the	None stated.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which	No further modification

[illegible]

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	
1436	Dominic	Batstone	Conclusions	The consultation is structured so that most of the public cannot understand it. Lots of jargon, tens of large documents and no easy way to find anything. Objects to every single point.	None stated.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1436	Dominic	Batstone	General	This is the worst consultation documents ever. Huge documents, too much jargon, too many links and not enough focus on what is important. Where can I see short summaries of the locations and plans? Reading thousands of pages is pointless. Surely there is a standard to adhere to so that 99% of the population are not excluded, which is achieved here.	Would like to see short summaries of the locations and plans.	Point noted, however the consultation covers a lot of detail which needs to be presented to the public. It is acknowledged that the content of the document is both technical and lengthy, and consideration was given to ensuring ways for the public to access documents and ask questions about the detail presented during the consultation period. Maps showing the locations of development and proposed uses were available at a number of consultation events across the Borough during the consultation period, and online in the form of an interactive map, which could be used to respond to the proposals for particular sites. Summary leaflets and posters, to raise awareness, were also produced and distributed around the Borough, in libraries, supermarkets and at consultation events. Further detail is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	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 woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	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 in fact 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	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	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	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
				motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.		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.	
599	Janet	Baynham	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 in fact 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	GB8	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. 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.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	GB9	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. 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.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	GB10	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. 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.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	GB11	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. 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.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	GB8	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB9	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				"Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.		Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	GB10	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB11	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB8	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB9	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB10	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB11	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	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
599	Janet	Baynham	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	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
						<p>best how 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>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>	of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how 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>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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how 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. 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how 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>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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed	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. 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</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.		public transport where feasible.	
599	Janet	Baynham	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	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 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	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 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	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 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB8	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB9	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB10	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB11	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB8	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB9	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB10	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB11	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
599	Janet	Baynham	GB8	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB9	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB10	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB11	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB8	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	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	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
						overall purpose of the Green Belt.	
599	Janet	Baynham	GB9	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fiel either side.	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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB10	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fiel either side.	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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB11	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fiel either side.	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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of lancape importance are 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of lancape importance are 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of lancape importance are 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of lancape importance are 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.		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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new 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	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
						Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
599	Janet	Baynham	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB10	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land 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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB11	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land 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
599	Janet	Baynham	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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB9	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
599	Janet	Baynham	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
599	Janet	Baynham	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
599	Janet	Baynham	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
599	Janet	Baynham	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)	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated, and alternative sites identified in the Green Belt Review (Murrays Lane, W.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.	Byfleet; Land off New Lane, Sutton Green; land to the west of West Hall, W. Byfleet; and land south of High Street, Byfleet) explored.		
599	Janet	Baynham	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
599	Janet	Baynham	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
599	Janet	Baynham	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
599	Janet	Baynham	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	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				inappropriateness.			
599	Janet	Baynham	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 Lancape 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 lancape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	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
599	Janet	Baynham	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 lancape 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
599	Janet	Baynham	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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB7	The additional traveller pitches would present a serious risk to children from the Hoe stream. Debris in the river as a result of additional occupiers or business activity would add to the likelihood of uncontrolled flooding.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream. This representation regarding flooding and business activity on the site has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10 and 4.12 respectively.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	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
599	Janet	Baynham	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
599	Janet	Baynham	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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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	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
						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.	
599	Janet	Baynham	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	General	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB8	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB9	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.			
599	Janet	Baynham	GB10	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB11	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	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
599	Janet	Baynham	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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB8	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need -including Traveller sites' does not justify 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, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	GB9	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need -including Traveller sites' does not justify 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, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	GB10	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need -including Traveller sites' does not justify 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, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	GB11	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need -including Traveller sites' does not justify 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, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	GB8	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site 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 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	GB9	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 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
				constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.			
599	Janet	Baynham	GB10	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site 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 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	GB11	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site 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 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	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
599	Janet	Baynham	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
599	Janet	Baynham	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
599	Janet	Baynham	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
599	Janet	Baynham	GB7	The Council has set aside the Green Belt Review's recommendations by selecting the	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.	stated.	Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2, and Section 17.0.	of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	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
599	Janet	Baynham	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.	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 Lancscape 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 landscaped grounds. The Lancscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. 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. 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
599	Janet	Baynham	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 landscaped 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
217	M	Beaney	GB7	I strongly object to the proposal to increase Traveller Pitches on this land.	None stated.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
217	M	Beaney	GB8	I strongly object to the proposal to build a joint application of Secondary School, Commercial Leisure Centre and Running Track.	None stated.	The proposal now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
217	M	Beaney	GB10	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11.	None stated.	The justification for the release of the sites from the Green Belt to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
217	M	Beaney	GB9	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11.	None stated.	The justification for the release of the sites from the Green Belt to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
217	M	Beaney	GB11	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11.	None stated.	The justification for the release of the sites from the Green Belt to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The capacity of lancape to accommodate the proposals without undermining their distinctive character and setting is addressed in detail in Sections 7 and 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford. This particular matter is addressed in Section 12 of the 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
217	M	Beaney	GB8	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11.	None stated.	The justification for the release of the sites from the Green Belt to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The capacity of lancape to accommodate the proposals without undermining their distinctive character and setting is addressed in detail in Sections 7 and 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford. This particular matter is addressed in Section 12 of the 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
351	J	Beare	GB7	Further expansion would have an impact on the adjoining common land.	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 Lancape 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 lancape grounds. The Lancape 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 lancape 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</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
						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.	
351	J	Beare	GB10	The topography of the area allows for excellent views	None stated.	<p>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 lancape 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 lancape 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 lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
351	J	Beare	GB11	The topography of the area allows for excellent views	None stated.	<p>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 lancape 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 lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
351	J	Beare	GB14	The topography of the area allows for excellent views	None stated.	<p>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 lancape 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 lancape 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 lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
351	J	Beare	GB10	Concerned that increased development and topography of the area could increase surface water flooding and create flooding problems on lower properties along Saunders Lane	None stated.	<p>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
351	J	Beare	GB11	Concerned that increased development and topography of the area could increase surface water flooding and create flooding problems on lower properties along Saunders Lane	None stated.	<p>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.</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 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.	
351	J	Beare	GB14	Concerned that increased development and topography of the area could increase surface water flooding and create flooding problems on lower properties along Saunders Lane	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
351	J	Beare	GB10	Development proposals will put severe strain on existing services and utilities	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 5.0, paragraph 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
351	J	Beare	GB11	Development proposals will put severe strain on existing services and utilities	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 5.0, paragraph 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
351	J	Beare	GB14	Development proposals will put severe strain on existing services and utilities	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 5.0, paragraph 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
351	J	Beare	GB10	Development proposals will impact on soil conditions in the area	None stated.	The site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA. 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. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
351	J	Beare	GB14	Development proposals will impact on soil conditions in the area	None stated.	<p>The site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA.</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. 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</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
						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	
351	J	Beare	GB11	Development proposals will impact on soil conditions in the area	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 5.0, paragraph 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
351	J	Beare	GB10	Proposals will have a major impact on traffic-temporary (construction phase) and permanent (through the increase in population).Traffic on Smarts Heath Road and Saunders Lane will increase pollution from stationary vehicles.	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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0The 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. 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.With regards to the representation on pollution, 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 significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution.The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution. 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	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
						combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	
351	J	Beare	GB11	Proposals will have a major impact on traffic-temporary (construction phase) and permanent (through the increase in population).Traffic on Smarts Heath Road and Saunders Lane will increase pollution from stationary vehicles.	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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0The 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. 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. With regards to the representation on pollution, 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 significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution. The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution. 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
351	J	Beare	GB14	Proposals will have a major impact on traffic-temporary (construction phase) and permanent (through the increase in population).Traffic on Smarts Heath Road and Saunders Lane will increase pollution from stationary vehicles.	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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0The 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	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
						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. 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. With regards to the representation on pollution, 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 significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution. The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution. 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.	
351	J	Beare	GB10	Outrageous that the protected areas of GB being threatened this way	None stated.	The concern is noted however the need to release Green Belt land to accommodate future development 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
351	J	Beare	GB11	Outrageous that the protected areas of GB being threatened this way	None stated.	The concern is noted however the need to release Green Belt land to accommodate future development 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
351	J	Beare	GB14	Outrageous that the protected areas of GB being threatened this way	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
351	J	Beare	GB7	Objects to further expansion of the site. There are already a significant amount of these sites in the area. There is no justification	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
351	J	Beare	GB10	Many residents enjoy using the open space for recreation and amenity purposes.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to the Green Belt and appreciates the multifunctional purpose of it. However, it has to	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
						<p>identify specific sites in the Green Belt to address the significant unmet housing need in the Borough which can not be fully accommodated on brownfield sites. In addition, the Council has also identified areas solely for green space and recreation.</p> <p>All proposals will also need to meet the requirements of all other Development Plan policies including CS17 Open Space, Green Infrastructure, sport and recreation.</p> <p>Please also read the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper which has comprehensively addressed these points in Section 1.0, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.2 and 3.7, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2</p>	of this representation
351	J	Beare	GB11	Many residents enjoy using the open space for recreation and amenity purposes.	None stated.	<p>The Council attaches great importance to the Green Belt and appreciates the multifunctional purpose of it. However, it has to identify specific sites in the Green Belt to address the significant unmet housing need in the Borough which can not be fully accommodated on brownfield sites. In addition, the Council has also identified areas solely for green space and recreation. All proposals will also need to meet the requirements of all other Development Plan policies including CS17 Open Space, Green Infrastructure, sport and recreation. Please also read the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper which has comprehensively addressed these points in Section 1.0, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.2 and 3.7, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
351	J	Beare	GB14	Many residents enjoy using the open space for recreation and amenity purposes.	None stated.	<p>The Council attaches great importance to the Green Belt and appreciates the multifunctional purpose of it. However, it has to identify specific sites in the Green Belt to address the significant unmet housing need in the Borough which can not be fully accommodated on brownfield sites. In addition, the Council has also identified areas solely for green space and recreation.</p> <p>All proposals will also need to meet the requirements of all other Development Plan policies including CS17 Open Space, Green Infrastructure, sport and recreation.</p> <p>Please also read the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper which has comprehensively addressed these points in Section 1.0, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.2 and 3.7, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
351	J	Beare	GB10	The extensive wildlife will be depleted, on and surrounding the site.	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. 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</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 site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
351	J	Beare	GB11	The extensive wildlife will be depleted, on and surrounding the site.	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. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
351	J	Beare	GB14	The extensive wildlife will be depleted, on and surrounding the site.	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. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
351	J	Beare	GB10	Object to proposals in Mayford. Residents have moved to the area specifically to enjoy open spaces and benefit from the GB here.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.2 and 3.7, Section 21.0 and Section 23.0. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of policy requirements in relation of open space, recreation and design will ensure there is still sufficient access open space and new development proposals are sympathetic to the character of the surrounding area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
351	J	Beare	GB11	Object to proposals in Mayford. Residents have moved to the area specifically to	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 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
				enjoy open spaces and benefit from the GB here.		paragraph 3.2 and 3.7, Section 21.0 and Section 23.0. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of policy requirements in relation of open space, recreation and design will ensure there is still sufficient access open space and new development proposals are sympathetic to the character of the surrounding area.	of this representation
351	J	Beare	GB14	Object to proposals in Mayford. Residents have moved to the area specifically to enjoy open spaces and benefit from the GB here.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.2 and 3.7, Section 21.0 and Section 23.0. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of policy requirements in relation of open space, recreation and design will ensure there is still sufficient access open space and new development proposals are sympathetic to the character of the surrounding area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1523	D.	Bearham	GB10	Numerous recent government and independent reports have stressed the huge value of green open public space, in improving health and well being, providing community benefits, and enabling monetary savings for the NHS.	The site should become open public green space	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs post 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet the long term housing development needs (beyond 2027) of the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 2.0 and 9.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term development needs, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1523	D.	Bearham	GB11	Numerous recent government and independent reports have stressed the huge value of green open public space, in improving health and well being, providing community benefits, and enabling monetary savings for the NHS.	The site should become open public green space	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs post 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet the long term housing development needs (beyond 2027) of the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 2.0 and 9.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term development needs, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1523	D.	Bearham	GB10	The purpose and definition of the Green Belt is to prevent needless urban sprawl and maintain essential open spaces, woodland and character between towns and villages. These proposals do the opposite, merging Mayford and Hook Heath with Woking.	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
1523	D.	Bearham	GB11	The purpose and definition of the Green Belt is to prevent needless urban sprawl and maintain essential open spaces, woodland and character between towns and villages. These proposals do the opposite, merging Mayford and Hook Heath with Woking.	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
1523	D.	Bearham	GB10	Given the lack of open public green spaces in South Woking, this is the perfect opportunity for the Council to preserve Hook Heath and Mayford whilst safeguarding public green open space for all to enjoy, rather than developing the sites for high density, low quality homes (in the immediate and longer term).	Preserve Hook Heath and Mayford and safeguard public green open space for all	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs before or after 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet housing development needs in the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0 and 9.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term development needs, beyond 2027.	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
1523	D.	Bearham	GB11	Given the lack of open public green spaces in South Woking, this is the perfect opportunity for the Council to preserve Hook Heath and Mayford whilst safeguarding public green open space for all to enjoy, rather than developing the sites for high density, low quality homes (in the immediate and longer term).	Preserve Hook Heath and Mayford, safeguard public green open space for all	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs before or after 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet housing development needs in the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0 and 9.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term development needs, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1523	D.	Bearham	GB10	Deeply concerned about the hugely negative, damaging proposals. Recommends these sites do not have their Green Belt status removed but become designated areas of publicly accessible green open space; a natural country park.	These sites should not have their Green Belt status removed and should instead become designated areas of publicly accessible green open space; a natural country park.	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs before or after 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet housing development needs in the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 2.0, 9.0 and 11.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term development needs, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1523	D.	Bearham	GB11	Deeply concerned about the hugely negative, damaging proposals. Recommends these sites do not have their Green Belt status removed but become designated areas of publicly accessible green open space; a natural country park.	These sites should not have their Green Belt status removed and should instead become designated areas of publicly accessible green open space; a natural country park.	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs before or after 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet housing development needs in the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 2.0, 9.0 and 11.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term development needs, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1523	D.	Bearham	GB10	While recognising the need to plan into the future and accommodate growing need for affordable, quality character long term housing, the current proposals are in complete contradiction to National Planning Policy. The proposals show deep disregard and seemingly wanton desire to significantly reduce the Green Belt, build on essential green public open spaces and woodland, and destroy the character of Hook Heath and Mayford.	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, Sections 9.0, 10.0 and 11.0. Sections 12.0, 21.0 and 23.0 provide further relevant information. 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
1523	D.	Bearham	GB11	While recognising the need to plan into the future and accommodate growing need for affordable, quality character long term housing, the current proposals are in complete contradiction to National Planning Policy. The proposals show deep disregard and seemingly wanton desire to significantly reduce the Green Belt, build on essential green public open spaces and woodland, and destroy the character of Hook Heath and Mayford.	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, Sections 9.0, 10.0 and 11.0. Sections 12.0, 21.0 and 23.0 provide further relevant information. 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
1523	D.	Bearham	GB10	Outlines the NPPF requirement to clearly demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances where release of land from the Green Belt is proposed. Acknowledges the need for 550 homes in the Green Belt from 2022 to 2027, but an exceptional need for 1200 or any number of homes in the Green Belt from 2027-40 is not defined or demonstrated through firm evidence.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1523	D.	Bearham	GB11	Outlines the NPPF requirement to clearly demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances where release of land from the Green Belt is proposed. Acknowledges the need for 550 homes in the Green Belt from 2022 to 2027, but an exceptional need for 1200 or any number of homes in the Green Belt from 2027-40 is not defined or demonstrated through firm evidence.	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
195	D	Bedford	GB11	Increased strain on local facilities and infrastructure from increased population and traffic.	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 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. 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
195	D	Bedford	GB10	Increased strain on local facilities and infrastructure from increased population and traffic.	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	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
						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.	
195	D	Bedford	GB9	Increased strain on local facilities and infrastructure from increased population and traffic.	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. 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
195	D	Bedford	GB8	Increased strain on local facilities and infrastructure from increased population and traffic.	None stated.	The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
195	D	Bedford	GB10	Woking has had more than its fair share of new housing development. Sensible to alleviate housing supply problems by allowing every town and village permission to build a very small number of sympathetically designed houses, as an alternative to areas for massive new estate developments.	None stated.	The Council has a housing requirement agreed in the Core Strategy that it needs to identify sufficient land to enable it delivery. The Government requires the Council to plan to meet its objectively assessed housing need. Because of the constraints of the area the Council has to identify sustainable locations for development. Based on the evidence as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal, the proposals are the most sustainable when compared against other alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
195	D	Bedford	GB11	Woking has had more than its fair share of new housing development. Sensible to alleviate housing supply problems by allowing every town and village permission to build a very small number of sympathetically designed houses, as an alternative to areas for massive new estate developments.	None stated.	The Council has a housing requirement agreed in the Core Strategy that it needs to identify sufficient land to enable it delivery. The Government requires the Council to plan to meet its objectively assessed housing need. Because of the constraints of the area the Council has to identify sustainable locations for development. Based on the evidence as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal, the proposals are the most sustainable when compared against other alternatives.	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
195	D	Bedford	GB8	Woking has had more than its fair share of new housing development. Sensible to alleviate housing supply problems by allowing every town and village permission to build a very small number of sympathetically designed houses, as an alternative to areas for massive new estate developments.	None stated.	The Council has a housing requirement agreed in the Core Strategy that it needs to identify sufficient land to enable it delivery. The Government requires the Council to plan to meet its objectively assessed housing need. Because of the constraints of the area the Council has to identify sustainable locations for development. Based on the evidence as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal, the proposals are the most sustainable when compared against other alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
195	D	Bedford	GB9	Woking has had more than its fair share of new housing development. Sensible to alleviate housing supply problems by allowing every town and village permission to build a very small number of sympathetically designed houses, as an alternative to areas for massive new estate developments.	None stated.	The Council has a housing requirement agreed in the Core Strategy that it needs to identify sufficient land to enable it delivery. The Government requires the Council to plan to meet its objectively assessed housing need. Because of the constraints of the area the Council has to identify sustainable locations for development. Based on the evidence as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal, the proposals are the most sustainable when compared against other alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
195	D	Bedford	GB9	We object to any large scale development of land around Mayford village. This would erode Green Belt. It is absurd the very policies designed to protect rural areas can be put aside so easily.	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
195	D	Bedford	GB10	We object to any large scale development of land around Mayford village. This would erode Green Belt. It is absurd the very policies designed to protect rural areas can be put aside so easily.	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 lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape 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
195	D	Bedford	GB11	We object to any large scale development of land around Mayford village. This would erode Green Belt. It is absurd the very policies designed to protect rural areas can be put aside so easily.	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 believes that the proposals will ultimately ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
195	D	Bedford	GB8	We object to any large scale development of land around Mayford village. This would erode Green Belt. It is absurd the very policies designed to protect rural areas can be put aside so easily.	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 lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape 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
361	Mark	Behrendt	General	Elmbridge Borough Council has recently commissioned a SHMA alongside the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames; Epsom &	None stated.	The Council welcomes future cooperation between the authorities and will continue to involve them in all the key stages of the process.	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
				Ewell Borough Council; and Mole Valley District Council. Elmbridge Borough Council has also commissioned a Green Belt Boundary Review and as in the process of assessing constraints to future housing delivery within the Borough. It is likely that there will be further cooperation with neighbouring authorities on meeting the objectively assessed housing need.			
361	Mark	Behrendt	General	Appreciates WBC desire to proceed on the basis of the post NPPF adopted Core Strategy however in line with the NPPF WBC should consider whether plan making activity by other authorities has an impact on planning and the Local Plan in their area- e.g. a revised SHMA	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed above. In addition, the Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to explore whether the unmet need can be met in their areas.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
361	Mark	Behrendt	General	The draft SHMA published 2014 identified between 1,522 – 2,053 homes per annum between 2001 and 2031, across the West Surrey Housing Market Area. It identified between 390 and 588 homes per annum for Woking. The figure is 100-300 homes more than the Core Strategy requirement. Therefore WBC should be seeking to increase housing delivery above the levels set out in the Core Strategy. The Site Allocation DPD identifies safeguarded sites between 2027-2040. These sites are available and suitable and it is therefore suggested that these sites are required to meet the identified need in Woking	None stated.	The NPPF clearly emphasises the benefit of safeguarding Green Belt land to meet future development needs stretching well beyond the plan period (paragraph 85). This is necessary to ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary. The Green Belt boundary review has revealed that apart from the sites that are recommended to be released from the Green Belt for development, no further site could be identified for development without damaging the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt. It is therefore critical that sites are safeguarded to meet future development needs. The Issues and Matters Topic Paper addresses the issue of safeguarding in detail (see Section 2.0)	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
361	Mark	Behrendt	General	Notwithstanding the identified need within Woking, as part of the 'duty to cooperate', consideration should be given as to whether the safeguarded land should be released within the earlier plan period of 2015 to 2027, to meet the wider development needs of the West Surrey Housing Market Area where housing need is unlikely to be met.	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed above, please see Section 2.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper . In addition, the Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities in accordance with the 'duty to cooperate'.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
361	Mark	Behrendt	General	Generally supportive however there is concern that updated evidence suggests that WBC needs to increase its provision of new homes in excess of its adopted Core Strategy and not wait until a review of the Core Strategy to review its figures	None stated.	The Council has prepared an Issues and Matters Topic Paper that addresses all the above issues in detail, and should read in conjunction with this response. The Woking Core Strategy was adopted in October 2012. Its provisions, in particular, the housing requirement was assessed against the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and found sound. The housing requirement of 292 dwellings per year was supported by the Inspector against the backdrop of an objectively assessed housing need of 594 dwellings per year. There has not been any change in national policy since the adoption of the Core Strategy and as such its provisions continue to be up to date. The revised SHMA figure of 517 is not significantly different from the options that were previously assessed at the Core Strategy stage. There is therefore no justification at this stage to request the review of the Core Strategy housing requirement. The Council's main focus through the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD should be towards the delivery of the Core Strategy to effect meaningful changes on the ground. The Core Strategy has its own in-built mechanism for monitoring and review, which will underpin its future review if and when it is necessary to do so. The Site Allocations DPD should not be used as proxy to review the Core Strategy, and indeed would not be appropriate for it to be used as such. It should be noted that the Core Strategy Inspector was supportive of the Council's case that because 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
						environmental constraints of the area, the historic data on housing delivery and the available evidence the delivery of 594 dwellings per year would not be environmentally sustainable, and indeed could be environmentally damaging. The same analysis is equally relevant to date. The Council is committed to the comprehensive delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy, and the Site Allocations DPD will play a significant role. Instead of the 550 dwellings committed to be delivered from the release of Green Belt land to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027, the draft Site Allocations DPD allocates land to deliver about 817 dwellings within the same period. This will ensure a steady supply of housing land to meet at least the requirement. It is important to note that actual average housing delivery from 2006 to date is about 300 dwellings per year, which is just about the same as the requirement. This average delivery figure covered the period including the economic boom, recession and recent recovery. The housing trajectory for the future indicates that at least the housing requirement will be met. The Core Strategy Inspector was complementary of the overall spatial strategy of the Core Strategy. He commented that: the Core Strategy provides the most appropriate spatial strategy for sustainable development within the context of the Borough with clear objectives for the plan period in accord with the aims of national planning policy. The spatial strategy focuses most new development on previously developed land in the main urban areas in close proximity to key services and facilities. The Council has identified sufficient urban sites to deliver the housing requirement until 2022. To achieve its sustainability aims, it is important that these sites are delivered before Green Belt land is released for development.	
361	Mark	Behrendt	General	Elmbridge welcome continuous engagement with WBC on cross boundary issues	None stated.	The Council welcomes representations from its adjoining authorities, and has engaged with relevant neighbouring authorities, statutory consultees and key stakeholders before and during the consultation period. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the authorities and other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. We will continue to involve them in all the key stages of the process	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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 Lancape 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 lancape grounds. The Lancape 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 lancape 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	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
						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.	
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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. 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>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB9	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. 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>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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. 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>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <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</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>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>	
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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. 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>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB7	Object to the proposal. 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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB8	Strongly object to the proposed leisure centre, running track and other facilities. These are inappropriate development within a residential area and do not meet the Council's own stated 800m separation policy.	None stated.	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. It is worth noting that the Council do not have a 800m separation policy between leisure facilities and residential properties. Through good design and, where necessary mitigation measures, it is possible to achieve a satisfactory relationship between different land uses. This is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design and the Design SPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB8	Strongly object. 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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB9	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and	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.	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
				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.		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.	
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB10	Strongly object. 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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB11	Strongly object. 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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape 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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape 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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape 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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape 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,	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
						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.	
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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.	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB9	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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	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 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.	
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB9	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB9	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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	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
						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).	
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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.	<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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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. 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</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
						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).	
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	General	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.	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</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
						village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB9	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB8	The additional visits per week will have negative impact on an already overloaded road network whilst the public transport in the area is dire.	None stated.	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. The representation regarding the existing public transport provision 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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB8	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB9	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB10	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB11	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB8	The hours of operation will have a major impact on residents and surrounding local area. It is inappropriate and shows a clear lack of transparency on behalf of the Council.	None stated.	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. The Council's decision on the proposed school and leisure centre are clearly set out on the Council's website. The Local Planning Authority has attached a number of planning conditions to the permitted scheme in order to minimise the impact of the proposal on the local area. The Council's reasons and decisions are set out within the Officer's Report.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	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. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However 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. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB9	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.	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. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However 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. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore	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
						not be undermined.	
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	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. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However 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. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	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>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However 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. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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 field 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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB9	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.	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	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
						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.	
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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. 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.	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 TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes. 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	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
						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 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.	
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB9	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.	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 TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes. 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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	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	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
				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.		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 TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes. 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. 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.	
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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.	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 TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes. 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. 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	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.	
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB9	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	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. 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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	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. 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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow,	None stated.	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. 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	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
				vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.		transport where feasible.	
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	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. 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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate amenity for residents including space for business activities. These activities are out of keeping in this location due to the proximity of houses and heritage assets.	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB7	Traveller sites should have access to local facilities. The site is not near a school or easy access to local services. There are virtually no local facilities in Mayford.	None 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB8	Accept that the proposed secondary school represents a special circumstance for development in the Green Belt, and I support the mitigation measures noted for the school.	None stated.	Support for the principle of a secondary school on the site, combined with suitable mitigation measures, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB9	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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	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
						walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
1671	Rosemary	Belah	GB9	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
1671	Rosemary	Belah	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
697	Ann	Belcher	General	Objecting to release Green Belt land in Byfleet and surrounding areas. The petition against building in the Green Belt has been ignored.	None stated.	<p>The response regarding the release of Green Belt for residential development has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>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 Representer ID 1524.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
697	Ann	Belcher	GB4	The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains. The land is prone to flooding.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p> <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
697	Ann	Belcher	GB5	The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains. The land is prone to flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could	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
						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). 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.	
697	Ann	Belcher	GB4	The infrastructure is already inadequate the roads especially Parvis Road are already gridlocked several times a day.	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
697	Ann	Belcher	GB5	The infrastructure is already inadequate the roads especially Parvis Road are already gridlocked several times a day.	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,	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>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 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. 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>	
697	Ann	Belcher	GB4	Byfleet has no medical facilities at present and there are long waiting times for doctor appointments. Schools 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
697	Ann	Belcher	GB5	Byfleet has no medical facilities at present and there are long waiting times for doctor appointments. Schools 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
697	Ann	Belcher	General	Byfleet was a delightful village before the M25 and it resulted in a loss of Green Belt and trees. Please reconsider and leave Byfleet's Green Belt to stay green	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 Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for 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
						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).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.	
698	John	Belcher	GB4	The Green Belt land in Byfleet frequently floods and is getting worse	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
698	John	Belcher	GB5	The Green Belt land in Byfleet frequently floods and is getting worse	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
698	John	Belcher	GB4	Byfleet has no medical facilities at present and with a large number of elderly people, can't rely on the poor bus services to attend appointments	None stated.	<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 Council acknowledge that improvements can be made to increase the frequency of public transport. 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
698	John	Belcher	GB5	Byfleet has no medical facilities at present and with a large number of elderly people, can't rely on the poor bus services to attend appointments	None stated.	<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 Council acknowledge that improvements can be made to increase the frequency of public transport. 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
698	John	Belcher	GB4	Objects to proposal. The roads are at capacity.	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	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 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. 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>	
698	John	Belcher	GB5	Objects to proposal. The roads are at capacity.	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. 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. 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</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
						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.	
698	John	Belcher	GB4	The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt. Byfleet should remain a village. If more houses are built, it would become a town and therefore would expect more amenities to support the population. The previous petition should be taken into consideration.	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>As an existing Local Centre, Byfleet is currently relatively well served by local amenities. The proposed site allocations is not expected to increase the population of Byfleet enough for it to be considered a town.</p> <p>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 Represor ID 1524.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
698	John	Belcher	GB5	The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt. Byfleet should remain a village. If more houses are built, it would become a town and therefore would expect more amenities to support the population. The previous petition should be taken into consideration.	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). Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford,</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
						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. As an existing Local Centre, Byfleet is currently relatively well served by local amenities. The proposed site allocations is not expected to increase the population of Byfleet enough for it to be considered a town. 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.	
698	John	Belcher	GB4	Schools are at capacity and results in traffic and congestion	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 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. 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. 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
698	John	Belcher	GB5	Schools are at capacity and results in traffic and congestion	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	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
						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. 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. The representation regarding education provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	
1032	Graham	Bell	GB16	Affordable housing should be based on Core Strategy policy CS12 and not prescribed.	None stated.	Proposals will have to comply with Development Plan policies, including Policy CS12 which sets out the requirement to provide affordable housing	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1032	Graham	Bell	GB16	Certain sub criteria merely reiterate the transport sub headings or green spaces or heritage matters and should be deleted.	None stated.	The Council will consider whether there are any repetitions that need to be removed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1032	Graham	Bell	GB16	The whole area should be removed from the Green Belt, the red line area on page 337 is missing the NW corner.	None stated.	The Council note the proposed modification to the site boundary. Broadoaks Estate does not include Hobbs Close and therefore is not considered within Site GB16. Nevertheless the Council agree that removing Broadoaks and Site GB23 from the Green Belt would result in a isolated pocket of Green Belt that would not serve the purposes of Green Belt. The Council therefore propose, as was previously set out on the Draft Site Allocations DPD - Regulation 18 Consultation Map, to include Hobbs Close within the urban area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1032	Graham	Bell	GB16	The policy should be shortened as the majority will be dealt with by reference to normal development management matters.	Clean up and shorten the policy, matters can be dealt with through the normal DM process.	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1032	Graham	Bell	GB16	Support the Council in taking a long term view of the Green Belt boundary. When future releases are dependent on other factors occurring the wording should be improved by inserting 'or by other policies of this plan which provide for housing' at the end of the third sentence of the third para of the policy. This allows the Council to take a widely based review of where housing might be provided before releasing more Green Belt land.	The wording needs to be improved by inserting 'or by other policies of this plan which provide for housing' at the end of the third sentence of the third paragraph of the policy.	The Council has identified sufficient land in both the urban area to meet development needs up to 2022. The policy is clear that the land will only be released if there is evidence of significant under provision against the housing requirement and there is no indication that the shortfall can be met by development on previously developed land within the urban 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
1032	Graham	Bell	GB16	Support for a different approach to be taken on the site than the allowed extant permissions.	None stated.	Support for the concept of a different approach is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1032	Graham	Bell	GB16	Supports the release of the site from Green Belt as it does not contradict the five purposes of the Green Belt as the site was previously in MOD use and is not adjoining a conservation area.	None stated.	Support the release of the site, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1032	Graham	Bell	GB16	The Core Strategy overview section is too long, please see original representation.	None stated.	The Council's response is set out in detail under each specific heading,	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1032	Graham	Bell	GB16	The NPPG and Core Strategy inspector states it is not acceptable to hold employment land that does not come forward. Therefore objects to the wording "quality offices and research premises" as it is too prescriptive and does not ensure the site is flexible, and so should be deleted. The Core Strategy was concerned about the site being taken forward as employment 12 years after an approval and a business park still hasn't been delivered.	None stated.	The site is identified in the adopted Core Strategy for employment use. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1032	Graham	Bell	GB16	The references to noise reports are unclear as it implies that there will not be any residential use on this site	None stated.	The key requirements require that due to the proximity to the M25 and Parvis Road, development will need to ensure mitigation measures to protect residential amenity. A Noise Impact Assessment would be required to ensure no adverse impacts. The Council fin this suitably clear. There are also emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD which will require development that does not have an adverse impact on noise.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1032	Graham	Bell	GB16	The Council must ensure the landscaping proposals in Policy GB15 to the east are strictly implemented.	None stated.	Development proposals will need meet all other relevant Development Plan Policies including robust policies in the Core Strategy and emerging Development Management Policies which seek to protect and encourage the creation of Green Infrastructure including trees. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Also, this proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes the retention of boundary planting, mature trees. tree belts and the requirement to conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1032	Graham	Bell	GB16	Delete the reference to avoiding development of the site frontage as it is too prescriptive there are already statutory measures in place.	None stated.	Although this key requirements is considered by the representor to be inflexible and prescriptive, the Local Planning Authority considers that it is necessary to ensure that the setting of the heritage assets within the site are protected. The inclusion of the key requirement is not considered to be unreasonable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1032	Graham	Bell	GB16	Support the release of the site from the Green Belt as it does not harm the five purposes of the Green Belt.	None stated.	Support for the release of the site from the green belt is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1032	Graham	Bell	GB16	Support the general thrust of the policy.	None stated.	Support the use of the site for mixed use development is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1032	Graham	Bell	GB16	Support the Council in the early release of the site and confirm it is also what the landowner and development partners desire.	None stated.	Support and confirmation noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
769	Douglas	Bellworthy	General	The GBBR recommended Parcel 20. Support this and look forward to the increased infrastructure	The SHLAA review of our site notes the most significant	The Council has carried out a Sustainability Appraisal on the site and based on the available evidence it will not be taking it forward	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 amenity that this will bring to Mayford. The DPD recommend releasing the majority of Parcel 20 but not our site.	barrier to short term development to be the Green Belt designation. We would like to ask that the council consider either to implement the Green Belt Review recommendations in full, releasing our site from the Green Belt, or include our site in the designated Mayford Settlement Area.	for further consideration.	of this representation
211	PM	Bendle	GB11	The same arguments apply to GB 11.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
211	PM	Bendle	GB7	Woking has three travellers sites already. Saunders Lane is not the appropriate site. I appeal against any planning that involves Green Belt land. The Council is ignoring Government guidelines to protect precious Green Belt.	None stated.	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
211	PM	Bendle	GB11	There is no infrastructure (shops, doctors, poor transport links). Saunders Lane is narrow, development would result in gridlock. Traffic survey in Egley Road carried out in half term week will give a false impression. Railway crosses weak bridges. More houses, more people and more traffic and subsequent strains on Mayford's infrastructure. WE SAY PROTECT OUR Green Belt IN MAYFORD PLEASE!	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 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. 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
211	PM	Bendle	GB10	There is no infrastructure (shops, doctors, poor transport links). Saunders Lane is narrow, development would result in gridlock. Traffic survey in Egley Road carried out in half term week will give a false impression. Railway crosses weak bridges. More houses, more people and more traffic and subsequent strains on Mayford's infrastructure. WE SAY PROTECT	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	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
				OUR Green Belt IN MAYFORD PLEASE!		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.	
211	PM	Bendle	GB8	There is no infrastructure (shops, doctors, poor transport links). Saunders Lane is narrow, development would result in gridlock. Traffic survey in Egley Road carried out in half term week will give a false impression. Railway crosses weak bridges. More houses, more people and more traffic and subsequent strains on Mayford's infrastructure. WE SAY PROTECT OUR Green Belt IN MAYFORD PLEASE!	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. 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
211	PM	Bendle	GB9	There is no infrastructure (shops, doctors, poor transport links). Saunders Lane is narrow, development would result in gridlock. Traffic survey in Egley Road carried out in half term week will give a false impression. Railway crosses weak bridges. More houses, more people and more traffic and subsequent strains on Mayford's infrastructure. WE SAY PROTECT OUR Green Belt IN MAYFORD PLEASE!	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. 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	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 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.	
211	PM	Bendle	GB10	I strongly object to the GB10, this is Green Belt and should remain so. The land drains into Saunders Lane lower down from these fiel and floods into the gardens of some bungalows after heavy rain. Woking Borough Council has NOT rectified this despite numerous attempts. Saunders Lane is very narrow in places. With the proposed development, this will only get worse.	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 lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape 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. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The flooding implications of the proposals is addressed in Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic implications is addressed in Section 20 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
218	M	Bendle	GB11	The same arguments apply to GB 11.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
218	M	Bendle	GB7	Woking has three travellers sites already. Saunders Lane is not the appropriate site. I appeal against any planning that involves Green Belt land. The Council is ignoring Government guidelines to protect precious Green Belt.	None stated.	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
218	M	Bendle	GB11	Saunders Lane is narrow, development would result in gridlock. Traffic survey in Egley Road carried out in half term week will give a false impression. Railway crosses weak bridges. More houses, more people and more traffic and subsequent strains on Mayford's infrastructure. WE SAY PROTECT OUR Green Belt IN MAYFORD PLEASE!	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 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 lancape 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. Section 20 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
						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	
218	M	Bendle	GB10	Saunders Lane is narrow, development would result in gridlock. Traffic survey in Egley Road carried out in half term week will give a false impression. Railway crosses weak bridges. More houses, more people and more traffic and subsequent strains on Mayford's infrastructure. WE SAY PROTECT OUR Green Belt IN MAYFORD PLEASE!	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. 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
218	M	Bendle	GB7	Saunders Lane is narrow, development would result in gridlock. Traffic survey in Egley Road carried out in half term week will give a false impression. Railway crosses weak bridges. More houses, more people and more traffic and subsequent strains on Mayford's infrastructure. WE SAY PROTECT OUR Green Belt IN MAYFORD PLEASE!	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. 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</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 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	
218	M	Bendle	GB8	Saunders Lane is narrow, development would result in gridlock. Traffic survey in Egley Road carried out in half term week will give a false impression. Railway crosses weak bridges. More houses, more people and more traffic and subsequent strains on Mayford's infrastructure. WE SAY PROTECT OUR Green Belt IN MAYFORD PLEASE!	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. 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
218	M	Bendle	GB9	Saunders Lane is narrow, development would result in gridlock. Traffic survey in Egley Road carried out in half term week will give a false impression. Railway crosses weak bridges. More houses, more people and more traffic and subsequent strains on Mayford's infrastructure. WE SAY PROTECT OUR Green Belt IN MAYFORD PLEASE!	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. 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
218	M	Bendle	GB11	There is no infrastructure (shops, doctors and poor transport links).	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 sites, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed as	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>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. 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</p>	
218	M	Bendle	GB10	There is no infrastructure (shops, doctors and poor transport links).	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. 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</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 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.	
218	M	Bendle	GB7	There is no infrastructure (shops, doctors and poor transport links).	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. 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
218	M	Bendle	GB8	There is no infrastructure (shops, doctors and poor transport links).	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. 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
218	M	Bendle	GB9	There is no infrastructure (shops, doctors and poor transport links).	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. 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	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. 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.	
218	M	Bendle	GB10	I strongly object to the GB10, this is Green Belt and should remain so. The land drains into Saunders Lane lower down from these fields and floods into the gardens of some bungalows after heavy rain. Woking Borough Council has NOT rectified this despite numerous attempts. Saunders Lane is very narrow in places. With the proposed development, this will only get worse.	None stated.	The implication of the proposals on flooding is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
15	Stephen	Bennett	UA23	Support the improvement of transport interchange facilities at Woking rail station, but good cycle access to the interchange is vitally important, particularly through the town centre. For example, there is no direct dedicated cycle route to the station from Horsell (you have to cycle the wrong way up one-way Chertsey Road or up Church Path which is pedestrian only and, going back, cycle the wrong way up one-way Chobham Road (by YMCA)). The staggered crossing on Victoria Way is inconvenient for pedestrians and cyclists.	Please include in Policy UA23 the requirement to provide direct and convenient cycle access through the town centre to this site, addressing the issues above.	An interchange facility at the Station is already a proposal in the Local Transport Strategy for Woking and the Regulation 123 list. Measures are also in the Transport Strategy to improve pedestrian and cycling facilities in the area. The Regulation 123 list and the Transport Strategy are both on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB10	There are no local facilities such as doctors, dentists and shops.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB11	There are no local facilities such as doctors, dentists and shops.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB14	There are no local facilities such as doctors, dentists and shops.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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	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. 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.	
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB10	Object to proposals to remove sites from the Green Belt and develop high density housing.	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
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB11	Object to proposals to remove sites from the Green Belt and develop high density housing.	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
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB14	Object to proposals to remove sites from the Green Belt and develop high density housing.	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
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB10	The proposed density is much higher than the surrounding density.	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
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB11	The proposed density is much higher than the surrounding density.	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
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB14	The proposed density is much higher than the surrounding density.	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
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB14	Removes open space enjoyed by the general public. Removes the rural aspect of Hook Hill Lane hedgerows.	None stated.	The proposed allocation is for green infrastructure and not for development. Any green infrastructure works that take place on the site will be designed to high standards and will ensure that users of the site have access to open space. This will be set out in detail at the Development Management stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB10	The road network is at capacity, and roads served by single lane traffic lights, 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</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>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>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> <p>The proposed safeguarded sites in Mayford are located close to Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which serves the day to day needs of local people.</p>	
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB11	The road network is at capacity, and roads served by single lane traffic lights, 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. 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. 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. It is</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
						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).The proposed safeguarded sites in Mayford are located close to Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which serves the day to day needs of local people.	
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB14	The road network is at capacity, and roads served by single lane traffic lights, and further development will make the situation worse.	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 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. 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.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.	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
						Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).The proposed safeguarded sites in Mayford are located close to Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which serves the day to day needs of local people.	
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB10	There needs to be a good margin to delineate the two different areas of Mayford and Hook Heath with no development on escarpment or rising land (1999 Local Plan Policy)	None stated.	<p>Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape 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 lancape 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 lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0, 7.0 and 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB11	There needs to be a good margin to delineate the two different areas of Mayford and Hook Heath with no development on escarpment or rising land (1999 Local Plan Policy)	None stated.	<p>Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape 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 lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0, 7.0 and 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB14	There needs to be a good margin to delineate the two different areas of Mayford and Hook Heath with no development on escarpment or rising land (1999 Local Plan Policy)	None stated.	<p>Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape 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 lancape 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 lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0, 7.0 and 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB10	If roads are widened this would alter the character of the neighbourhood. Access to Saunders Lane for housing estates would be dangerous for residents.	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	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>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. 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. It is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB11	If roads are widened this would alter the character of the neighbourhood. Access to Saunders Lane for housing estates would be dangerous for residents.	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. 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. 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</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
						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. It is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	
1034	Penny	Beretta	GB14	If roads are widened this would alter the character of the neighbourhood. Access to Saunders Lane for housing estates would be dangerous for residents.	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 transport 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. 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. It is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure. 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
120	Daniel	Berry	GB12	Traffic congestion is already an issue for the village and additional housing would make it worse, particularly around the school.	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	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
						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.	
120	Daniel	Berry	GB13	Traffic congestion is already an issue for the village and additional housing would make it worse, particularly around the school.	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 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
120	Daniel	Berry	GB12	Development in adjacent areas in Guildford Borough would also have a significant impact on traffic, congestion and safety. Combined with this site, the situation would need huge infrastructure investments in order to mitigate the impacts.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
120	Daniel	Berry	GB13	Development in adjacent areas in Guildford Borough would also have a significant impact on traffic, congestion and safety. Combined with this site, the situation would need huge infrastructure investments in order to mitigate the impacts.	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	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 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.	
120	Daniel	Berry	GB12	The DPD is not based on the recommendations of the GBBR.	None stated.	This particular issue is addressed comprehensively addressed in Section 17 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has used a range of evidence to inform the DPD. They collectively justify the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
120	Daniel	Berry	GB13	The DPD is not based on the recommendations of the GBBR.	None stated.	This particular issues is comprehensively addressed in Section 17 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has used a range of evidence to inform the DPD. They collectively justify the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
314		Berville	GB12	Affordability is a concern. Downsizing options should be open to mature citizens who don't want to leave the area.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate elderly housing provision in the borough.</p> <p>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
314		Berville	GB13	Affordability is a concern. Downsizing options should be open to mature citizens who don't want to leave the area.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate elderly housing provision in the borough.</p> <p>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</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
						existing.	
314		Berville	GB12	Aviary Road is a Conservation Area, GB provides an important setting to heritage assets and the removal of GB puts the assets at risk	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0 and Section 7.0 particularly 7.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
314		Berville	GB13	Aviary Road is a Conservation Area, GB provides an important setting to heritage assets and the removal of GB puts the assets at risk	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0 and Section 7.0 particularly 7.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
314		Berville	GB12	In January the Woodland Trust planted a hedgerow of trees along Sandy Lane, boarding the proposed development. These trees were designed to stand as a living memorial to the residents of Pyrford who died in the First World War and foster wild life, I believe the development would seriously threaten this legacy.	None stated.	<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.</p> <p>Applicants will also be required to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, seek to retain mature trees and boundary planting 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
314		Berville	GB13	In January the Woodland Trust planted a hedgerow of f trees along Sandy Lane, boarding the proposed development. These trees were designed to stand as a living memorial to the residents of Pyrford who died in the First World War and foster wild life, I believe the development would seriously threaten this legacy.	None stated.	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. Applicants will also be required to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, seek to retain mature trees and boundary planting 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
314		Berville	GB12	Less homes would be supported, however 400+ homes seems excessive particularly with proposal at Wisley Airfield (which has capacity to accommodate supporting infrastructure).	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly paragraph 1.4 and 1.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
314		Berville	GB13	Less homes would be supported, however 400+ homes seems excessive particularly with proposal at Wisley Airfield (which has capacity to accommodate supporting infrastructure).	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly paragraph 1.4 and 1.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
314		Berville	GB12	Pyrford should be kept as it is. The character of Pyrford and its community need to be a consideration. Pyrford is in danger of losing its community and village status	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 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
314		Berville	GB13	Pyrford should be kept as it is. The character of Pyrford and its community need to be a	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and	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
				consideration. Pyrford is in danger of losing its community and village status		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).	of this representation
314		Berville	GB12	Need to consider the ecological and environmental impacts of development on GB12 and GB13.	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 this site GB12 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
314		Berville	GB13	Need to consider the ecological and environmental impacts of development on GB12 and GB13.	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 this site GB13 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	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>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>	
314		Berville	GB12	Coldharbour Road is often gridlocked and is generally a dangerous road at school open/close hours. Development proposals will exacerbate problems here	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. 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. 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
314		Berville	GB13	Coldharbour Road is often gridlocked and is generally a dangerous road at school open/close hours. Development proposals will exacerbate problems here	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. 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</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
						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. 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.	
314		Berville	GB12	Object to development in the Green Belt in Pyrford. The surrounding countryside add to the character of Pyrford and footpaths allow access to the countryside for recreational purposes	None stated.	This rep has been broadly dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0. Representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 573 and Representations submitted by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 19. With respect to comments about the character of Pyrford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
314		Berville	GB13	Object to development in the Green Belt in Pyrford. The surrounding countryside add to the character of Pyrford and footpaths allow access to the countryside for recreational purposes	None stated.	This rep has been broadly dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0. Representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 573 and Representations submitted by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 19. With respect to comments about the character of Pyrford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
314		Berville	GB12	Local infrastructure is a concern. There is insufficient infrastructure (schools, doctors, shops) in Pyrford to support 400+ new homes. These aspects need to be considered	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
314		Berville	GB13	Local infrastructure is a concern. There is insufficient infrastructure (schools, doctors, shops) in Pyrford to support 400+ new homes. These aspects need to be considered	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1492	Elspeth	Berwick	GB12	Chose to live in Pyrford because it is surrounded by Green Belt and loves birds and wildlife. As a conservation area, felt wildlife would be protected, and be able to grow and flourish.	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	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>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 this site 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).</p>	
1492	Elspeth	Berwick	GB13	Chose to live in Pyrford because it is surrounded by Green Belt and loves birds and wildlife. As a conservation area, felt wildlife would be protected, and be able to grow and flourish.	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</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 the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	
1492	Elspeth	Berwick	GB12	Understands the need for more housing but there are areas more suited to development. Destroying fiell and meadows recognised in the Domesday Book is nothing short of vandalism.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0, 9.0-11.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1492	Elspeth	Berwick	GB13	Understands the need for more housing but there are areas more suited to development. Destroying fiell and meadows recognised in the Domesday Book is nothing short of vandalism.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0, 9.0-11.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1492	Elspeth	Berwick	GB12	Many footpaths will be destroyed if the plans go ahead. This will impact residents and visitors who enjoy the amenities and countryside that Pyrford offers.	None stated.	The key requirements for the site state that development should address opportunities for pedestrian and cycle ways through the site. This will account for established footpaths, especially if these are public rights of way. The key requirements also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. Issues of amenity and the countryside (lancape) are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0 and 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1492	Elspeth	Berwick	GB13	Many footpaths will be destroyed if the plans go ahead. This will impact residents and visitors who enjoy the amenities and countryside that Pyrford offers.	None stated.	The key requirements for the site state that development should address opportunities for pedestrian and cycle ways through the site. This will account for established footpaths, especially if these are public rights of way. The key requirements also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. Issues of amenity and the countryside (lancape) are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0 and 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1492	Elspeth	Berwick	GB12	Concerned about the impact of development on local infrastructure. There are insufficient primary school places in Pyrford to cater for the additional demand. Asks whether there is enough sewerage facilities to cope with the additional homes. There is also congestion and parking issues at the local shops in Pyrford, and on the road by the school where parents park inconsiderately. There is no choice but to drive to work due to the lack of public transport and distances travelled. Also questions the impact of construction traffic on roads.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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. Despite this, the enforcement of parking with regard to people parking on kerbs and blocking pedestrian access is outside the remit of planning, but should be addressed and will be flagged to the relevant department/ organisation. With regard to the lack of public transport, the point made is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how 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
1492	Elspeth	Berwick	GB13	Concerned about the impact of development on local infrastructure. There are insufficient primary school places in Pyrford to cater for the additional demand. Asks whether there is enough sewerage facilities to cope with the additional homes. There is also congestion and parking issues at the local shops in Pyrford, and on the road by the school where parents park inconsiderately. There is no choice but to drive to work due to the lack of public transport and distances travelled. Also	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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. Despite this, the enforcement of parking with regard to people parking 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
				questions the impact of construction traffic on roads.		kerbs and blocking pedestrian access is outside the remit of planning, but should be addressed and will be flagged to the relevant department/ organisation. With regard to the lack of public transport, the point made is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how 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.	
1492	Elspeth	Berwick	GB12	There is a village feel rather than being a anonymous conurbation. There is a sense of community and neighbours can rely on each other. WBC has led residents to believe they share there values but it appears we have been misled.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that planning to meet local housing need would undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) 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 and design standards in accordance with the environmental and 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
1492	Elspeth	Berwick	GB13	There is a village feel rather than being a anonymous conurbation. There is a sense of community and neighbours can rely on each other. WBC has led residents to believe they share there values but it appears we have been misled.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that planning to meet local housing need would undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) 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 and design standards in accordance with the environmental and 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
1492	Elspeth	Berwick	GB12	The proposal does not account for the dramatic increases to the volume of traffic. There is also considerable congestion and the current road structure is insufficient to take more traffic. Any road construction will destroy the character and nature of 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
1492	Elspeth	Berwick	GB13	The proposal does not account for the dramatic increases to the volume of traffic. There is also considerable congestion and the current road structure is insufficient to take more traffic. Any road construction will destroy the character and nature of 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
1492	Elspeth	Berwick	GB12	There have already been homes built on the Oakfield school site. There must be other suitable sites to develop, rather than destroying more Green Belt.	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
1492	Elspeth	Berwick	GB13	There have already been homes built on the Oakfield school site. There must be other suitable sites to develop, rather than destroying more Green Belt.	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
825	Martin	Bett	UA51	Support the comprehensive redevelopment of the site and removing the constraints of existing	That the comprehensive redevelopment of the UA51 site	Support for the proposed allocation is noted. The Core Strategy (2012) and Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)	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
				buildings, their footprint and the current road layout. This would maximise benefits to the centre of West Byfleet.	as a whole, unconstrained by the footprint of existing buildings and road layout, particularly Sheer House and the Library, be considered a requirement for the achievement of the objective to enhance the centre of West Byfleet, improve and make the road layout less confusing and safer for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles and meet the requirements for sustainable development. The height of Sheer House is an unsightly anomaly and does not conform or add to the character of West Byfleet and that the comprehensive redevelopment of the UA51 site should be restricted to a height that is in keeping with other buildings around the centre of West Byfleet, 2, 3 or 4 storey.	(2015) set clear design policy and guidance that development proposals must comply with. The Design SPD in particular contains specific guidance on the comprehensive redevelopment of this site and how it should respond positively to its immediate context. Therefore restricting the building heights for proposed developments on the site would be too prescriptive and each planning application should be determined on its own merits.	of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	UA51	The proposed redevelopment of the site would meet a number of objectives of sustainable development.	None stated.	Support for the proposed allocation is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	UA51	Comprehensive redevelopment would provide the opportunity to redesign traffic flow and improve road safety and access. The current layout is confusing and dangerous.	West Byfleet has established a Neighbourhood Forum and plans to issue a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). Any proposed development within West Byfleet should conform to the aspirations of the NDP, once published.	Support for the proposed allocation is noted. As set out in the Localism Act (2011), Neighbourhood Development Plans will form part of the Development Plan for the area once adopted. It is therefore agreed that any proposal will be required to comply with the adopted development plan of the area at the time of the planning application for the development of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB15	All of the proposed development is within Flood Zone 2 and without significant flood infrastructure, there is no minimum standard of flood protection. The IDP is too vague on flood risk but given the close proximity to the Wey Navigation and removal of 30ha of sock away there is a considerable risk of flooding and surface water management for the site and surrounding area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. To clarify, the latest Environment Agency Flood data shows that the site known as GB15 (West Hall) lies within Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged as the risk of flooding is 'very unlikely' (less than 1 in 1000 chance of flooding occurring each year). It is noted that the southern Section of the site (adjacent to Dodd's Bridge) is in close proximity to the Wey Navigation and flood zones 2 and 3. However development of the site in combination with Su and detailed careful masterplanning design should ensure that there is no adverse impact on flooding.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB15	Any development on the site cannot be supported by the existing road infrastructure. The A245 is gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse. This will have a negative effect on commercial activities in the area. The 2015 Woking Transport Assessment, only assessed morning peak hour, indicates a small increase in traffic flow based on Scenario E and F. However the report does not model the cumulative impact of developments in West Byfleet, Byfleet and Pyrford. The number of dwellings tested in the model are lower than proposed. It also shows unacceptable levels of Service and Ratio to Flow Capacity on surrounding roads. This will also impact access	WBC and Surrey County Council should consider more radical alternatives to mitigate the existing and increasing traffic flow from the A3 and M25 via the A245 and Pyrford Road, much of which flows to/from the new residential, retail and office developments in and around Woking. Such an alternative could include dual carriageway access from the A3 to Woking Town centre from somewhere between Wisley and Sutton Green on the A3. This would	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 transport 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. 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
				for emergency vehicles to the east of the borough.	bypass West Byfleet altogether removing a significant constraint on the further development of West Byfleet whilst at the same time improving the attractiveness of Woking as a residential, retail and commercial centre with excellent road, rail and air communication links.	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. The representation regarding the 2010 Transport Assessment has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.0. It should be noted that traffic flows are modelled during the morning peak only as it presents a worse case scenario as the afternoon/evening peak takes place over a longer period where traffic congestion is more displaced. The Council will highlight the proposed modification for a bypass to Surrey County Council, as the Highways Authority for the Borough. The Council has also consulted with the relevant emergency services to make sure their operational requirements are not compromised as a result of the proposed allocations.	
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	The Green Belt and Wey Navigation are natural buffers and offer amenity value to local people. The trees act as a sound barrier between the M25 and West Byfleet. The area suffers from flooding and present challenges to environmentally responsible development.	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 land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>The proposed allocation sets out in the key requirements that the site must contain biodiversity improvements, with built in wildlife features and corridors, have regard to biodiversity opportunities, create a strong landscape edge and minimise the impact of development on the character and landscape and setting of heritage assets.</p> <p>The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in 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
						Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	Object to the proposals for housing and commercial uses. It does not meet the five requirements of national planning policy for Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. Broadoaks is an existing Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and any proposed development on the site would have to comply with Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt. The policy allows for limited infilling and redevelopment of the site for high quality office premises due to the importance of the site to the employment strategy of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB15	The proposed developments of this scale will materially change the character of West Byfleet and therefore conflicts with the wording of the document.	None stated.	<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> <p>The representation regarding lancape character and assessments has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In lancape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	The proposed developments of this scale will materially change the character of West Byfleet and therefore conflicts with the wording of the document.	None stated.	<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> <p>The representation regarding lancape character and assessments has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In lancape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	The proposed developments will change the character of West Byfleet and therefore conflicts with the wording of the document.	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	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
						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. The representation regarding lancape character and assessments has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In lancape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage.	
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	The A245 is gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse. This will have a negative effect on commercial activities in the area. The 2010 Woking Transport Evaluation does not take into account the proposals at West hall so cannot be used to justify a minimal impact on the road network. The report only considers the impact of releasing Green Belt land for development in south Woking and therefore not relevant. This will also impact access for emergency vehicles to the east of the borough.	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 the 2010 Transport Assessment has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.0.</p> <p>The Council has also consulted with the relevant emergency services to make sure their operational requirements are not compromised as a result of the proposed allocations.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	General	West Byfleet is identified in the Core Strategy however the IDP identifies infrastructure	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph	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
				deficiencies in the area. It is therefore imperative that these are addressed as a requirement for before proposed developments are approved.		3.8, 3.9 and 3.11. 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 educational needs of local children in the Borough. 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.	of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	The proposals will place additional strain on the existing infrastructure including road capacity, healthcare provision, school places and water supply. Woking has extensive areas of Flood Zone 3 and there are no clear mitigation measures to deal with the risk of flooding, which will increase with additional development.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure provision has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8 to 3.11. In addition 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 flood risk has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. It should be noted that the site is not located within Flood Zone 3. The Council have consulted with the Environment Agency who raise no objection to the inclusion of the site in the Site Allocations DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	Broadoaks, if developed sensitively, could be a major asset for West Byfleet. However development at the site will result in traffic problems as well as pressure on healthcare, schools, public transport, water and sewerage supplies. What actions will be taken to ensure responsible future development of a sustainable and joined up plan for the borough.	None stated.	<p>The proposed site allocation contains a number of locally and statutory listed assets and redevelopment of the site would need to retain and enhance the setting of these assets. Possible sensitive restoration works would also need to be considered for any development scheme, as set out in the key requirements for the allocation. The site could also deliver residential development alongside an employment scheme and this is already set out in the draft DPD.</p> <p>This representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.6, 3.8, 3.9 and 3.10.</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 Core Strategy sets out the strategic objectives for the Borough up to 2027. It includes all areas of the Borough, including West Byfleet and sets a clear vision of what the Borough will look like by 2027 whilst providing a clear sense of direction for how the vision will be achieved. This is set out specifically in CS1. Based on the policies of the Local Development Plan and 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
						Development Plan Documents as well as the available evidence base that underpins them, the Council is confident that the proposed Site Allocations DPD identifies the most suitable and sustainable sites for current and future development needs.	
825	Martin	Bett	General	Proposed development within West Byfleet should conform to the aspirations of the Neighbourhood Plan once published.	None stated.	Neighbourhood Development Plans should not be used as a tool to prevent development. This is clearly set out by national planning policy. Nevertheless, it is correct that development proposals should comply with the Development Plan and the various Development Plan Documents for the area, including any adopted Neighbourhood Plans.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	Little natural green space in West Byfleet and the area around West Hall and the Wey Navigation is important for local people. Development would have a negative impact on the Wey and on wildlife. It should be protected. There will be no Green Belt left in the village if the proposals take place.	None stated.	<p>The Council notes the comment regarding the lack of open space in West Byfleet whilst agreeing that the Wey Navigation is an important wildlife and landscape corridor in the Borough. The Council also recognises that it is well used for recreational activities. The key requirements for the site note that additional green infrastructure could also be provided on land to the east which is within the same land ownership as GB15. This would act as a buffer to the Wey Navigation corridor with its distinctive character and wildlife corridor function. The proposed allocation also states that 4.7ha of public open space will be required to be provided as part of any development scheme.</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>It should be noted that the proposed allocation seeks to improve foot and cycle paths into the site whilst exploring the opportunity to improve the wider network.</p> <p>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. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing</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
						Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, 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.	
825	Martin	Bett	GB15	Objects. The proposed use of GB15 does not comply with national Green Belt Policy. It will increase urban sprawl from Knaphill in the west to the east of the borough.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl. The Green Belt boundary review notes that by realigning the boundary it will retain a wedge of Green Belt between new development and the M25, thus maintaining a separation between Byfleet and West Byfleet.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	UA51	A major concern around almost any development in West Byfleet is the increase in the volume of traffic. Development in the wider area has resulted in congestion and further development will make the situation worse. This will have a negative effect on commercial activities in the area. The 2015 Woking Transport Assessment, only assessed morning peak hour, indicates a small increase in traffic flow based on Scenario E and F. However the report does not model the cumulative impact of developments in West Byfleet, Byfleet and Pyrford or of this proposal. There will be unacceptable Levels of Service and Ratio to Flow Capacity. This will also impact access for emergency vehicles to the east of the borough.	WBC and Surrey County Council should consider more radical alternatives to mitigate the existing and increasing traffic flow from the A3 and M25 via the A245 and Pyrford Road, much of which flows to/from the new residential, retail and office developments in and around Woking. Such an alternative could include dual carriageway access from the A3 to Woking Town centre from somewhere between Wisley and Sutton Green on the A3. This would bypass West Byfleet altogether removing a significant constraint on the further development of West Byfleet whilst at the same time improving the attractiveness of Woking as a residential, retail and commercial centre with excellent road, rail and air communication links.	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 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, when the exact amount and type of development will be fully known and able to be assessed. It should be noted that traffic flows are modelled during the morning peak only as it presents a worse case scenario as the afternoon/evening peak takes place over a longer period where traffic congestion is more displaced. 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, including development proposals within and outside of the Borough. 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. The Council will highlight this the proposed modification to Surrey County Council, as the Highways Authority for the Borough. The site is in a sustainable location, close to 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
						existing public transport and local services, therefore reducing the need to travel by private vehicle.	
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	Any development on the site cannot be supported by the existing road infrastructure. The A245 is gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse. This will have a negative effect on commercial activities in the area. The 2015 Woking Transport Assessment, only assessed morning peak hour, indicates a small increase in traffic flow based on Scenario E and F. However the report does not model the cumulative impact of developments in West Byfleet, Byfleet and Pyrford. The number of dwellings tested in the model are lower than proposed. It also shows unacceptable levels of Service and Ratio to Flow Capacity on surrounding roads. This will also impact access for emergency vehicles to the east of the borough.	WBC and Surrey County Council should consider more radical alternatives to mitigate the existing and increasing traffic flow from the A3 and M25 via the A245 and Coldharbour and Pyrford Roads, much of which flows to/from the new residential, retail and office developments in and around Woking. Such an alternative could include dual carriageway access from the A3 to Woking Town centre from somewhere between Wisley and Sutton Green on the A3. This would bypass West Byfleet altogether removing a significant constraint on the further development of West Byfleet whilst at the same time improving the attractiveness of Woking as a residential, retail and commercial centre with excellent road, rail and air communication links.	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 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. 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. The representation regarding the 2010 Transport Assessment has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.0. It should be noted that traffic flows are modelled during the morning peak only as it presents a worse case scenario as the afternoon/evening peak takes place over a longer period where traffic congestion is more displaced. The Council will highlight the proposed modification for a bypass to Surrey County Council, as the Highways Authority for the Borough. The Council has also consulted with the relevant emergency services to make sure their operational requirements are not compromised as a result of the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	UA51	Objecting. Development in West Byfleet Centre should provide adequate parking for residential and commercial purposes. This is key to the successful development of West Byfleet. There is current parking displacement and parking pressures.	None stated.	The draft site allocation notes within the key requirements for the site that the redevelopment of the site must provide appropriate and adequate provision of car and cycle parking that takes into account the site's sustainable location and will not compromise on highway safety; (and comply with the Parking Standards SPD). Car parking provision should not be reduced and suitable provision for cycle parking should be provided. The Council recognise the importance of providing adequate parking provision as part of new developments and this has been reflected in the draft DPD. Guidance highlighting the design of parking and access is set out within the Design SPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	UA51	Objecting. The proposals would place additional	Any redevelopment in or around	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				strain on the existing and planned infrastructure. As noted in the IDP, there are a shortage of school places, the medical facilities are at capacity and West Byfleet is an area of severe water supply stress.	West Byfleet must adequately address the issues identified in the Infrastructure Development Plan relating to the provision of school places, healthcare (GP provision) and water supply.	and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8, 3.9 and 3.11. 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 educational needs of local children in the Borough. 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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	General	Development in the centre of West Byfleet should provide adequate parking for residential and commercial purposes. Recent developments have not provided enough parking which has impacted adjacent roads. The heavy use of the Recreation Ground has also added to parking pressures. It is the only Recreation Ground in Woking without dedicated parking.	None stated.	The draft site allocation notes within the key requirements for the site that the redevelopment of the site must provide appropriate and adequate provision of car and cycle parking that takes into account the site's sustainable location and will not compromise on highway safety; (and comply with the Parking Standards SPD). Car parking provision should not be reduced and suitable provision for cycle parking should be provided. The Council recognise the importance of providing adequate parking provision as part of new developments and this has been reflected in the draft DPD. Guidance highlighting the design of parking and access is set out within the Design SPD. The Council note the popularity of the Recreation Ground for sports and recreation uses and the consequence of this on the local road network. The Local Planning Authority will draw the Council's Neighbourhood Services to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Nevertheless, the proposed allocated sites are all within walking and cycling distance of the recreation ground and therefore should reduce the need to travel to the recreation ground by car.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	General	Due to changes in the Borough, the amount of traffic generated has significantly increased. Traffic along the A245 and surrounding roads is at a standstill. Any further development will add additional traffic to a road network is already beyond capacity. This will have a negative impact on the borough, residents and commercial activity. Will also impact emergency services. Detailed traffic assessments need to be conducted and innovative proposals needs to address keys issues. WBC and SCC need to consider alternatives to mitigate existing and increasing traffic flow from the A3 and M25 via A245 and Pyrford Road.	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. 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	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>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. The Council has also consulted with the relevant emergency services to make sure their operational requirements are not compromised as a result of the proposed allocations.</p> <p>The Council note the suggestion for a West Byfleet by-pass between Woking Town Centre and the A3. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this for their consideration.</p>	
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	The proposed allocation does not meet the principles of sustainable development.	None stated.	The purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is to assess each site against sustainability criteria. The Council has assessed this site against the criteria and consider it to be the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The SA considered both urban area and Green Belt sites, in total 125 alternative sites were considered in the Green Belt alone. Please refer to the SA which is on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	The proposed development will remove almost 15ha of Green Belt with diverse natural habitats, flora and fauna and will not protect the borough's important landscapes, habitats and biodiversity.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. 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 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
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	Objects. The proposed use of GB16 does not comply with national Green Belt Policy. It will increase urban sprawl from Knaphill in the west to the east of the borough.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl. The Green Belt boundary review notes that by realigning the boundary it will retain a wedge of Green Belt between new development and the M25, thus maintaining a separation between Byfleet and West Byfleet.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB15	The proposed development will not meet the principles of sustainable development as it is within Flood Zone 2 and features a number of existing drainage channels. It will remove an area	Given the level of impact of releasing almost 30ha from the green belt, removing an important buffer	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0</p> <p>To clarify, the latest Environment Agency Flood data shows that</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 natural drainage and increase flood risk across the local area.	between West Byfleet and the M25 and the impact on infrastructure (healthcare, schools and water supply) and the road network that building 592 dwellings on the GB15 site will cause, I propose that this site be retained as Green Belt and incorporated into the GB17 SANG to preserve a suitable green belt around West Byfleet and maintain the character of the village.	the site known as GB15 (West Hall) lies within Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged as the risk of flooding is 'very unlikely' (less than 1 in 1000 chance of flooding occurring each year). It is noted that the southern Section of the site (adjacent to Dodd's Bridge) is in close proximity to the Wey Navigation and flood zones 2 and 3. However development of the site in combination with Su and detailed careful masterplanning design should ensure that there is no adverse impact on flooding.	
825	Martin	Bett	GB15	The scale of the proposal is not supported by the existing and planned infrastructure. There are a shortage of school places in the local area by 2019, the health centre is at capacity and West Byfleet is designated as an area of severe water supply stress.	Any redevelopment in or around West Byfleet must adequately address the issues identified in the Infrastructure Development Plan relating to the provision of school places, healthcare (GP provision) and water supply.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8, 3.9 and 3.11. 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 educational needs of local children in the Borough. 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
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	The scale of the proposal is not supported by the existing and planned infrastructure. There are a shortage of school places in the local area by 2019, the health centre is at capacity and West Byfleet is designated as an area of severe water supply stress.	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, 3.9 and 3.11. 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 educational needs of local children in the Borough. 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
825	Martin	Bett	GB15	The proposal will encroach into a large proportion of the Green Belt around West Byfleet.	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. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green	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
						Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	The proposal will encroach into a large proportion of the Green Belt around West Byfleet.	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. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB15	The proposal actively discourages the recycling of urban sites.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.6 and 1.7. The Council accept that the release of Green Belt land for development will reduce the amount of Green Belt land and countryside in the Borough. 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. It should also be noted that the Site Allocations DPD identifies over 50 sites in the existing urban area for a wide range of development including residential, retail and commercial uses. Almost all of these sites will require the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	The proposal actively discourages the recycling of urban sites.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.6 and 1.7. The Council accept that the release of Green Belt land for development will reduce the amount of Green Belt land and countryside in the Borough. 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. It should also be noted that the Site Allocations DPD identifies over 50 sites in the existing urban area for a wide range of development including residential, retail and commercial uses. Almost all of these sites will require the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB15	The existing infrastructure is at capacity and additional dwellings will reduce this provision and quality to all residents.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8, 3.9 and 3.11.</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 educational needs of local children in the Borough.</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</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 proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	The existing infrastructure is at capacity and additional dwellings will reduce this provision and quality to all residents.	Any redevelopment in or around West Byfleet must adequately address the issues identified in the Infrastructure Development Plan relating to the provision of school places, healthcare (GP provision) and water supply.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8, 3.9 and 3.11.</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 educational needs of local children in the Borough.</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
825	Martin	Bett	GB15	The proposed development removes almost 30ha of green space and does not provide green space or access to the countryside.	None stated.	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 land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	The proposed development removes almost 15ha of green space and does not provide green space or access to the countryside.	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. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	It will not preserve the character of the Broadoaks site and surrounding Green Belt and hence the special character of West Byfleet.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, including Broadoaks House and adjacent	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
						buildings, 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. It should also be noted that the site currently has outstanding planning permission for three large office buildings/data centres. The permitted scheme was considered to have no significant harmful impact on the heritage assets of the site. The DPD also states that any proposed development must retain and enhance the setting of the heritage assets and consider the possibility of sensitive re-use or restoration works.	
825	Martin	Bett	GB15	It will not preserve the character of the West Hall site and surrounding Green Belt and hence the special character of West Byfleet.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, including Broadoaks House and West Hall, 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. The proposed allocation is not considered to have a significant harmful impact on the heritage assets adjacent to the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB15	The site will increase the risk of Byfleet and West Byfleet merging with only the M25, Wey Navigation and proposed site GB17.	None stated.	Although the proposed allocation will reduce the gap between Byfleet and West Byfleet, it is not considered to result in the merging of neighbouring towns. The West Hall Estate, proposed SANG (Site GB17) and the M25 motorway all serve to maintain effective separation between the two areas as well as protect valued features of the area, including the ancient woodland of Old Wood, the listed West Hall and its setting as well as biodiversity assets.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	The site will increase the risk of Byfleet and West Byfleet merging with only the M25, Wey Navigation and proposed site GB17.	None stated.	Although the proposed allocation will reduce the gap between Byfleet and West Byfleet, it is not considered to result in the merging of neighbouring towns. The West Hall Estate, proposed SANG (Site GB17) and the M25 motorway all serve to maintain effective separation between the two areas as well as protect valued features of the area, including the ancient woodland of Old Wood, the listed West Hall and its setting as well as biodiversity assets.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB15	West Byfleet and Woking will become unattractive locations that are not attractive, prosperous or competitive due to inadequate transport and infrastructure provision.	None stated.	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 land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	West Byfleet and Woking will become unattractive locations that are not attractive, prosperous or competitive due to inadequate transport and infrastructure provision.	None stated.	The Spatial Vision of the Core Strategy sets out how the Borough will achieve sustainable development, which will create a sustainable community where people will choose to live, work and visit. The need to concentrate most new development in sustainable locations where facilities and services are easily	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
						accessible by all relevant modes of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport is paramount. One of the objectives of the Core Strategy is to work in partnership with Surrey County Council and other stakeholders for enable the provision of transport infrastructure to deliver a transport system that enable people to access key services, facilities and jobs. The Council intend to deliver the Core Strategy in full in order to meet all of the objectives set out.	
825	Martin	Bett	GB15	The proposed development is largely in excess of 1 mile from the centre of West Byfleet and many residents will travel by car, therefore not reducing the need to travel and promoting sustainable modes of transport.	None stated.	<p>The Site Allocations DPD, informed by both the Green Belt boundary review and the Sustainability Appraisal, seeks to allocate sites for development in the most sustainable locations. This is consistent with both national policy (NPPF) and the Core Strategy. When compared to all reasonable alternatives, the Council consider the proposed allocation to be in a sustainable location close to existing services, public transport and community facilities.</p> <p>More information about how the Council has assessed alternative sites in the Green Belt is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.</p> <p>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
825	Martin	Bett	GB15	The proposed development will remove almost 30ha of Green Belt with diverse natural habitats, flora and fauna and will not protect the borough's important landscapes, habitats and biodiversity.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. 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 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB15	The proposals will remove the natural buffer of Green Belt between the M25 and West Byfleet and will therefore increase air, light, water and noise pollution.	None stated.	<p>The Council monitors air quality throughout the Borough to make sure pollution levels remain below the recommended/legal limit. In terms of Planning Policy, Core Strategy Policy CS21 as well as the Development Management Policies DPD set out a robust policy framework to make sure that new development does not have a significant impact on air quality. Where a negative impact is identified, the Council will require mitigation measures to be implemented. This can only be determined at the planning application stage, when development proposals are considered in more detail and where up to date evidence can be used 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>establish air quality levels.</p> <p>The key requirements for the site note that due to the significant traffic on the M25, the development will need to consider the impacts on noise and ensure mitigation measures are implemented to protect residential amenity. A Noise Impact Assessment would be required. The Council also has a robust policy framework to make sure that developments near sources of noise provide mitigation measures.</p> <p>The key requirements for the site also note that trees, landscaping and green infrastructure should be retained and enhanced where possible.</p> <p>The proposed allocation is not expected to have any significant impacts on light or water pollution. The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency and other stakeholders to ensure that pollution of this nature as a result of development will be minimised.</p>	
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	The proposals will remove the natural buffer of Green Belt between the M25 and West Byfleet and will therefore increase air, light, water and noise pollution.	None stated.	<p>The Council monitors air quality throughout the Borough to make sure pollution levels remain below the recommended/legal limit. In terms of Planning Policy, Core Strategy Policy CS21 as well as the Development Management Policies DPD set out a robust policy framework to make sure that new development does not have a significant impact on air quality. Where a negative impact is identified, the Council will require mitigation measures to be implemented. This can only be determined at the planning application stage, when development proposals are considered in more detail and where up to date evidence can be used to establish air quality levels. The key requirements for the site note that due to the significant traffic on the M25, the development will need to consider the impacts on noise and ensure mitigation measures are implemented to protect residential amenity. A Noise Impact Assessment would be required. The Council also has a robust policy framework to make sure that developments near sources of noise provide mitigation measures. The key requirements for the site also note that trees, landscaping and green infrastructure should be retained and enhanced where possible. The proposed allocation is not expected to have any significant impacts on light or water pollution. The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency and other stakeholders to ensure that pollution of this nature as a result of development will be minimised.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
825	Martin	Bett	GB15	The proposed development will not protect or enhance the natural environment through the removal of almost 30ha of Green Belt.	West Byfleet has established a Neighbourhood Forum and plans to issue a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). Any proposed development within West Byfleet should conform to the aspirations of the NDP, once published.	<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</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>area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Development Plans should not be used as a tool to prevent development. This is clearly set out by national planning policy. Nevertheless, it is correct that development proposals should comply with the Development Plan and the various Development Plan Documents for the area, including any adopted Neighbourhood Plans.</p>	
825	Martin	Bett	GB16	The proposed development will not protect or enhance the natural environment through the removal of almost 15ha of Green Belt.	West Byfleet has established a Neighbourhood Forum and plans to issue a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). Any proposed development within West Byfleet should conform to the aspirations of the NDP, once published.	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 land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest. Neighbourhood Development Plans should not be used as a tool to prevent development. This is clearly set out by national planning policy. Nevertheless, it is correct that development proposals should comply with the Development Plan and the various Development Plan Documents for the area, including any adopted Neighbourhood Plans.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
827	Pamela	Bett	UA51	The proposed redevelopment of the site would meet a number of objectives of sustainable development.	None stated.	Support for the site is noted. The Council also believe that the site is in a sustainable location and redevelopment of the site would support the criteria for sustainable development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
827	Pamela	Bett	UA51	Comprehensive redevelopment would provide the opportunity to redesign traffic flow and improve road safety and access. The current layout is confusing and dangerous.	None stated.	The comprehensive redevelopment of the site would offer the opportunity to carry out highways improvements around the site. This would need to be inline with best practice guidance and supported by the County Highways Authority.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
827	Pamela	Bett	GB15	The proposed developments of this scale will materially change the character of West Byfleet and therefore conflicts with the wording of the document.	None stated.	<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> <p>The representation regarding lancape character and assessments has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In lancape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved</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
						on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage.	
827	Pamela	Bett	GB16	The proposed developments of this scale will materially change the character of West Byfleet and therefore conflicts with the wording of the document.	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. The representation regarding lancape character and assessments has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In lancape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
827	Pamela	Bett	General	West Byfleet is identified in the Core Strategy however the IDP identifies infrastructure deficiencies in the area. It is therefore imperative that these are addressed as a requirement for before proposed developments are approved.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8, 3.9 and 3.11.</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 educational needs of local children in the Borough.</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
827	Pamela	Bett	General	Proposed development within West Byfleet should conform to the aspirations of the Neighbourhood Plan once published.	None stated.	Neighbourhood Development Plans should not be used as a tool to prevent development. This is clearly set out by national planning policy. Nevertheless, it is correct that development proposals should comply with the Development Plan and the various Development Plan Documents for the area, including any adopted Neighbourhood Plans.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
827	Pamela	Bett	GB15	All of the proposed development is within Flood Zone 2 and without significant flood infrastructure, there is no minimum standard of flood protection.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0</p> <p>To clarify, the latest Environment Agency Flood data shows that the site known as GB15 (West Hall) lies within Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged as the risk of flooding is 'very unlikely' (less than 1 in 1000 chance of flooding occurring each year). It is noted that the southern Section of the site (adjacent to Dodd's Bridge) is in close proximity to the Wey Navigation and flood zones 2 and 3. However development of the site in combination with Su and detailed careful masterplanning design should ensure that there is no adverse impact on flooding.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
827	Pamela	Bett	UA51	A major concern around almost any development	West Byfleet has established a	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				in West Byfleet is the increase in the volume of traffic. Development in the wider area has resulted in congestion and further development will make the situation worse. This will have a negative effect on commercial activities in the area. The 2015 Woking Transport Assessment, only assessed morning peak hour, indicates a small increase in traffic flow based on Scenario E and F. However the report does not model the cumulative impact of developments in West Byfleet, Byfleet and Pyrford. This will also impact access for emergency vehicles to the east of the borough.	Neighbourhood Forum and plans to issue a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). Any proposed development within West Byfleet should conform to the aspirations of the NDP, once published. That the comprehensive redevelopment of the UA51 site as a whole, unconstrained by the footprint of existing buildings and road layout, be considered a requirement for the achievement of the objective to: enhance the centre of West Byfleet improve and make the road layout less confusing and safer for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles; and meet the requirements for sustainable development. The height of Sheer House does not conform to the character of West Byfleet and that the comprehensive redevelopment of the UA51 site should be restricted to a height that is in keeping with other buildings around the centre of West Byfleet: 4 storeys. Any redevelopment in or around West Byfleet must adequately address the issues identified in the Infrastructure Development Plan relating to the provision of school places, healthcare (GP provision) and water supply. WBC and Surrey County Council should consider more radical alternatives to mitigate the existing and increasing traffic flow from the A3 and M25 via the A245 and Pyrford Road, much of which flows to/from the new residential, retail and office developments in and around Woking.	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 transport 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, when the exact amount and type of development will be fully known and able to be assessed. It should be noted that traffic flows are modelled during the morning peak only as it presents a worse case scenario as the afternoon/evening peak takes place over a longer period where traffic congestion is more displaced. 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, including development proposals within and outside of the Borough. 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. The Council will highlight this representation to Surrey County Council, as the Highways Authority for the Borough. The site is in a sustainable location, close to the existing public transport and local services, therefore reducing the need to travel by private vehicle.	is proposed as a result of this representation
827	Pamela	Bett	GB15	Any development on the site cannot be supported by the existing road infrastructure. The A245 is gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse. This will have a negative effect on commercial activities in the area. The 2015 Woking Transport Assessment, only assessed morning peak hour, indicates a small increase in traffic flow based on Scenario E and F. However the report does not model the cumulative impact of developments in West Byfleet, Byfleet and Pyrford. The number of dwellings tested in the model are lower than proposed. It also shows unacceptable levels of Service and Ratio to Flow Capacity on	Given the level of impact of releasing 29.5ha from the green belt, removing an important buffer between West Byfleet and the M25 and the impact on infrastructure (healthcare, schools and water supply) and the road network that building 592 dwellings on the GB15 site will cause, I propose that this site should be withdrawn from the green belt site list and be incorporated into the GB17 SANG to preserve a suitable	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 transport 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	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
				surrounding roads. This will also impact access for emergency vehicles to the east of the borough.	green belt around West Byfleet and maintain the character of the village. Any redevelopment in or around West Byfleet must adequately address the issues identified in the Infrastructure Development Plan relating to the provision of school places, healthcare (GP provision) and water supply. WBC and Surrey County Council should consider more radical alternatives to mitigate the existing and increasing traffic flow from the A3 and M25 via the A245 and Pyrford Road, much of which flows to/from the new residential, retail and office developments in and around Woking. Such an alternative could include dualcarriageway access from the A3 to Woking Town centre from somewhere between Wisley and Sutton Green on the A3. This would bypass West Byfleet altogether removing a significant constraint on the further development of West Byfleet whilst at the same time improving the attractiveness of Woking as a residential, retail and commercial centre with excellent road, rail and air communication links.	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 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. The representation regarding the 2010 Transport Assessment has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.0. It should be noted that traffic flows are modelled during the morning peak only as it presents a worse case scenario as the afternoon/evening peak takes place over a longer period where traffic congestion is more displaced. The Council will highlight the proposed modification for a bypass to Surrey County Council, as the Highways Authority for the Borough. The Council has also consulted with the relevant emergency services to make sure their operational requirements are not compromised as a result of the proposed allocations. The proposed modification to allocate GB15 for SANG is noted by the Council. All the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution towards meeting the housing requirement. Not allocating any or all of the sites (or not having new sites to replace any site that is rejected) could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy. The key requirements set out as part of the proposed allocations will further make sure that any adverse impacts on the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt and the general environment of the area is minimised.	
827	Pamela	Bett	GB16	Any development on the site cannot be supported by the existing road infrastructure. The A245 is gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse. This will have a negative effect on commercial activities in the area. The 2015 Woking Transport Assessment, only assessed morning peak hour, indicates a small increase in traffic flow based on Scenario E and F. However the report does not model the cumulative impact of developments in West Byfleet, Byfleet and Pyrford. The number of dwellings tested in the model are lower than proposed. It also shows unacceptable levels of Service and Ratio to Flow Capacity on surrounding roads. This will also impact access for emergency vehicles to the east of the borough.	Proposed modifications – please explain what changes you consider should be made, if any (for example, changes to the text, a site boundary, etc.) West Byfleet has established a Neighbourhood Forum and plans to issue a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). Any proposed development within West Byfleet should conform to the aspirations of the NDP, once published. Any redevelopment in or around West Byfleet must adequately address the issues identified in the Infrastructure Development Plan relating to the provision of school places, healthcare (GP provision) and	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 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. 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	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
					water supply. WBC and Surrey County Council should consider more radical alternatives to mitigate the existing and increasing traffic flow from the A3 and M25 via the A245 and Coldharbour and Pyrford Roads, much of which flows to/from the new residential, retail and office developments in and around Woking. Such an alternative could include dual carriageway access from the A3 to Woking Town centre from somewhere between Wisley and Sutton Green on the A3. This would bypass West Byfleet altogether removing a significant constraint on the further development of West Byfleet whilst at the same time improving the attractiveness of Woking as a residential, retail and commercial centre with excellent road, rail and air communication links.	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 including Elmbridge Borough Council. 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. The representation regarding the 2010 Transport Assessment has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.0. The Council has also consulted with the relevant emergency services to make sure their operational requirements are not compromised as a result of the proposed allocations. Regarding the proposed modification, as set out in planning legislation and policy, Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the Development Plan for the area, in this case the Woking Core Strategy and other development plan documents as well as the National Planning Policy Framework. Any proposed modifications to the sites in the DPD will be clearly set out when the document is published for Regulation 19 consultation. The Council's response to infrastructure provision is set out within Section 3.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper as well as the key requirements for the individual sites. The Council will highlight the proposed modification for a bypass to Surrey County Council, as the Highways Authority for the Borough.	
827	Pamela	Bett	UA51	Objecting. Development in West Byfleet Centre should provide adequate parking for residential and commercial purposes. This is key to the successful development of West Byfleet.	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 and existing traffic congestion.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
827	Pamela	Bett	GB16	The proposed development will remove almost 15ha of Green Belt with diverse natural habitats, flora and fauna and will not protect the borough's important landscapes, habitats and biodiversity.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. 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 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	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
						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.	
827	Pamela	Bett	GB15	The proposed development will not meet the principles of sustainable development as it is within Flood Zone 2 and features a number of existing drainage channels. It will remove an area of natural drainage and increase flood risk across the local area.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0</p> <p>To clarify, the latest Environment Agency Flood data shows that the site known as GB15 (West Hall) lies within Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged as the risk of flooding is 'very unlikely' (less than 1 in 1000 chance of flooding occurring each year). It is noted that the southern Section of the site (adjacent to Dodd's Bridge) is in close proximity to the Wey Navigation and flood zones 2 and 3. However development of the site in combination with Su and detailed careful masterplanning design should ensure that there is no adverse impact on flooding.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
827	Pamela	Bett	GB15	The proposal does not comply with the Green Belt polices of the NPPF.	None stated.	The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development and whether the Council's approach is consistent with National Green Belt Policy, has been 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
827	Pamela	Bett	UA51	Objecting. The proposals would place additional strain on the existing and planned infrastructure. As noted in the IDP, there are a shortage of school places, the medical facilities are at capacity and West Byfleet is an area of severe water supply stress.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8, 3.9 and 3.11.</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 educational needs of local children in the Borough.</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
827	Pamela	Bett	GB15	The scale of the proposal is not supported by the existing and planned infrastructure. There are a shortage of school places in the local area by 2019, the health centre is at capacity and West Byfleet is designated as an area of severe water supply stress.	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, 3.9 and 3.11. 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 educational needs of local children in the Borough. 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
827	Pamela	Bett	GB16	The scale of the proposal is not supported by the existing and planned infrastructure. There are a shortage of school places in the local area by	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, 3.9 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
				2019, the health centre is at capacity and West Byfleet is designated as an area of severe water supply stress.		<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 educational needs of local children in the Borough.</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>	
827	Pamela	Bett	General	Development in the centre of West Byfleet should provide adequate parking for residential and commercial purposes. Recent developments have not provided enough parking which has impacted adjacent roads. The heavy use of the Recreation Ground has also added to parking pressures. It is the only Recreation Ground in Woking without dedicated parking.	None stated.	<p>The draft site allocation notes within the key requirements for the site that the redevelopment of the site must provide appropriate and adequate provision of car and cycle parking that takes into account the site's sustainable location and will not compromise on highway safety; (and comply with the Parking Standards SPD). Car parking provision should not be reduced and suitable provision for cycle parking should be provided. The Council recognise the importance of providing adequate parking provision as part of new developments and this has been reflected in the draft DPD. Guidance highlighting the design of parking and access is set out within the Design SPD.</p> <p>The Council note the popularity of the Recreation Ground for sports and recreation uses and the consequence of this on the local road network. The Local Planning Authority will draw the Council's Neighbourhood Services to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Nevertheless, the proposed allocated sites are all within walking and cycling distance of the recreation ground and therefore should reduce the need to travel to the recreation ground by car.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
827	Pamela	Bett	General	Any further development in West Byfleet will add additional traffic to a road network is already beyond capacity. This will have a negative impact on the borough, residents and commercial activity. Will also impact emergency services. Detailed traffic assessments need to be conducted and innovative proposals needs to address keys issues. WBC and SCC need to consider alternatives to mitigate existing and increasing traffic flow from the A3 and M25 via A245 and Pyrford Road.	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. 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. 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</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
						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. The Council has also consulted with the relevant emergency services to make sure their operational requirements are not compromised as a result of the proposed allocations. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding alternative solutions to congestion 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.	
827	Pamela	Bett	UA51	Support the comprehensive redevelopment of the site and removing the constraints of existing buildings, their footprint and the current road layout. This would maximise benefits to the centre of West Byfleet.	None stated.	Support for the proposed site allocation is noted. The Council agrees that a comprehensive redevelopment of the site would maximise the opportunities to enhance the centre of West Byfleet. The key requirements noted in the allocation highlight a number of design related issues that any proposed development must address, including improving the quality of the public realm, building footprints to be of an appropriate scale to reflect the grain and character of adjacent development and improving pedestrian connectivity within West Byfleet.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
827	Pamela	Bett	GB16	Objects. The proposed use of GB16 does not comply with national Green Belt Policy.	None stated.	The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development and whether the Council's approach is consistent with National Green Belt Policy, has been 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
827	Pamela	Bett	GB15	The existing infrastructure is at capacity and additional dwellings will reduce this provision and quality to all residents.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8, 3.9 and 3.11.</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 educational needs of local children in the Borough.</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
827	Pamela	Bett	GB16	The existing infrastructure is at capacity and additional dwellings will reduce this provision and quality to all residents.	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, 3.9 and 3.11. 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 educational needs of local children in the Borough. 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	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
						unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
827	Pamela	Bett	GB15	The proposed development removes 29.5ha of green space and does not provide green space or access to the countryside.	None stated.	The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land. The Council 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
827	Pamela	Bett	GB16	The proposed development removes almost 15ha of green space and does not provide green space or access to the countryside.	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. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
827	Pamela	Bett	GB15	West Byfleet and Woking will become unattractive locations that are not attractive, prosperous or competitive due to inadequate transport and infrastructure provision.	None stated.	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
827	Pamela	Bett	GB16	West Byfleet and Woking will become unattractive locations that are not attractive, prosperous or competitive due to inadequate transport and infrastructure provision.	None stated.	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
827	Pamela	Bett	GB15	The proposed development is largely in excess of 1 mile from the centre of West Byfleet and many residents will travel by car, therefore not reducing the need to travel and promoting sustainable modes of transport.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD, informed by both the Green Belt boundary review and the Sustainability Appraisal, seeks to allocate sites for development in the most sustainable locations. This is consistent with both national policy (NPPF) and the Core Strategy. When compared to all reasonable alternatives, the Council consider the proposed allocation to be in a sustainable location close to existing services, public transport and community facilities. More information about how the Council has assessed alternative sites in the Green Belt is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0. 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
827	Pamela	Bett	GB15	The proposed development will remove 29.5ha of	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Green Belt with diverse natural habitats, flora and fauna and will not protect the borough's important landscapes, habitats and biodiversity.		Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. 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 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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
827	Pamela	Bett	GB15	The proposals will remove the natural buffer of Green Belt between the M25 and West Byfleet and will therefore increase air, light, water and noise pollution.	None stated.	<p>The Council monitors air quality throughout the Borough to make sure pollution levels remain below the recommended/legal limit. In terms of Planning Policy, Core Strategy Policy CS21 as well as the Development Management Policies DPD set out a robust policy framework to make sure that new development does not have a significant impact on air quality. Where a negative impact is identified, the Council will require mitigation measures to be implemented. This can only be determined at the planning application stage, when development proposals are considered in more detail and where up to date evidence can be used to establish air quality levels.</p> <p>The key requirements for the site note that due to the significant traffic on the M25, the development will need to consider the impacts on noise and ensure mitigation measures are implemented to protect residential amenity. A Noise Impact Assessment would be required. The Council also has a robust policy framework to make sure that developments near sources of noise provide mitigation measures.</p> <p>The key requirements for the site also note that trees, landscaping and green infrastructure should be retained and enhanced where possible.</p> <p>The proposed allocation is not expected to have any significant impacts on light or water pollution. The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency and other stakeholders to ensure that pollution of this nature as a result of development will be minimised.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
827	Pamela	Bett	GB16	The proposals will remove the natural buffer of Green Belt between the M25 and West Byfleet and will therefore increase air, light, water and noise pollution.	None stated.	The Council monitors air quality throughout the Borough to make sure pollution levels remain below the recommended/legal limit. In terms of Planning Policy, Core Strategy Policy CS21 as well as the Development Management Policies DPD set out a robust policy framework to make sure that new development does not have a significant impact on air quality. Where a negative impact is identified, the Council will require mitigation measures to be	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
						implemented. This can only be determined at the planning application stage, when development proposals are considered in more detail and where up to date evidence can be used to establish air quality levels. The key requirements for the site note that due to the significant traffic on the M25, the development will need to consider the impacts on noise and ensure mitigation measures are implemented to protect residential amenity. A Noise Impact Assessment would be required. The Council also has a robust policy framework to make sure that developments near sources of noise provide mitigation measures. The key requirements for the site also note that trees, landscaping and green infrastructure should be retained and enhanced where possible. The proposed allocation is not expected to have any significant impacts on light or water pollution. The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency and other stakeholders to ensure that pollution of this nature as a result of development will be minimised.	
827	Pamela	Bett	GB15	The proposed development will not protect or enhance the natural environment through the removal of 29.5ha of Green Belt.	None stated.	The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land. The Council 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
827	Pamela	Bett	GB16	The proposed development will not protect or enhance the natural environment through the removal of almost 15ha of Green Belt.	None stated.	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 land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
172	Verity	Betterley	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 4. Whilst Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect the purpose of the Green Belt, it also commits the Council to release Green Belt land to meet development requirements of the Core Strategy. The proposal is therefore not contrary to Policy CS6 or the NPPF.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
172	Verity	Betterley	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3a 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.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation needs for Travellers has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 4. Ten Acre Farm is about 3.36ha. 72.05% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. 6.52% in Flood Zone 2 and 5.51% in Flood Zone 3. The Council has carried out a sequential tests to justify the use of the 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
						accommodation needs of Travellers. Development on the site will be directed to the area of the site with the least risk of flooding, i.e. Flood Zone 1. The is considered an enforceable approach that will be clarified in the allocation. The allocation also includes key requirement to ensure that detailed flood risk assessment is carried out to inform the planning application process for any scheme that will come forward for the delivery of the site. With the specifications set out in the key requirements of the allocation, the Council is satisfied that the site can be developed without significant flood risk to occupiers. It is also not envisaged that the development will exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The site can be developed with no significant adverse impacts on the visual amenity of the area and nearby residents. There are robust policies in the Core Strategy to ensure that this is achieved,	
172	Verity	Betterley	GB7	The GBR considered other options to meet future need for pitches including WOK001 and WOK006. There are also sites with capacity to deliver 15 pitches each combined (land at West Hall WGB004a/SHLAAWB019b and south of High Road WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These are omitted from the DPD with little explanation.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The 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
172	Verity	Betterley	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.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The representation has been 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
172	Verity	Betterley	GB7	Ten Acre Farm does not have the required accessibility, contrary to Woking Core Strategy and SHLAA. Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not close to facilities, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure, poor public transport, and provision of a communal building would not positively enhance the environment, increase openness or contribute to existing character.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. 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).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
172	Verity	Betterley	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. The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	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. 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 be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation 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
172	Verity	Betterley	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.	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	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 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.	
172	Verity	Betterley	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>	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	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
172	Verity	Betterley	GB7	Ten Acre Farm borders two environmentally sensitive sites. Development will adversely impact these and cannot be adequately mitigated - Smarts Heath Common (Special Sites of Scientific Interest and an "Important Bird Area") and the Hoe Stream (Site of Nature Conservation Importance, linking habitat corridor to other SNCI sites).	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The Council has a clear objective to protect environmentally sensitive sites, 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 Lancap 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. 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 Lancap 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 lancap grounds. The Lancap Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
172	Verity	Betterley	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre	It is intended to allocate the site for a business use. The site is	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008.	Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	allocated to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. In doing so, the Council need to make sure that the allocation should reflect the extent to which traditional lifestyles can contribute to sustainability. The bullet point will be reworded to clarify this point. The overall justification for the allocation of the site for Travellers accommodation is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	is proposed as a result of this representation
172	Verity	Betterley	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.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	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
172	Verity	Betterley	GB11	I strongly object to development of GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Any housing will fill the open green space between Mayford and Woking, altering the character of the village and impacting residents. Mayford has strong historical importance and was listed in the Domesday Book. The GBBR incorrectly dismisses this, saying Woking is not considered to have particularly strong historical character. The Council should preserve and promote the history of the Borough not destroy it through excessive development.	Site GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 should be removed from the Site Allocations DPD and not considered for future development.	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 lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the lancape 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. 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
172	Verity	Betterley	GB8	I strongly object to development of GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Any housing will fill the open green space between Mayford and Woking, altering the character of the village and impacting residents. Mayford has strong historical importance and was listed in the Domesday Book. The GBBR incorrectly dismisses this, saying Woking is not considered to have particularly strong historical character. The Council should preserve and promote the history	Site GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 should be removed from the Site Allocations DPD and not considered for future development.	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 lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape 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	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 Borough not destroy it through excessive development.		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. 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.	
172	Verity	Betterley	GB9	I strongly object to development of GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Any housing will fill the open green space between Mayford and Woking, altering the character of the village and impacting residents. Mayford has strong historical importance and was listed in the Domesday Book. The GBBR incorrectly dismisses this, saying Woking is not considered to have particularly strong historical character. The Council should preserve and promote the history of the Borough not destroy it through excessive development.	Site GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 should be removed from the Site Allocations DPD and not considered for future development.	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. 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
172	Verity	Betterley	GB10	I strongly object to development of GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Any housing will fill the open green space between Mayford and Woking,	Site GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 should be removed from the Site Allocations DPD and	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	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
				altering the character of the village and impacting residents. Mayford has strong historical importance and was listed in the Domesday Book. The GBBR incorrectly dismisses this, saying Woking is not considered to have particularly strong historical character. The Council should preserve and promote the history of the Borough not destroy it through excessive development.	not considered for future development.	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. 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.	
172	Verity	Betterley	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.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	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
172	Verity	Betterley	GB10	Mayford has a poor road network and traffic is gridlocked, unsuitable for further development. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are very few pedestrian footpaths. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station. The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has inadequate supporting infrastructure. Please reconsider the plans as it will irrevocably change the character of the area, which the Council has responsibility to protect not destroy.	Site GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 should be removed from the Site Allocations DPD and not considered for future development.	<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
172	Verity	Betterley	GB11	Mayford has a poor road network and traffic is gridlocked, unsuitable for further development. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are very few pedestrian footpaths. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station. The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has inadequate supporting infrastructure. Please reconsider the plans as it will irrevocably change the character of the area, which the Council has responsibility to protect not destroy.	Site GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 should be removed from the Site Allocations DPD and not considered for future development.	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	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
						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.	
172	Verity	Betterley	GB8	Mayford has a poor road network and traffic is gridlocked, unsuitable for further development. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are very few pedestrian footpaths. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station. The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has inadequate supporting infrastructure. Please reconsider the plans as it will irrevocably change the character of the area, which the Council has responsibility to protect not destroy.	Site GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 should be removed from the Site Allocations DPD and not considered for future development.	<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
172	Verity	Betterley	GB9	Mayford has a poor road network and traffic is gridlocked, unsuitable for further development. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are very few pedestrian footpaths. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station. The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has inadequate supporting infrastructure. Please reconsider the plans as it will irrevocably change the character of the area, which the Council has responsibility to protect not destroy.	Site GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 should be removed from the Site Allocations DPD and not considered for future development.	<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. 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</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
						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.	
172	Verity	Betterley	GB8	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted.	Site GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 should be removed from the Site Allocations DPD and not considered for future development.	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
172	Verity	Betterley	GB9	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted.	Site GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 should be removed from the Site Allocations DPD and not considered for future development.	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
172	Verity	Betterley	GB11	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted.	Site GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 should be removed from the Site Allocations DPD and not considered for future development.	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 an assessment of the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet future 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
172	Verity	Betterley	GB10	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted.	Site GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 should be removed from the Site Allocations DPD and not considered for future development.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
172	Verity	Betterley	GB7	No independently verified evidence demonstrating Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development or why sites listed in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included whilst others excluded. Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres are the ONLY proposed sites.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
172	Verity	Betterley	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 remediated.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The SHLAA treats all sites in the Green Belt as currently not developable. Green Belt sites will only be released for development through the plan making process. Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further	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
						additional pitches. 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 be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation 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. 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. Overall, the justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet developments needs of the area is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. see Sections 1, 2 and 4.	
172	Verity	Betterley	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with urban area sites considered before those in the Green Belt.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
172	Verity	Betterley	GB7	The TAA suggests the site and its immediate surrounding be explored for potential future expansion. The DPD incorrectly uses the term 'intensification'. This site was never envisaged to be expanded outside Mr Lee's immediate family. The Council has set aside GBR recommendations.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	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. The Council is satisfied that the number of pitches on the site can be expanded without undermining the general character 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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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	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
						address any adverse impacts.	
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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 Lancape 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 lancape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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 lancape 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	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>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>	
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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.	<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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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.	<p>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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.	<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</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 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.	
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB8	No independently verified evidence has been provided to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development potential.	None stated.	This 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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB9	No independently verified evidence has been provided to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development potential.	None stated.	This 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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB10	No independently verified evidence has been provided to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development potential.	None stated.	This 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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB11	No independently verified evidence has been provided to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development potential.	None stated.	This 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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB8	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any open space between Mayford and Woking and significantly alter the character of Mayford Village.	None stated.	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. 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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB9	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any open space between Mayford and Woking and significantly alter the character of Mayford Village.	None stated.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB10	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any open space between Mayford and Woking and significantly alter the character of Mayford Village.	None stated.	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. 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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB11	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any open space between Mayford and Woking and significantly alter the character of Mayford Village.	None stated.	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. 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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB8	Mayford's has a road network with several narrow	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				roads and most are unlit at night with few pedestrian footpaths. Worplesdon station has no easy pedestrian access, with unlit footpaths that cross heathland.		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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB9	Mayford's has a road network with several narrow roads and most are unlit at night with few pedestrian footpaths. Worplesdon station has no easy pedestrian access, with unlit footpaths that cross heathland.	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB10	Mayford's has a road network with several narrow roads and most are unlit at night with few pedestrian footpaths. Worplesdon station has no easy pedestrian access, with unlit footpaths that cross heathland.	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB11	Mayford's has a road network with several narrow roads and most are unlit at night with few pedestrian footpaths. Worplesdon station has no easy pedestrian access, with unlit footpaths that cross heathland.	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB8	Mayford is a village of strong historical importance and listed in the Domesday Book. The GBR dismisses this on the basis that "Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character." This is not correct for all parts of the Borough, and the Council should preserve and promote history, not destroy it through excessive development.	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. 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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB9	Mayford is a village of strong historical importance and listed in the Domesday Book. The GBR dismisses this on the basis that "Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character." This is not correct for all parts of the Borough, and the Council should preserve and promote history, not destroy it through excessive development.	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	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
						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. 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.	
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB10	Mayford is a village of strong historical importance and listed in the Domesday Book. The GBR dismisses this on the basis that "Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character." This is not correct for all parts of the Borough, and the Council should preserve and promote history, not destroy it through excessive development.	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. 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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB11	Mayford is a village of strong historical importance and listed in the Domesday Book. The GBR dismisses this on the basis that "Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character." This is not correct for all parts of the Borough, and the Council should preserve and promote history, not destroy it through excessive development.	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. 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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB8	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly that housing need does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	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 to 1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB9	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly that housing need does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	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 to 1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB10	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly that housing need does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	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 to 1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB11	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly	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 to 1.12.	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
				that housing need does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development			
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB8	Please reconsider the plans, which will irrevocably change the nature and character of a very special, beautiful part of the Borough. The Council has a responsibility to protect such areas, not destroy them.	The site should be removed from the DPD and not considered for future development.	All the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution towards meeting the local housing requirement. Not allocating any or all of the sites (or not having new sites to replace any site that is rejected) could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy in order to create a sustainable community for Woking Borough, where people have access to good quality housing, employment opportunities as well as recreation, social and community facilities. 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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB9	Please reconsider the plans, which will irrevocably change the nature and character of a very special, beautiful part of the Borough. The Council has a responsibility to protect such areas, not destroy them.	The site should be removed from the DPD and not considered for future development.	All the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution towards meeting the local housing requirement. Not allocating any or all of the sites (or not having new sites to replace any site that is rejected) could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy in order to create a sustainable community for Woking Borough, where people have access to good quality housing, employment opportunities as well as recreation, social and community facilities. 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	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>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>	
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB10	Please reconsider the plans, which will irrevocably change the nature and character of a very special, beautiful part of the Borough. The Council has a responsibility to protect such areas, not destroy them.	The site should be removed from the DPD and not considered for future development.	<p>All the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution towards meeting the local housing requirement. Not allocating any or all of the sites (or not having new sites to replace any site that is rejected) could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy in order to create a sustainable community for Woking Borough, where people have access to good quality housing, employment opportunities as well as recreation, social and community facilities.</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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB11	Please reconsider the plans, which will irrevocably change the nature and character of a very special, beautiful part of the Borough. The Council has a responsibility to protect such areas, not destroy them.	The site should be removed from the DPD and not considered for future development.	<p>All the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution towards meeting the local housing requirement. Not allocating any or all of the sites (or not having new sites to replace any site that is rejected) could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy in order to create a sustainable community for Woking Borough, where people have access to good quality housing, employment opportunities as well as recreation, social and community facilities. 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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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	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 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.	
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB8	The bus service to the area is poor to non-existent.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB9	The bus service to the area is poor to non-existent.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB10	The bus service to the area is poor to non-existent.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB11	The bus service to the area is poor to non-existent.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB8	There is no consideration of the effect of the development on existing residents in the area and specifically in Mayford.	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the views of local residents. However, it will have to balance that with its responsibility to meet the needs of the area. It believes that the proposals will protect the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary. 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	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
						evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB9	There is no consideration of the effect of the development on existing residents in the area and specifically in Mayford.	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the views of local residents. However, it will have to balance that with its responsibility to meet the needs of the area. It believes that the proposals will protect the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary. 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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB10	There is no consideration of the effect of the development on existing residents in the area and specifically in Mayford.	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the views of local residents. However, it will have to balance that with its responsibility to meet the needs of the area. It believes that the proposals will protect the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary. 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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB11	There is no consideration of the effect of the development on existing residents in the area and specifically in Mayford.	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the views of local residents. However, it will have to balance that with its responsibility to meet the needs of the area. It believes that the proposals will protect the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary. 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	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
						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 Matters 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 Matters Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2, and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and Barbers, Mayford does not have the facilities needed to meet the needs for several hundred additional residents.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and Barbers, Mayford does not have the facilities needed to meet the needs for several hundred additional residents.	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	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
						'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and Barbers, Mayford does not have the facilities needed to meet the needs for several hundred additional residents.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and Barbers, Mayford does not have the facilities needed to meet the needs for several hundred additional residents.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB8	The infrastructure in Mayford means it is not suitable for substantial additional development. The increase in road traffic would cause consideration congestion and hazards to pedestrians.	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB9	The infrastructure in Mayford means it is not suitable for substantial additional development. The increase in road traffic would cause consideration congestion and hazards to pedestrians.	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB10	The infrastructure in Mayford means it is not suitable for substantial additional development. The increase in road traffic would cause consideration congestion and hazards to pedestrians.	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	GB11	The infrastructure in Mayford means it is not suitable for substantial additional development. The increase in road traffic would cause consideration congestion and hazards to pedestrians.	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
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons 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.	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
				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 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 Lancape 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 lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. 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. 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. 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.	
585	Nicholas	Betterley	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 lancape 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
660	G	Beveridge	GB12	Object to Safeguarding sites GB12 and GB13 for development. Pyrford is an attractive place to live but note that the existing housing stock does not meet current demand. The village does not have the capacity (Schools, amenities or infrastructure) to support additional homes. Investment should instead be placed in school provision and infrastructure in other areas of the Borough.	None stated.	The objection to safeguarding sites is noted. The Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper sets out the Council's approach to safeguarding. See Section 2.0. The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
660	G	Beveridge	GB13	Object to Safeguarding sites GB12 and GB13 for development. Pyrford is an attractive place to live but note that the existing housing stock does not meet current demand. The village does not have the capacity (Schools,	None stated.	The objection to safeguarding sites is noted. The Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper sets out the Council's approach to safeguarding. See Section 2.0. The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	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
				amenities or infrastructure) to support additional homes. Investment should instead be placed in school provision and infrastructure in other areas of the Borough.			
660	G	Beveridge	GB12	The area has a high proportion of families and older people. Therefore, we do not need starter homes or executive apartments. More sympathetically created conversions of larger properties or sites and low density homes are needed to meet local demand.	None stated.	The Council recognises the character of Pyrford. This is set out in documents including the Heritage of Woking and the Woking Character Study. 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. It could be suggested that the lower proportion of 19-34 year olds in the area are as a result of the type of housing in the area which does not meet their needs in terms of size, tenure or affordability. The Core Strategy states that new developments must provide a range of housing types that reflect local need. The Site Allocations DPD does not state under any of the proposed allocations that a site must provide 'executive apartments'. In fact, the DPD states that developments should be consistent with Core Strategy Policy CS11: Housing mix. Core Strategy Policy CS21, the Design SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD all provide robust policy and guidance to ensure that new development reflects the local context. The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities as suggested would require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
660	G	Beveridge	GB13	The area has a high proportion of families and older people. Therefore, we do not need starter homes or executive apartments. More sympathetically created conversions of larger properties or site and low density homes are needed to meet local demand.	None stated.	The Council recognises the character of Pyrford. This is set out in documents including the Heritage of Woking and the Woking Character Study. 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. It could be suggested that the lower proportion of 19-34 year olds in the area are as a result of the type of housing in the area which does not meet their needs in terms of size, tenure or affordability. The Core Strategy states that new developments must provide a range of housing types that reflect local need. The Site Allocations DPD does not state under any of the proposed allocations that a site must provide 'executive apartments'. In fact, the DPD states that developments should be consistent with Core Strategy Policy CS11: Housing mix. Core Strategy Policy CS21, the Design SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD all provide robust policy and guidance to ensure that new development reflects the local context. The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly 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
						line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities as suggested would require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.	
660	G	Beveridge	GB12	The existing school can not be expanded and therefore future proposed residents will have to take their children to schools in Ripley - causing further traffic issues on country roads.	None stated.	This representation 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
660	G	Beveridge	GB13	The existing school can not be expanded and therefore future proposed residents will have to take their children to schools in Ripley - causing further traffic issues on country roads.	None stated.	This representation 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
660	G	Beveridge	GB12	The existing healthcare facilities in West Byfleet are at capacity with frequent long waiting times for an appointment.	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
660	G	Beveridge	GB13	The existing healthcare facilities in West Byfleet are at capacity with frequent long waiting times for an appointment.	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
660	G	Beveridge	GB12	Suggest removing GB12 and GB13 from the DPD. Invest in education and transport. Support residential developments that redevelop existing large properties to allow for down-sizing by older residents into low density properties Consider road safety measures for Coldharbour Road to prevent future accidents	None stated.	The Council's commitment to future infrastructure provision is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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 Core Strategy notes that the subdivision of existing housing will be resisted if it results in the loss of family size accommodation. The need for family sized housing across the Borough is clearly set out in the Core Strategy and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Again, the subdivision of properties or plots alone will not reduce the amount of land/or dwellings required to meet the local housing need. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to the existing safety issues on Coldharbour Road. 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
660	G	Beveridge	GB13	Suggest removing GB12 and GB13 from the DPD. Invest in education and transport. Support residential developments that redevelop existing large properties to allow for down-sizing by older residents into low density properties Consider road safety measures for Coldharbour	None stated.	The Council's commitment to future infrastructure provision is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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	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 to prevent future accidents		<p>not reduce the amount of land/or dwellings required to meet the local housing need. The Core Strategy notes that the subdivision of existing housing will be resisted if it results in the loss of family size accommodation. The need for family sized housing across the Borough is clearly set out in the Core Strategy and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Again, the subdivision of properties or plots alone will not reduce the amount of land/or dwellings required to meet the local housing need.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to the existing safety issues on Coldharbour Road. 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>	
660	G	Beveridge	GB12	Coldharbour Road is gridlocked at peak times and dangerous. A number of local services are located within a short stretch of road, including the school. Development of the site will result in more traffic and be dangerous.	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. 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. 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
660	G	Beveridge	GB13	Coldharbour Road is gridlocked at peak times and dangerous. A number of local services are located within a short stretch of road, including the school. Development of the site will result in more traffic and be dangerous.	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. 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</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
						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. 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.	
626	Tamsin	Birch	GB15	There has not been enough consideration to the impact on school places. The West Byfleet schools are being expanded for an additional 30 places per year, but this is already allocated to existing children, and surely no further classrooms can be built on the site?	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
626	Tamsin	Birch	GB15	Objects due to the detrimental effect of development on the quality of life of West Byfleet residents, particularly in terms of increased traffic on already busy local roads, which makes walking and cycling (with children) through West Byfleet, particularly the junction of Pyrford Road and Parvis Road, dangerous. It will also increase journey times to work.	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 and 4. The land at West Hall will make a significant contribution to meeting the housing requirement of the Core Strategy. The Council has made sure that the traffic implications of the proposals is fully assessed and appropriate mitigation will be developed to support any development that will come forward. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 20 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	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
						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.	
626	Tamsin	Birch	GB15	Loading Broadoaks, West hall and Pyrford development into the same small corner of the Borough makes no sense with regard to pressure on infrastructure, roads and health services, unless these are to be expanded substantially. There is not space for this. Accepts the Broadoaks development will go ahead, but in light of that West Hall and Pyrford should not.	Development should not go ahead.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, 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
626	Tamsin	Birch	GB16	Loading Broadoaks, West hall and Pyrford development into the same small corner of the Borough makes no sense with regard to pressure on infrastructure, roads and health services, unless these are to be expanded substantially. There is not space for this. Accepts the Broadoaks development will go ahead, but in light of that West Hall and Pyrford should not.	Accepts this development will go ahead.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, 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
626	Tamsin	Birch	GB12	Loading Broadoaks, West hall and Pyrford development into the same small corner of the Borough makes no sense with regard to pressure on infrastructure, roads and health services, unless these are to be expanded substantially. There is not space for this. Accepts the Broadoaks development will go ahead, but in light of that West Hall and Pyrford should not.	Development should not go ahead.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, 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
626	Tamsin	Birch	GB13	Loading Broadoaks, West hall and Pyrford development into the same small corner of the Borough makes no sense with regard to pressure on infrastructure, roads and health services, unless these are to be expanded substantially. There is not space for this. Accepts the Broadoaks development will go ahead, but in light of that West Hall and Pyrford should not.	Development should not go ahead.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, 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
626	Tamsin	Birch	GB15	The housing at West Hall will largely not benefit local residents (due to price) but enable more families to move out of London, thus increasing the number of children within the school catchment.	None stated.	The proposal at West Hall will make a significant contribution to meeting the housing requirement of the Core Strategy. The development will benefit the whole of Woking, including West Byfleet. The proposals in the DPD including West Hall are designed to meet locally identified housing need. The proposals in the DPD will be supported by the necessary infrastructure, including educational facilities. The approach taken to provide infrastructure to support the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
626	Tamsin	Birch	GB23	The housing at West Hall will largely not benefit local residents (due to price) but enable more families to move out of London, thus increasing	None stated.	The proposal at West Hall will make a significant contribution to meeting the housing requirement of the Core Strategy. The development will benefit the whole of Woking, including West	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 number of children within the school catchment.		Byfleet. The proposals in the DPD including West Hall are designed to meet locally identified housing need. The proposals in the DPD will be supported by the necessary infrastructure, including educational facilities. The approach taken to provide infrastructure to support the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
626	Tamsin	Birch	GB23	There has not been enough consideration to the impact on school places. The West Byfleet schools are being expanded for an additional 30 places per year, but this is already allocated to existing children, and surely no further classrooms can be built on the site?	None stated.	The proposal at West Hall will make a significant contribution to meeting the housing requirement of the Core Strategy. The development will benefit the whole of Woking, including West Byfleet. The proposals in the DPD including West Hall are designed to meet locally identified housing need. The proposals in the DPD will be supported by the necessary infrastructure, including educational facilities. The approach taken to provide infrastructure to support the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1253	Davinder	Birk	GB12	Local resident. Development of this large scale will have a detrimental and irreversible effect on its special character. The GB is there to protect the environment and the character of villages like Pyrford.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9.</p> <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.</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 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1253	Davinder	Birk	GB13	Local resident. Development of this large scale will have a detrimental and irreversible effect on its special character. The GB is there to protect the environment and the character of villages like Pyrford.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9.</p> <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.</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 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1253	Davinder	Birk	GB12	The development of successful communities lies in the careful alignment of facilities, services, transport links with housing growth. The existing facilities-schools, health service, transport are already oversubscribed. Proposals will have irreversible impact on Pyrford	None stated.	The Council agrees that the successful sustainable communities need careful planning, this is why the Council is seeking to address the growth in the borough through a plan led approach. It is the combination of the plan-making and development management process that will ensure that the development 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
				and further encroachment into the GB		Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 3.0 and 8.0	
1253	Davinder	Birk	GB13	The development of successful communities lies in the careful alignment of facilities, services, transport links with housing growth. The existing facilities-schools, health service, transport are already oversubscribed. Proposals will have irreversible impact on Pyrford and further encroachment into the GB	None stated.	The Council agrees that the successful sustainable communities need careful planning, this is why the Council is seeking to address the growth in the borough through a plan led approach. It is the combination of the plan-making and development management process that will ensure that the development is sustainable. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 3.0 and 8.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1253	Davinder	Birk	GB12	Supports the historic protection of the English Countryside through GB designation- hopes to see this ethos continued.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9. It is important to note that the majority of the Green Belt will be retained, 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1253	Davinder	Birk	GB13	Supports the historic protection of the English Countryside through GB designation- hopes to see this ethos continued.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9. It is important to note that the majority of the Green Belt will be retained, 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1253	Davinder	Birk	GB12	Understands housing targets need to be met however believes the reuse of brownfield sites should be redeveloped over green spaces.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9 Please also see Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1253	Davinder	Birk	GB13	Understands housing targets need to be met however believes the reuse of brownfield sites should be redeveloped over green spaces.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9 Please also see Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
980	G	Bishop	General	Objects as the SADPD fails to allocate any sites for the building of sizeable houses with sizeable gardens. The NPPF requires local councils to deliver "a wide choice of high quality homes", not just medium and smaller ones. The SADPD fails to provide sites for sizable homes. As Woking is encouraging more businesses to move to the area there needs to be a supply of high quality, sizeable homes to attract the owners and senior executives of those businesses. According to estate agents there is a demand for but lack of sizeable houses in the Woking area. Restricted supply makes the existing houses more expensive, raising the price of smaller houses. There are a few areas where sizable homes can be built including, Heath House Road; sites adjoining West Hill or Worplesdon golf courses. When Worplesdon golf course was built the intention was to create an estate around the course using restrictive covenants. According to the GBBR "it is quite possible that individual sites might be sustainable and appropriate for removal	None stated.	It is important to note that development plan policies including Core Strategy Policy CS11; Housing Mix which requires a mix of dwelling types and sizes and Policy CS21: Design will apply to the 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
				from the Green Belt, despite the wider parcel within which they were being assessed, being considered inappropriate". Despite Parcel 19 not being suitable for removal from the Green Belt, some development could be integrated along Heath House Road "without wider visual harm" as the parcel is "generally very well contained visually from surroundings due to the high level of mature vegetation". The GBBR description of Heath House Road is incorrect and there is a continuous line of houses, only the last plot on the corner of Blackhorse Road has not been built on. The south side of the road there are two gaps in the line of houses. The SHLAA incorrectly identifies the houses as ribbon development as they were built around a golf course. The GBBR states such a development might result in "adverse effects on landscape features and its existing character", but these effects are not identified and could be overcome through planning conditions. Houses will not affect the "openness" as they will be on large sites and visually well contained due to the "high level of mature vegetation". There is no public access to the sites. These sites should be either removed from the Green Belt as individual sites or inset within the Green Belt.			
980	G	Bishop	GB8	The scale of development will cease Mayford to be a village and separate to Woking and will make it part of it. This is in conflict with the Core Strategy Green Belt that describes Mayford as a small and compact community where only infill development is normally acceptable. The proposals go against the first three Green Belt purposes. The scale will have a damaging impact on the village and surrounding area and cause traffic problems. It is unacceptable there are no explanations in the SADPD how these problems will be addressed.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 3.0, 10.0, 12.0 20.0, 23.0 and 24.0 Planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The Officer's Report for the application is available online	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
980	G	Bishop	GB9	The scale of development will cease Mayford to be a village and separate to Woking and will make it part of it. This is in conflict with the Core Strategy Green Belt that describes Mayford as a small and compact community where only infill development is normally acceptable. The proposals go against the first three Green Belt purposes. The scale will have a damaging impact on the village and surrounding area and cause traffic problems. It is unacceptable there are no explanations in the SADPD how these problems will be addressed.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 3.0, 10.0, 12.0 20.0, 23.0 and 24.0 Planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The Officer's Report for the application is available online	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
980	G	Bishop	GB10	The scale of development will cease Mayford to be a village and separate to Woking and will make it part of it. This is in conflict with the Core Strategy Green Belt that describes Mayford as a small and compact community where only infill development is normally acceptable. The proposals go against the first three Green Belt purposes.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 3.0, 10.0, 12.0 20.0, 23.0 and 24.0 Planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The Officer's Report for the application is available online	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 scale will have a damaging impact on the village and surrounding area and cause traffic problems. It is unacceptable there are no explanations in the SADPD how these problems will be addressed.			
980	G	Bishop	GB11	The scale of development will cease Mayford to be a village and separate to Woking and will make it part of it. This is in conflict with the Core Strategy Green Belt that describes Mayford as a small and compact community where only infill development is normally acceptable. The proposals go against the first three Green Belt purposes. The scale will have a damaging impact on the village and surrounding area and cause traffic problems. It is unacceptable there are no explanations in the SADPD how these problems will be addressed.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 3.0, 10.0, 12.0 20.0, 23.0 and 24.0 Planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The Officer's Report for the application is available online	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
980	G	Bishop	GB14	The scale of development will cease Mayford to be a village and separate to Woking and will make it part of it. This is in conflict with the Core Strategy Green Belt that describes Mayford as a small and compact community where only infill development is normally acceptable. The proposals go against the first three Green Belt purposes. The scale will have a damaging impact on the village and surrounding area and cause traffic problems. It is unacceptable there are no explanations in the SADPD how these problems will be addressed.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 3.0, 10.0, 12.0 20.0, 23.0 and 24.0 Planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The Officer's Report for the application is available online	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
980	G	Bishop	GB2	Objects to more than 15 pitches on the site, this is above the maximum number stated by the Government, police, GBBR and the Council's TAA (December 2013). It is wrong to put the current peaceful coexistence at risk. Furthermore it is undesirable all Traveller sites are in one small area. There must be other suitable sites in the Borough.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0 and 22.0. It is important to note, the Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites' 2008 guidance does recommend a maximum of 15 pitches per site to ensure a comfortable living environment and also allows for easy management.. Nevertheless, the maximum of 15 pitches per site is guidance and is not a prescribed limit. The Council is aware of other Gypsy and Traveller sites in adjoining boroughs and elsewhere in the country which exceed this recommended limit, where there is no known amenity issues or management issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
980	G	Bishop	General	Objects because of the automatic rejection of sites that will yield less than 10 dwellings, making the document unsound. The adopted approach means that small sites in the Green Belt cannot come forward as windfall development and unless allocated in the SADPD will remain in the Green Belt regardless is they are suitable for removal. The site on the corner of Heath House Road and Rough Road (SHLAABRO34) is considered suitable for development in the SHLAA, provided the site is released through the SADPD. AS the site can only yield 2 dwellings it has not been considered in this process which is unjust.	None stated.	As the representation points out, the Council has explained its methodology at the beginning of the Site Allocation DPD. To clarify, it is not correct that if sites are not identified in the Site Allocation DPD that they are 'rejected'. The Site Allocation DPD is seeking to deliver the level of development set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The Council accepts that development may come forward on smaller sites and is satisfied that there are sufficiently robust policies in the Development Plan that will ensure such proposals can be comprehensively assessed. Whilst these sites will contribute to the housing delivery, these are fluid in nature and therefore difficult to predict the level of contribution. Proposals that come forward for development within the Green Belt that are not on sites identified within the Site Allocation DPD will be determined against other policies in the Development Plan and NPPF.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB1	The BBNF agrees that Coblands Nursery and Lyndhurst (Policy GB1) an d should be released	None stated.	Support for the release of Green Belt land is noted.	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
				from the Green Belt and developed for housing.			of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB1	In preparing the Neighbourhood Plan, the BBNF has identified a present need for one and two bedroom houses, including affordable housing. Coblands is the only site in the area which is available for such development.	None stated.	The Council will ensure that any proposal for the development of the site reflects the range of housing needed in the area as set out in Policies CS13 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB1	Coblands has been derelict and an eyesore for many years. No detriment will be caused to the area or the adjoining Traveller Site by developing it. Development would greatly improve it.	None stated.	The Council is proposing to allocate the land for residential development and exclude it from the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB1	Either before or at the time of the development, improvements should be carried out to Brookwood crossroads to ensure development of Coblands does not create greater congestion there.	None stated.	The infrastructure and traffic implications of the DPD is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 and 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The current traffic issues around Brookwood Crossroad is already known and the Council will ensure that development does not exacerbate the current situation. This has been identified as one of the key requirements for development to consider.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB2	The BBNF accepts the Green Belt Review recommendation to grant planning permission for the two pitches on Five Acres Farm that at present have temporary permission.	None stated.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB3	The BBNF accepts the Green Belt Review recommendation to grant planning permission for the two pitches on Five Acres Farm that at present have temporary permission.	None stated.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB2	The BBNF considers the proposal contrary to the interests of both Travellers on the site and other local residents. There is a "peaceful and integrated co-existence" at present; it would be irresponsible to risk this. We reject the proposed increase in the number of pitches.	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council is satisfied that the number of pitches on the site can be intensified and managed effectively.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB3	The BBNF considers the proposal contrary to the interests of both Travellers on the site and other local residents. There is a "peaceful and integrated co-existence" at present; it would be irresponsible to risk this. We reject the proposed increase in the number of pitches.	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The site is under two management regimes and so far has been relatively managed well. The Council believes development on the site can be intensified without damage to the amenity and/or character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB2	The BBNF considers the best approach is to look at development of Five Acre Farm and Coblands sites as a whole rather than in parts, to ensure effective integration and make peaceful co-existence far more likely.	None stated.	A proposed modification is being made to merge GB2 and GB3. However, because of the different timescales for the release of Five Acres and Coblands, It will reasonable to keep the allocations separate.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB3	The BBNF considers the best approach is to look at development of Five Acre Farm and Coblands sites as a whole rather than in parts, to ensure effective integration and make peaceful co-existence far more likely.	None stated.	A proposed modification is being made to merge GB2 and GB3. However, because of the different timescales for the release of Five Acres and Coblands, It will reasonable to keep the allocations separate.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB1	The best approach to Coblands and Five Acres is to look at the development of the sites as a whole rather than in parts, to ensure effective integration of the development and make peaceful co-existence between the residents more likely.	None stated.	The Five Acres site is being looked at as a single site. Because of the difference in the timing of development on the Coblands and Five Acres site, both sites are treated separately with different policy requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB2	If landowners and residents agree, part of Five Acres identified in GB3 should be developed with Coblands as one and two bedroom starter homes. The pitches presently on that land should be moved to south of the bungalow.	None stated.	The Five Acres site is being looked at as a single site. Because of the difference in the timing of development on the Coblands and Five Acres site, both sites are treated separately with different policy requirements. Land at Coblands is allocated for residential development. The mix of housing on the site should reflect the range of house types needed in the area as set out in the Core Strategy, taking into account local circumstances.	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
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB3	If landowners and residents agree, part of Five Acres identified in GB3 should be developed with Coblands as one and two bedroom starter homes. The pitches presently on that land should be moved to south of the bungalow.	None stated.	The Five Acres site is being looked at as a single site. Because of the difference in the timing of development on the Coblands and Five Acres site, both sites are treated separately with different policy requirements. Land at Coblands is allocated for residential development. The mix of housing on the site should reflect the range of house types needed in the area as set out in the Core Strategy, taking into account local circumstances.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB1	If the owners and residents of the land are agreeable, the part of Five Acres identified in GB3 should be developed with Coblands as one and two bedroom starter homes and the pitches presently on that land should be moved to the land to the south of the bungalow on Brookwood Lye Road. This would assist in the integration of the whole site and make further land available for starter homes.	None stated.	The Five Acres site is being looked at as a single site. Because of the difference in the timing of development on the Coblands and Five Acres site, both sites are treated separately with different policy requirements. Land at Coblands is allocated for residential development. The mix of housing on the site should reflect the range of house types needed in the area as set out in the Core Strategy, taking into account local circumstances.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB2	<p>Including the two temporary pitches, Five Acres Farm already contains 15 pitches, the maximum number of pitches "conducive to providing a comfortable environment which is easy to manage". The TAA confirms this. The Green Belt Review did not find the site suitable for expansion for this reason. There are other suitable available sites for residential Traveller pitches. It would be irresponsible to grant permission for more than 15 pitches on Five Acres.</p> <p>The Council has attempted to avoid that conclusion by falsely claiming it two sites. For all relevant purposes Five Acres Farm is and has always been treated as one site (references the Core Strategy, Traveller Accommodation Assessment, Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal for the Draft Site Allocations DPD. Ownership is split between a number of people but there one entrance.</p>	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The site is under two management regimes and so far has been relatively managed well. The Council believes development on the site can be intensified without damage to the amenity and/or character of the area. It is being proposed to allocate the site an a single site but with the same proposed number of pitches as set out in the Draft Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB3	<p>Including the two temporary pitches, Five Acres Farm already contains 15 pitches, the maximum number of pitches "conducive to providing a comfortable environment which is easy to manage". The TAA confirms this. The Green Belt Review did not find the site suitable for expansion for this reason. There are other suitable available sites for residential Traveller pitches. It would be irresponsible to grant permission for more than 15 pitches on Five Acres. The Council has attempted to avoid that conclusion by falsely claiming it two sites. For all relevant purposes Five Acres Farm is and has always been treated as one site (references the Core Strategy, Traveller Accommodation Assessment, Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal for the Draft Site Allocations DPD. Ownership is split between a number of people but there one entrance.</p>	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The site is under two management regimes and so far has been relatively managed well. The Council believes development on the site can be intensified without damage to the amenity and/or character of the area. It is being proposed to allocate the site an a single site but with the same proposed number of pitches as set out in the Draft Site Allocations DPD. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and M	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB2	The landowners did not propose intensification of the site, the proposal was put forward by the Council without notice to them. Travellers' sites are more easily managed and enjoy good relationships within the local community when they are relatively small and occupied by a few	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council is satisfied that the number of pitches on the site can be intensified and managed effectively.	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
				family groups.			
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB3	The landowners did not propose intensification of the site, the proposal was put forward by the Council without notice to them. Travellers' sites are more easily managed and enjoy good relationships within the local community when they are relatively small and occupied by a few family groups.	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council is satisfied that the site will be available and deliverable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB3	All the Traveller sites in the Borough are within a short distance of each other. Patently obvious that any further pitches should be in other parts of the Borough. The Green Belt Review identified other possible sites.	None stated.	The approach to meeting the accommodation needs of Traveller is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The DPD has not led to an increase in the number of Traveller sites in the Borough. It will however be intensifying the use of existing sites and the Council accepts that this will lead to an increase in the number of pitches and consequently Travellers population in this part of the Borough. The existing sites have so far been well managed and there is every indication that they will continue to be well managed when additional pitches are delivered. Based on the sequential approach, the Council believes that the proposed site allocations relatively offer the most sustainable locations to meet Travellers accommodation needs when compared against other alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB2	All the Traveller sites in the Borough are within a short distance of each other. Patently obvious that any further pitches should be in other parts of the Borough. The Green Belt Review identified other possible sites.	None stated.	The DPD has not led to an increase in the number of Traveller sites in the Borough. It will however be intensifying the use of existing sites and the Council accepts that this will lead to an increase in the number of pitches and consequently Travellers population in this part of the Borough. The existing sites have so far been well managed and there is every indication that they will continue to be well managed when additional pitches are delivered. Based on the sequential approach, the Council believes that the proposed site allocations relatively offer the most sustainable locations to meet Travellers accommodation needs when compared against other alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB10	With regard to development in Mayford Policies GB10 and GB11, although outside the BBNF's Neighbourhood Area, development of this scale unsustainable and occupants to access facilities.	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 is 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 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 Mayford and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issue is also addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB11	With regard to development in Mayford Policies GB10 and GB11, although outside the BBNF's Neighbourhood Area, development of this scale unsustainable and occupants to access facilities.	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 is 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 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	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
						including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and is satisfied that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issue is also addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB10	Road access from GB10 and GB11 will be onto Saunders Lane, which is incapable of accommodating construction traffic. Roads within the BBNF Neighbourhood Area could not cope. It would detrimentally effect Brookwood crossroads. Saunders Lane could not be widened. There are no proposals as to how the traffic problems could be solved. It is wrong to propose a sites without providing detailed proposals as to how the traffic problems will be solved.	None stated.	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. Improvements to Brookwood Crossroad has been identified as a key requirement for development to consider.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB11	Road access from GB10 and GB11 will be onto Saunders Lane, which is incapable of accommodating construction traffic. Roads within the BBNF Neighbourhood Area could not cope. It would detrimentally effect Brookwood crossroads. Saunders Lane could not be widened. There are no proposals as to how the traffic problems could be solved. It is wrong to propose a sites without providing detailed proposals as to how the traffic problems will be solved.	None stated.	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	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
						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. Brookwood Crossroad is identified as a key requirement for development to consider.	
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB1	However the Coblands should not be delayed until 2022 or beyond. With the proviso below, the BBNF considers the site should be developed in the near future.	None stated.	The Core Strategy sets out the overall spatial strategy for the area. It focuses most new development on previously developed land in the main urban centres. Development of brownfield land is prioritised over Green Belt. The Council has identified sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs up to 2022.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB2	However totally reject the proposal that a further eight pitches be permitted at Five Acre Farm together with a Traveller transit site. This is contrary to Government guidelines on the size of Traveller sites, the Green Belt Review and the Council's own Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA).	None stated.	The matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB3	However totally reject the proposal that a further eight pitches be permitted at Five Acre Farm together with a Traveller transit site. This is contrary to Government guidelines on the size of Traveller sites, the Green Belt Review and the Council's own Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA).	None stated.	The matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB2	The Brookwood and Bridley Neighbourhood Forum (the BBNF) wishes to make representations on the following issues raised by the Site Allocations DPD (SADPD): the release of land at Coblands Nursery and Lyndhurst, Brookwood Lye Road (Policy GB1); the proposal at Five Acre Farm Gypsy and Travellers' site (Five Acres) (Policies GB2 and GB3); the proposal that large areas of Mayford north of Saunders Lane (Policies GB10 and GB11) should be safeguarded; the overall approach adopted by Woking Borough Council to the Green Belt Review (the GBR) and Site Allocations.	None stated.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB3	The Brookwood and Bridley Neighbourhood Forum (the BBNF) wishes to make representations on the following issues raised by the Site Allocations DPD (SADPD): the release of land at Coblands Nursery and Lyndhurst, Brookwood Lye Road (Policy GB1); the proposal at Five Acre Farm Gypsy and Travellers' site (Five Acres) (Policies GB2 and GB3); the proposal that large areas of Mayford north of Saunders Lane (Policies GB10 and GB11) should be safeguarded; the overall approach adopted by Woking Borough Council to the Green Belt Review (the GBR) and Site Allocations.	None stated.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB11	The Brookwood and Bridley Neighbourhood Forum (the BBNF) wishes to make representations on the following issues raised by the Site Allocations DPD (SADPD): the release of land at Coblands Nursery and Lyndhurst,	None stated.	Coverage of representations 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
				Brookwood Lye Road (Policy GB1); the proposal at Five Acre Farm Gypsy and Travellers' site (Five Acres) (Policies GB2 and GB3); the proposal that large areas of Mayford north of Saunders Lane (Policies GB10 and GB11) should be safeguarded; the overall approach adopted by Woking Borough Council to the Green Belt Review (the GBR) and Site Allocations.			
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB1	The Brookwood and Bridley Neighbourhood Forum (the BBNF) wishes to make representations on the following issues raised by the Site Allocations DPD (SADPD): the release of land at Coblands Nursery and Lyndhurst, Brookwood Lye Road (Policy GB1); the proposal at Five Acre Farm Gypsy and Travellers' site (Five Acres) (Policies GB2 and GB3); the proposal that large areas of Mayford north of Saunders Lane (Policies GB10 and GB11) should be safeguarded; the overall approach adopted by Woking Borough Council to the Green Belt Review (the GBR) and Site Allocations.	None stated.	The coverage of representations is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	GB10	The Brookwood and Bridley Neighbourhood Forum (the BBNF) wishes to make representations on the following issues raised by the Site Allocations DPD (SADPD): the release of land at Coblands Nursery and Lyndhurst, Brookwood Lye Road (Policy GB1); the proposal at Five Acre Farm Gypsy and Travellers' site (Five Acres) (Policies GB2 and GB3); the proposal that large areas of Mayford north of Saunders Lane (Policies GB10 and GB11) should be safeguarded; the overall approach adopted by Woking Borough Council to the Green Belt Review (the GBR) and Site Allocations.	None stated.	The coverage of representations made is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1066	Gordon	Bishop	General	The DPD's approach of only considering for removal from the Green Belt sites which will yield at least 10 dwellings at an average density of 30 dph is misguided and unsound. All sites should be considered if they can contribute to the housing need without offending Green Belt principles or causing damage to their surrounding area. For example there are a number of sites in Bridley suitable for low density housing. The NPPF requires councils to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, which must necessarily include low density as well as high density housing.	None stated.	The 10 dwellings threshold is necessary to make the process manageable. It is also important to make sure that that the Council identify sites in sustainable locations that will also enable a defensible Green Belt boundary to be drawn. The Council have identified sites that it considers achieves the above objectives. Development of isolated plots that are not contiguous to the urban area would undermine the its purpose and integrity. Development of any sites that are not allocated and/or are not acceptable development in the Green Belt will only be accepted if a special circumstances case can be made.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
998	Carole	Blackburn	GB4	Object to removal of Green Belt, states four purposes of Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The principle of Green Belt development and 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.</p> <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. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and other settlements.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl.</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
998	Carole	Blackburn	GB5	Object to removal of Green Belt, states four purposes of Green Belt.	None stated.	The principle of Green Belt development and 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. 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. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and other settlements. The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
998	Carole	Blackburn	GB15	Object to removal of Green Belt, states four purposes of Green Belt.	None stated.	The principle of Green Belt development and 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. 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. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and other settlements. The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
998	Carole	Blackburn	GB16	Object to removal of Green Belt, states four purposes of Green Belt.	None stated.	The principle of Green Belt development and 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. 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. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and other settlements. The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
998	Carole	Blackburn	GB12	Object to removal of Green Belt, states four purposes of Green Belt.	None stated.	The principle of Green Belt development and 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. 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. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and other settlements. The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
998	Carole	Blackburn	GB13	Object to removal of Green Belt, states four purposes of Green Belt.	None stated.	The principle of Green Belt development and 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. 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. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce 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
						gap between the town and other settlements. The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl.	
998	Carole	Blackburn	GB4	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</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.</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
998	Carole	Blackburn	GB5	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment	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 as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits. 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 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. 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>	
998	Carole	Blackburn	GB15	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits. 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 the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory</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
						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. 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.	
998	Carole	Blackburn	GB16	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits. 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 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. 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	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 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.	
998	Carole	Blackburn	GB12	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits. 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 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. 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
998	Carole	Blackburn	GB13	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of 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>elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits. 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 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. 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>	
998	Carole	Blackburn	GB4	The community would be better served if development came from urban regeneration rather than destroying valued countryside.	None stated.	<p>It should be noted that the proposed Site Allocations includes over 50 sites within the existing urban area for a wide range of development, including retail, commercial and residential uses. Nevertheless land is a finite resource and as noted in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Core Strategy Examination Inspector agreed that the Green Belt should be a future direction of growth to meet part of the borough's housing needs.</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 of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support</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
						this view.	
998	Carole	Blackburn	GB5	The community would be better served if development came from urban regeneration rather than destroying valued countryside.	None stated.	It should be noted that the proposed Site Allocations includes over 50 sites within the existing urban area for a wide range of development, including retail, commercial and residential uses. Nevertheless land is a finite resource and as noted in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Core Strategy Examination Inspector agreed that the Green Belt should be a future direction of growth to meet part of the borough's housing needs. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
998	Carole	Blackburn	GB15	The community would be better served if development came from urban regeneration rather than destroying valued countryside.	None stated.	It should be noted that the proposed Site Allocations includes over 50 sites within the existing urban area for a wide range of development, including retail, commercial and residential uses. Nevertheless land is a finite resource and as noted in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Core Strategy Examination Inspector agreed that the Green Belt should be a future direction of growth to meet part of the borough's housing needs. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
998	Carole	Blackburn	GB16	The community would be better served if development came from urban regeneration rather than destroying valued countryside.	None stated.	It should be noted that the proposed Site Allocations includes over 50 sites within the existing urban area for a wide range of development, including retail, commercial and residential uses. Nevertheless land is a finite resource and as noted in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Core Strategy Examination Inspector agreed that the Green Belt should be a future direction of growth to meet part of the borough's housing needs. 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	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
						this view.	
998	Carole	Blackburn	GB12	The community would be better served if development came from urban regeneration rather than destroying valued countryside.	None stated.	It should be noted that the proposed Site Allocations includes over 50 sites within the existing urban area for a wide range of development, including retail, commercial and residential uses. Nevertheless land is a finite resource and as noted in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Core Strategy Examination Inspector agreed that the Green Belt should be a future direction of growth to meet part of the borough's housing needs. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
998	Carole	Blackburn	GB13	The community would be better served if development came from urban regeneration rather than destroying valued countryside.	None stated.	It should be noted that the proposed Site Allocations includes over 50 sites within the existing urban area for a wide range of development, including retail, commercial and residential uses. Nevertheless land is a finite resource and as noted in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Core Strategy Examination Inspector agreed that the Green Belt should be a future direction of growth to meet part of the borough's housing needs. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
66	Brian J	Blair	GB12	Express my concern about the impact of higher traffic levels on Upshot Lane/Coldharbour Road/Oakcroft Road and Pyrford Common Road, as well as the Old Woking Road, of the proposed housing development of the two Pyrford fiel on either side of Upshot Lane. This could cause an unacceptably high level of traffic during rush hours.	Are any alternative routes in which could be developed (even if these involved building a bridge over the canal and M25)?	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 lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape 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	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>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. 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. 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.</p>	
66	Brian J	Blair	GB16	The Octagon proposals for the development of the Broadoaks site are very suitable and sympathetic with the surroundings, but I am concerned about the increased traffic levels on the Parvis Road, which already gets very congested during rush hours.	Are any alternative routes in which could be developed (even if these involved building a bridge over the canal and M25)?	<p>The Site Allocation seeks to allocate the site for employment, residential and elderly people's accommodation. It is acknowledged that that planning application has been submitted for residential development and a school. This applications is being determined and will be taken into account when a decision is made. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. To inform the allocations, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the general character of the area will not be significantly undermined. 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</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
						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. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is also working its neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to make sure that the impacts of development in their area such as Wisley Airfield that has cross boundary implications are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation put in place to address any adverse impacts.	
66	Brian J	Blair	GB15	The proposed even bigger development on the West Hall site, probably in itself is a good thing, would lead to an even more unacceptable traffic level, unless some radical ways of alleviating it are found. As there does not seem to be any scope for widening Parvis Road, I wonder if there are any alternative routes in, which could be developed (even if these involved building a bridge over the canal and M25)?	Are any alternative routes in which could be developed (even if these involved building a bridge over the canal and M25)?	The general approach to assessing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 respectively in 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. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is working with neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to make sure that the cross boundary traffic implications of their development are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
66	Brian J	Blair	GB13	Express my concern about the impact of higher traffic levels on Upshot Lane/Coldharbour Road/Oakcroft Road and Pyrford Common Road, as well as the Old Woking Road, of the proposed housing development of the two Pyrford fiel on either side of Upshot Lane. This could cause an unacceptably high level of traffic during rush hours.	Are any alternative routes in which could be developed (even if these involved building a bridge over the canal and M25)?	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	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
						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.	
739	Rebecca	Blair	GB4	Objects to Green Belt proposals in Byfleet and West Byfleet. It should be preserved and other land is available. The proposal would remove most of the local Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 11.0.</p> <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
739	Rebecca	Blair	GB5	Objects to Green Belt proposals in Byfleet and West Byfleet. It should be preserved and other land is available. The proposal would remove most of the local Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 11.0.</p> <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
739	Rebecca	Blair	GB15	Objects to Green Belt proposals in Byfleet and	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				West Byfleet. It should be preserved and other land is available. The proposal would remove most of the local Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains.		Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 11.0. 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). 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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
739	Rebecca	Blair	GB16	Objects to Green Belt proposals in Byfleet and West Byfleet. It should be preserved and other land is available. The proposal would remove most of the local Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 11.0.</p> <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
739	Rebecca	Blair	GB4	The proposed area has previously flooded or is in danger of flooding	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
739	Rebecca	Blair	GB5	The proposed area has previously flooded or is in danger of flooding	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
739	Rebecca	Blair	GB15	The proposed area has previously flooded or is in danger of flooding	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
739	Rebecca	Blair	GB16	The proposed area has previously flooded or is in danger of flooding	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
739	Rebecca	Blair	GB4	The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored. Add my objection to the others.	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 Represor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
739	Rebecca	Blair	GB5	The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored. Add my objection to the others.	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 Represor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
739	Rebecca	Blair	GB15	The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored. Add my objection to the others.	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 Represor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
739	Rebecca	Blair	GB16	The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored. Add my objection to the others.	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 Represor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
739	Rebecca	Blair	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 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</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 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.	
739	Rebecca	Blair	GB5	The A245 is constantly gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse.	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 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
739	Rebecca	Blair	GB15	The A245 is constantly gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse.	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 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	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
						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 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.	
739	Rebecca	Blair	GB16	The A245 is constantly gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse.	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 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. 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.	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
300		Blake	GB4	Concern that proposals identified for Byfleet and West Byfleet will exacerbate traffic problems. The area suffers from heavy congestion, particularly given its proximity to the M25 and A3. Byfleet will not be able to cope.	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>It should be noted that the Broadoaks site is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
300		Blake	GB5	Concern that proposals identified for Byfleet and West Byfleet will exacerbate traffic problems. The area suffers from heavy congestion, particularly given its proximity to the M25 and A3. Byfleet will not be able to cope.	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>It should be noted that the Broadoaks site is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
300		Blake	GB15	Concern that proposals identified for Byfleet and West Byfleet will exacerbate traffic problems. The area suffers from heavy congestion, particularly given its proximity to the M25 and A3. Byfleet will not be able to cope.	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. It should be noted that the Broadoaks site is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
300		Blake	GB16	Concern that proposals identified for Byfleet and West Byfleet will exacerbate traffic problems. The area suffers from heavy congestion, particularly given its proximity to the M25 and A3. Byfleet will not be able to cope.	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>It should be noted that the site is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
300		Blake	GB4	GB4 and GB5 are within the flood plain areas and will suffer flooding problems	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0, particularly paragraph 5.2, 5.4 and 5.5</p> <p>To clarify, GB4 is not within Flood Zone 2 or 3; and only the south western tip of the site GB5 is within Flood Zone 2.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
300		Blake	GB5	GB4 and GB5 are within the flood plain areas and will suffer flooding problems	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0, particularly paragraph 5.2, 5.4 and 5.5</p> <p>To clarify, GB4 is not within Flood Zone 2 or 3; and only the south western tip of the site GB5 is within Flood Zone 2.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
300		Blake	GB4	Proposals will exacerbate pollution levels and	None stated.	With regards to the representation on pollution, the Core Strategy	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				have a negative impact on health. Existing pollution from the motorway, added with the poor air quality along Parvis Road will increase.		<p>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 significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	is proposed as a result of this representation
300		Blake	GB5	Proposals will exacerbate pollution levels and have a negative impact on health. Existing pollution from the motorway, added with the poor air quality along Parvis Road will increase.	None stated.	<p>With regards to the representation on pollution, 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 significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution. 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
300		Blake	GB4	Concern about the amenity of residents being disrupted. Significant disruption, including noise and pollution will be caused by proposals. Privacy will be lost	None stated.	<p>Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with 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 also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM7 Noise and Light pollution.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
300		Blake	GB5	Concern about the amenity of residents being disrupted. Significant disruption, including noise and pollution will be caused by proposals. Privacy will be lost	None stated.	<p>Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with 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 also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM7 Noise and Light pollution.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
300		Blake	GB4	There has been insufficient opportunity for local residents to comment on the proposals. The	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0	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
				scale of what is proposals are significant and residents should have been notified- as they are when a planning application is submitted			of this representation
300		Blake	GB5	There has been insufficient opportunity for local residents to comment on the proposals. The scale of what is proposals are significant and residents should have been notified- as they are when a planning application is submitted	None stated.	This representation has been 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
300		Blake	GB4	Object to the development on GB land in Byfleet as it will have a negative impact on its character	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
300		Blake	GB5	Object to the development on GB land in Byfleet as it will have a negative impact on its character	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
300		Blake	GB4	The Council does not need to identify GB land to meet housing targets. Consider alternative solutions, consider all brown field sites, unoccupied buildings to meet the housing need. Byfleet doesn't want on need the release of GB land	Consider alternative brownfield sites and unoccupied buildings to releasing land from the GB	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly 1.9, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
300		Blake	GB5	The Council does not need to identify GB land to meet housing targets. Consider alternative solutions, consider all brown field sites, unoccupied buildings to meet the housing need. Byfleet doesn't want on need the release of GB land	Consider alternative brownfield sites and unoccupied buildings to releasing land from the GB	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly 1.9, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
993	Bernard	Blake	GB12	Object to using Green Belt to provide housing on this site. There are no special circumstances to require Green Belt development. This proposal would result in urban sprawl, against the purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 2.0 and 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
993	Bernard	Blake	GB13	Object to using Green Belt to provide housing on this site. There are no special circumstances to require Green Belt development. This proposal would result in urban sprawl, against the purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 2.0 and 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
993	Bernard	Blake	GB12	The local infrastructure 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</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>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> <p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p> <p>It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Pyrford form the Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation of this site is within walking and cycling distance of the Neighbourhood Centre and therefore will help meet the day to day needs of local people and reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>The existing bus service provision 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>	
993	Bernard	Blake	GB13	The local infrastructure 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. 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</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>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. 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. 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. Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified. It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Pyrford form the Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation of this site is within walking and cycling distance of the Neighbourhood Centre and therefore will help meet the day to day needs of local people and reduce the need to travel by car. The existing bus service provision 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>	
993	Bernard	Blake	GB12	Site provides distant views to the North Downs	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				and Surrey Hills development would negatively affect these.		and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In lancape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views. The representation regarding Green Belt development and 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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
993	Bernard	Blake	GB13	Site provides distant views to the North Downs and Surrey Hills development would negatively affect these.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In lancape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views. The representation regarding Green Belt development and 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
993	Bernard	Blake	GB12	There are available brownfield sites that should be considered before the Green Belt. The type of housing required is for first time buyers and small family units, rather than larger properties. The site is unsuitable for the required type of housing due to location and infrastructure limitations. Despite Green Belt sites being more attractive for developers this is not justification.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0. There are also robust Development Plan proposals to make sure that proposals provide a mix of dwelling types and sizes to address the nature of local needs as evidenced in the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
993	Bernard	Blake	GB13	There are available brownfield sites that should be considered before the Green Belt. The type of housing required is for first time buyers and small family units, rather than larger properties. The site is unsuitable for the required type of housing due to location and infrastructure limitations. Despite Green Belt sites being more attractive for developers this is not justification.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0. There are also robust Development Plan proposals to make sure that proposals provide a mix of dwelling types and sizes to address the nature of local needs as evidenced in the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1611	Rosie	Blake	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 Lancape 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 lancape grounds. The Lancape 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 lancape 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>	
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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. The proposed defensible boundary would not prevent future development towards Guildford. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB9	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. The proposed defensible boundary would not prevent future development towards Guildford. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. 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	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
						continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	
1611	Rosie	Blake	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. The proposed defensible boundary would not prevent future development towards Guildford. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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. The proposed defensible boundary would not prevent future development towards Guildford. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB7	Object to proposals. 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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB8	Strongly object to the proposed leisure centre, running track and other facilities. These are inappropriate development within a residential area and do not meet the Council's own stated 800m separation policy.	None stated.	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. It is worth noting that the Council do not have a 800m separation policy between leisure facilities and residential properties. Through good design and, where necessary mitigation measures, it is possible to achieve a satisfactory relationship between different land uses. This is set	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
						out in Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design and the Design SPD.	
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB8	Strongly object to development proposals. 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. The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB9	Strongly object to development proposals. 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. The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB10	Strongly object to development proposals. 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. The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB11	Strongly object to development proposals. 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. The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape 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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape	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</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
				Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of Lancap importance has been ignored.		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.	
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancap Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of Lancap 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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancap Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of Lancap 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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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.	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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	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.	
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB9	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB9	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB9	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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	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>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).</p>	
1611	Rosie	Blake	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.	<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</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
						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).	
1611	Rosie	Blake	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. 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).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1611	Rosie	Blake	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</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>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>	
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB9	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB8	The additional visits per week will have negative impact on an already overloaded road network whilst the public transport in the area is dire. The hours of operation will have a major impact on residents and surrounding local area. It is inappropriate and shows a clear lack of transparency on behalf of the Council.	None stated.	<p>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>The representation regarding the existing public transport provision 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> <p>As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will</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
						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. The Council's decision on the proposed school and leisure centre are clearly set out on the Council's website. The Local Planning Authority has attached a number of planning conditions to the permitted scheme in order to minimise the impact of the proposal on the local area. The Council's reasons and decisions are set out within the Officer's Report.	
1611	Rosie	Blake	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. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	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. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However 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. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB9	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.	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. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However 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. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1611	Rosie	Blake	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. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	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. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However 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. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB11	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in	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
				character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.		<p>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>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However 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. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.</p>	of this representation
1611	Rosie	Blake	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 fiel 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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB9	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 fiel 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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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 fiel 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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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 fiel 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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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. 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.	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. 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. The Core Strategy, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD and the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of	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 that will come forward on the allocated sites is of high standard and sympathetic to the general character 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.	
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB9	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. 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.	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>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. The Core Strategy, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD and the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites is of high standard and sympathetic to the general character 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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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. 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.	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. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school</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 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. 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. The Core Strategy, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD and the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites is of high standard and sympathetic to the general character 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.	
1611	Rosie	Blake	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. 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.	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>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. The Core Strategy, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD and the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites is of high standard and sympathetic to the general character 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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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	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	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 is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths.		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 TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes. 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. 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.	
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB9	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.	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 TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes. 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. 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	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
						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.	
1611	Rosie	Blake	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.	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 TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes. 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1611	Rosie	Blake	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.	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 TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes. 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	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 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 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.	
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB9	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	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. 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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow,	None stated.	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. 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.			
1611	Rosie	Blake	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. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	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. 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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	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. 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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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.	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB9	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.	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	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
						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.	
1611	Rosie	Blake	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.	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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.	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate amenity for residents including space for business activities. These activities are out of keeping in this location due to the proximity of houses and heritage assets.	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB7	Traveller sites should have access to local facilities. The site is not near a school or easy access to local services. There are virtually no local facilities in Mayford.	None 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	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 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.	
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB8	Accept that the proposed secondary school represents a special circumstance for development in the Green Belt, and I support the mitigation measures noted for the school.	None stated.	Support for the principle of a secondary school on the site, combined with suitable mitigation measures, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB9	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	GB9	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
1611	Rosie	Blake	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
378	Pamela	Blanchard	GB10	Object to proposals GB10, GB11 and GB14. GB land has been there for over 40 years, the scale of the proposals would not be in keeping with the surrounding area	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	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
						evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation 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 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. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 23.0	
378	Pamela	Blanchard	GB11	Object to proposals GB10, GB11 and GB14. GB land has been there for over 40 years, the scale of the proposals would not be in keeping with the surrounding area	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 are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</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, see Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
378	Pamela	Blanchard	GB14	Object to proposals GB10, GB11 and GB14. GB land has been there for over 40 years, the scale of the proposals would not be in keeping with the surrounding area	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 are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</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, see Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
378	Pamela	Blanchard	GB10	The local infrastructure including schooling, medical facilities, transport system as inadequate to meet the level of growth	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	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
						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 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. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0 which addresses infrastructure provision	
378	Pamela	Blanchard	GB11	The local infrastructure including schooling, medical facilities, transport system as inadequate to meet the level of growth	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> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0 which addresses infrastructure provision</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
378	Pamela	Blanchard	GB14	The local infrastructure including schooling, medical facilities, transport system as inadequate to meet the level of growth	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. 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</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
						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. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0 which addresses infrastructure provision	
1612	N C	Blick	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.	<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 Lancape 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 lancape grounds. The Lancape 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 lancape 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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB8	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB9	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB11	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB7	Object to proposals. All of Woking's Traveller	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.		Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	is proposed as a result of this representation
1612	N C	Blick	GB8	Strongly object to the proposed leisure centre, running track and other facilities. These are inappropriate development within a residential area and do not meet the Council's own stated 800m separation policy.	None stated.	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. It is worth noting that the Council do not have a 800m separation policy between leisure facilities and residential properties. Through good design and, where necessary mitigation measures, it is possible to achieve a satisfactory relationship between different land uses. This is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design and the Design SPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1612	N C	Blick	GB8	Object to proposals. 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. The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB9	Object to proposals. 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. The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB10	Object to proposals. 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. The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB11	Object to proposals. 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. The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid	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	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 it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored.		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.	
1612	N C	Blick	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape 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
1612	N C	Blick	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape 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
1612	N C	Blick	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape 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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	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.	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	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	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
				will result in development not being allowed within 400m.			
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB9	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB9	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB9	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	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	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>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>	
1612	N C	Blick	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. 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).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1612	N C	Blick	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>	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>	
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB9	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB8	The additional visits per week will have negative impact on an already overloaded road network whilst the public transport in the area is dire. The hours of operation will have a major impact on residents and surrounding local area. It is inappropriate and shows a clear lack of transparency on behalf of the Council.	None stated.	<p>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>The representation regarding the existing public transport provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers 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>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>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 Council's decision on the proposed school and leisure centre are clearly set out on the Council's website. The Local Planning Authority has attached a number of planning conditions to the permitted scheme in order to minimise the impact of the proposal on the local area. The Council's reasons and decisions are set out within the Officer's Report.</p>	
1612	N C	Blick	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. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	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>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However 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. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1612	N C	Blick	GB9	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.	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. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However 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. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1612	N C	Blick	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. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	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>	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
						It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However 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. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.	
1612	N C	Blick	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. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	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>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However 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. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1612	N C	Blick	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 field 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
1612	N C	Blick	GB9	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 field 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
1612	N C	Blick	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 field 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
1612	N C	Blick	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 field 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
1612	N C	Blick	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. 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	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	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
				views.		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. 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. The Core Strategy, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD and the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites is of high standard and sympathetic to the general character 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.	
1612	N C	Blick	GB9	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. 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.	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>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. The Core Strategy, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD and the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites is of high standard and sympathetic to the general character 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
1612	N C	Blick	GB10	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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. 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.		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. 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. The Core Strategy, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD and the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites is of high standard and sympathetic to the general character 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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
1612	N C	Blick	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. 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.	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>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. The Core Strategy, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD and the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites is of high standard and sympathetic to the general character of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is</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
						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.	
1612	N C	Blick	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.	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 TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes. 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1612	N C	Blick	GB9	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.	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 TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes. 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	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
						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 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.	
1612	N C	Blick	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.	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 TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes. 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1612	N C	Blick	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	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	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
				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.		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 TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes. 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. 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.	
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB9	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	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. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and	None stated.	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. 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				houses are built up right to the road edge.			
1612	N C	Blick	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. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	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. 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
1612	N C	Blick	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. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	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. 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
1612	N C	Blick	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. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	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. 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
1612	N C	Blick	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.	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB9	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	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.	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
				occur at Worplesdon Station.		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.	
1612	N C	Blick	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.	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
1612	N C	Blick	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.	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB8	There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				merging if Mayford is developed further. 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.		Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. 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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
1612	N C	Blick	GB9	There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. 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>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <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
1612	N C	Blick	GB10	There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. 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>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1612	N C	Blick	GB11	There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. 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.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. 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
1612	N C	Blick	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate amenity for residents including space for business activities. These activities are out of keeping in this location due to the proximity of houses and heritage assets.	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB7	Traveller sites should have access to local facilities. The site is not near a school or easy access to local services. There are virtually no local facilities in Mayford.	None 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1612	N C	Blick	GB8	Accept that the proposed secondary school represents a special circumstance for development in the Green Belt, and I support the mitigation measures noted for the school.	None stated.	Support for the principle of a secondary school on the site, combined with suitable mitigation measures, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB9	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	GB8	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station.		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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
1612	N C	Blick	GB9	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1612	N C	Blick	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
1148	Victoria	Blissett	GB12	It values its village status and has well-maintained historic buildings and conservation areas. Removal of Green Belt could irreparably damage these assets.	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 collective evidence of the Council supports the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1148	Victoria	Blissett	GB13	It values its village status and has well-maintained historic buildings and conservation areas. Removal of Green Belt could irreparably damage these assets.	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
1148	Victoria	Blissett	GB12	Pyrford central village is already congested. 433 new houses will increase already unacceptable congestion, perhaps gridlock. Coldharbour Road is blocked with parked cars at school drop off/pick up times. An accident will happen. I am highly unsatisfied with existing traffic 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	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
						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.	
1148	Victoria	Blissett	GB13	Pyrford central village is already congested. 433 new houses will increase already unacceptable congestion, perhaps gridlock. Coldharbour Road is blocked with parked cars at school drop off/pick up times. An accident will happen. I am highly unsatisfied with existing traffic 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1148	Victoria	Blissett	GB12	Development in Guildford Borough (Wisley Airfield etc.) will contribute to massive traffic increase. Newark Bridges could not cope with more traffic.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council has been working with its neighbouring authorities to make sure that the development impacts of their proposals with cross boundary implications are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation put in place to address any potential adverse impacts. 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
1148	Victoria	Blissett	GB13	Development in Guildford Borough (Wisley	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council has been working with	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Airfield etc.) will contribute to massive traffic increase. Newark Bridges could not cope with more traffic.		its neighbouring authorities to make sure that the development impacts of their proposals with cross boundary implications are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation put in place to address any potential adverse impacts. 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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
1148	Victoria	Blissett	GB12	There will be a massive water and sewerage impact. Transport is essential. Also bio-diversity. Pyrford Primary School is about to be re-built with slight increase to meet current demand. 433 new houses will create a massive need for school places in 2030. Nursery and pre school facilities already at capacity. More elderly care facilities will be needed. The village is a community where people want to live, due to its pleasant environment. Safety is paramount. Village character, once destroyed, cannot be re-created.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure implications 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. Based on the evidence the Council satisfied that the character of the area will not be significantly undermined by the proposals. Further detail response is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 7, 19 and 23.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1148	Victoria	Blissett	GB13	There will be a massive water and sewerage impact. Transport is essential. Also bio-diversity. Pyrford Primary School is about to be re-built with slight increase to meet current demand. 433 new houses will create a massive need for school places in 2030. Nursery and pre school facilities already at capacity. More elderly care facilities will be needed. The village is a community where people want to live, due to its pleasant environment. Safety is paramount. Village character, once destroyed, cannot be re-created.	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	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>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. Any proposal that comes forward could include an element of elderly people's accommodation if the need is justified. 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.</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>	
1148	Victoria	Blissett	GB13	I object. Pyrford's charm and character, maintaining the natural lancape, views and footpaths are important. Pyrford is unique in its unspoilt countryside, an asset for the borough.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or lancape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Lancape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or lancape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1148	Victoria	Blissett	GB12	I object. Pyrford's charm and character, maintaining the natural lancape, views and footpaths are important. Pyrford is unique in its unspoilt countryside, an asset for the borough.	None stated.	The Council accepts the character of Pyrford is distinctive to be protected. However, it is satisfied that it will not be compromised by the proposals. The lancape implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
922	Eloise	Blyth	GB16	By 2040 the Borough will only lose 3.4% of Green Belt to development, yet West Byfleet loses 80-	My suggestion under point 5 to spread out the number of	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could	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
				90%, this doesn't make sense. Use the other 21 Green Belt pocket sites, not sites that are easy to buy like West Hall	homes over the 21 pockets of Green Belt already ear marked would mean that all the objectives above would be satisfied, please consider this suggestion respectfully.	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 West Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). The Council has assessed 125 alternative sites in the Green Belt for development. These are set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which is available on the Council's website.	of this representation
922	Eloise	Blyth	GB16	Medical facilities are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. A new medical centre will be required if the proposals go ahead.	My suggestion under point 5 to spread out the number of homes over the 21 pockets of Green Belt already ear marked would mean that all the objectives above would be satisfied, please consider this suggestion respectfully.	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
922	Eloise	Blyth	GB16	Smaller local roads will see at least a 90% increase in traffic and will have to be replaced.	My suggestion under point 5 to spread out the number of homes over the 21 pockets of Green Belt already ear marked would mean that all the objectives above would be satisfied, please consider this suggestion respectfully.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
922	Eloise	Blyth	GB16	The Council's traffic impact study in West Byfleet shows that traffic on Parvis Road as 'F' or 1.61 (where 0.85-1.00 indicates a road struggling to cope). This assessment only includes Broadoaks and not the proposed West Hall development. The proposed mitigation measures put forward by the Council is a roundabout and cycle path for all proposed development. No alternatives can be suggested as there is not space for a new road or to widen the current road.	My suggestion under point 5 to spread out the number of homes over the 21 pockets of Green Belt already ear marked would mean that all the objectives above would be satisfied, please consider this suggestion respectfully.	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 transport 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. 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	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. 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. The key requirements for Site GB15 note that a roundabout should be provided in order to achieve a safe entrance onto the site from Parvis Road. This is based on the findings of the County Highways Authority who are responsible for the highways in the area as well as highways safety. It should be noted that the draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits. The Council notes the proposed modification to distribute development across the Borough evenly. 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 are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The full list of alternative sites considered by the Council can be found in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p>	
922	Eloise	Blyth	GB16	The proposed playing field for the school are not sufficient for 900 pupil school. They are likely to have to use the recreation ground opposite, which is used by local child.	My suggestion under point 5 to spread out the number of homes over the 21 pockets of Green Belt already earmarked would mean that all the objectives above would be satisfied, please consider this suggestion respectfully.	Please note that the current proposal is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process in accordance with existing Development Plan Policies including Core Strategy Policy CS17 Open Space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
922	Eloise	Blyth	GB16	The houses on the development will be large and expensive, don't understand how they will help with the Borough's housing shortage. Smaller and fewer houses should be developed.	My suggestion under point 5 to spread out the number of homes over the 21 pockets of Green Belt already earmarked would mean that all the objectives above would be satisfied, please consider this suggestion respectfully.	Please note that the current proposal is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process in accordance with existing Development Plan Policies including Core Strategy Policy CS11 Housing Mix and CS12 Affordable housing.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
922	Eloise	Blyth	GB16	900 pupil school is massive for the area. As it will be independent it won't have a local catchment area therefore bringing more traffic to the area. Suggests putting offices on the site instead as the maximum number of staff would be 400.	Put offices on the site instead of a school as the maximum number of staff would be 400.	The Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private	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
						secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process. Please also see This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	
922	Eloise	Blyth	GB16	The Council's strategy is to develop urban areas, West Byfleet is a village.	My suggestion under point 5 to spread out the number of homes over the 21 pockets of Green Belt already ear marked would mean that all the objectives above would be satisfied, please consider this suggestion respectfully.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 in particular paragraph 1.7-1.9.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
922	Eloise	Blyth	GB16	Proposed developments in Pyrford, Sheerwater and Ripley will cause gridlock at the proposed West Byfleet developments.	My suggestion under point 5 to spread out the number of homes over the 21 pockets of Green Belt already ear marked would mean that all the objectives above would be satisfied, please consider this suggestion respectfully.	<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
922	Eloise	Blyth	GB16	WBC strategy is to build 550 new homes in the Borough. Doesn't understand why there are proposals for 592 and 157, which is more than the required 550. The above housing requirement could be spread out to 50 homes on pocket Green Belt sites which could be easily identified.	My suggestion under point 5 to spread out the number of homes over the 21 pockets of Green Belt already ear marked would mean that all the objectives above would be satisfied, please consider this suggestion respectfully.	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	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
						evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in West Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The 592 dwellings stated in the Site Allocations DPD is based on an indicative density of 40 dwellings per hectare. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. The Site Allocations DPD proposes that Broadoaks be used for high quality office and research premises with an element of housing. The stated 157 dwellings is a developer led proposal that is being assessed on its own merits. The Council notes the proposed modification to distribute development across the Borough evenly. 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 are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The full list of alternative sites considered by the Council can be found in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).	
787	Paul	Bocking	GB8	Believe that some of the site could be released earlier for affordable housing, including houses with gardens and care home needs. All parts of the borough must have some new development for the town to prosper. There has been no development in this area for some time. Because of the sustainability of the site, it should be released earlier to meet housing needs.	None stated.	<p>Support for the allocation is noted.</p> <p>The Council note the proposed modification for a care home on the site. Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy highlights that the Council will support the development or redevelopment of specialist accommodation in the Borough provided it is located in a sustainable location and meets local need. During this plan period, the Council have identified sites for specialist accommodation. This site is proposed to be safeguarded for future development needs. At the time when this site is released from the Green Belt for development, the development scheme will be required to demonstrate that it is providing a housing mix based on local housing need. This could include private, affordable and specialist accommodation. However this would need to be considered during a review of the Core Strategy or during the preparation of the next local plan as the site is not required to meet the housing need in this plan period.</p> <p>Based on existing evidence, the Council is satisfied that the site should be safeguarded for future housing needs and not brought forward for development prior to 2027. The matter regarding safeguarding land in the Green Belt has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
787	Paul	Bocking	GB8	Support for the allocation of the site between 2022 and 2027. Earlier release may be possible with a new secondary school and leisure facilities planned to open in September 2017. Planning should include housing, care homes and a hotel that would service the needs of the school and leisure facilities. This will increase local employment and economy. The Council should allow earlier development under special circumstances as the site can supply the numbers required to fulfil outstanding commitments.	The site should be released from the Green Belt earlier then set out in the DPD for residential, hotel and care homes.	Support for the allocation is noted. The Council notes the suggestion that the site could be released for education needs prior to 2022. The Council recently approved the application for a secondary school and leisure facilities on the site and is due to open before 2022. The planning application can be viewed online. Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy clearly states that the Green Belt is identified as a broad location for future growth to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027. The Council, through the economic strategy of the Core Strategy, will encourage the development of town centre uses in the Borough's centres. This includes hotels as defined in the Glossary of the Core Strategy. Therefore the Council does not believe that this particular use can	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 justified as a very special circumstance in the Green Belt based on the Core Strategy. The Council note the proposed modification for a care home on the site. Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy highlights that the Council will support the development or redevelopment of specialist accommodation in the Borough provided it is located in a sustainable location and meets local need. During this plan period, the Council have identified sites for specialist accommodation. This site is proposed to be safeguarded for future development needs. At the time when this site is released from the Green Belt for development, the development scheme will be required to demonstrate that it is providing a housing mix based on local housing need. This could include private, affordable and specialist accommodation. However this would need to be considered during a review of the Core Strategy or during the preparation of the next local plan as the site is not required to meet the housing need in this plan period. Based on existing evidence, the Council is satisfied that the site should be safeguarded for future housing needs and not brought forward for development prior to 2027. The matter regarding safeguarding land in the Green Belt has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.	
787	Paul	Bocking	General	The site should be allocated between 2016 and 2022 for a Traveller pitch to meet WBC needs.	Allocate the site for a Travellers pitch between 2016 and 2022.	<p>The Council note the suggested site for Traveller accommodation. As set out within the Green Belt boundary review, this part of the Green Belt is particularly important to the containment of the southern edge of the town. In addition, the review notes that future development in this location could have an impact on the existing piecemeal nature of the existing local character. This is also reflected in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that states that the Green Belt in this location ensures the containment of the southern edge of the town, contributes towards the separation between neighbouring urban areas and assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) also notes that the site is not within walking distance of the nearest neighbourhood centre and would not reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>The Council approach to identifying sites for Travellers accommodation has been set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Section 4.0, in particular paragraph 4.7 highlights that the Council made a decision that in following the sequential approach to site selection, it 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 has identified that GB2, GB3 and GB7 should be expanded rather than identifying a new site in the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
787	Paul	Bocking	General	Would like to submit the site and believe it is suitable for a Traveller pitch.	Develop the site for a Traveller pitch.	<p>The Council note the suggested site for Traveller accommodation. As set out within the Green Belt boundary review, this part of the Green Belt is particularly important to the containment of the southern edge of the town. In addition, the review notes that future development in this location could have an impact on the existing piecemeal nature of the existing local character. This is also reflected in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that states that the Green Belt in this location ensures the containment of the southern edge of the town, contributes towards the separation between neighbouring urban areas and assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) also notes that the site is not within walking distance of the nearest neighbourhood centre and would not reduce the need 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
						travel. The Council approach to identifying sites for Travellers accommodation has been set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Section 4.0, in particular paragraph 4.7 highlights that the Council made a decision that in following the sequential approach to site selection, it 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 has identified that GB2, GB3 and GB7 should be expanded rather than identifying a new site in the Green Belt.	
787	Paul	Bocking	General	The site should be released from the Green Belt between 2022 and 2027. As a hotel it will be well placed to support the new school on Egley Road and in close proximity to Worplesdon Station. It will support the local economy and be a welcome return of a hotel on the site close to where one once stood.	Allocate the site for a hotel between 2022 and 2027.	<p>Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy clearly states that the Green Belt is identified as a broad location for future growth to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027. The Council, through the economic strategy of the Core Strategy, will encourage the development of town centre uses in the Borough's centres. This includes hotels as defined in the Glossary of the Core Strategy. Therefore the Council does not believe that this particular use can be justified as a very special circumstance in the Green Belt based on the Core Strategy.</p> <p>As set out within the Green Belt boundary review, this part of the Green Belt is particularly important to the containment of the southern edge of the town. In addition, the review notes that future development in this location could have an impact on the existing piecemeal nature of the existing local character. This is also reflected in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that states that the Green Belt in this location ensures the containment of the southern edge of the town, contributes towards the separation between neighbouring urban areas and assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) also notes that the site is not within walking distance of the nearest neighbourhood centre and would not reduce the need to travel.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
787	Paul	Bocking	General	Support the development of the site. The site would offer a perfect opportunity for a hotel and has history of being a hotel previously. It would support visitors to the proposed school on Egley Road.	Allocate the site for a hotel.	<p>Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy clearly states that the Green Belt is identified as a broad location for future growth to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027. The Council, through the economic strategy of the Core Strategy, will encourage the development of town centre uses in the Borough's centres. This includes hotels as defined in the Glossary of the Core Strategy. Therefore the Council does not believe that this particular use can be justified as a very special circumstance in the Green Belt based on the Core Strategy.</p> <p>As set out within the Green Belt boundary review, this part of the Green Belt is particularly important to the containment of the southern edge of the town. In addition, the review notes that future development in this location could have an impact on the existing piecemeal nature of the existing local character. This is also reflected in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that states that the Green Belt in this location ensures the containment of the southern edge of the town, contributes towards the separation between neighbouring urban areas and assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) also notes that the site is not within walking distance of the nearest neighbourhood centre and would not reduce the need to travel.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
787	Paul	Bocking	General	Should consider this site to increase Mayford Grange. It is a stand alone site with protected boundaries on all sides. Releasing it for	Develop the site for a retirement/elderly accommodation development.	The Council note the suggested site for specialist accommodation. As set out within the Green Belt boundary review, this part of the Green Belt is particularly important to the containment 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
				development will help the local economy and employment need. Support Tetlow King Planning on behalf of Retirement Villages Ltd.		southern edge of the town. In addition, the review notes that future development in this location could have an impact on the existing piecemeal nature of the existing local character. This is also reflected in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that states that the Green Belt in this location ensures the containment of the southern edge of the town, contributes towards the separation between neighbouring urban areas and assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.	
787	Paul	Bocking	General	Should consider this site to increase Mayford Grange. It has protected boundaries on all sides. Releasing it for development between 2016 and 2022 through a review of the Very Special Circumstances. Support Tetlow King Planning on behalf of Retirement Villages Ltd.	Develop the site for a retirement/elderly accommodation development between 2016 and 2022.	The Council note the suggested site for specialist accommodation. As set out within the Green Belt boundary review, this part of the Green Belt is particularly important to the containment of the southern edge of the town. In addition, the review notes that future development in this location could have an impact on the existing piecemeal nature of the existing local character. This is also reflected in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that states that the Green Belt in this location ensures the containment of the southern edge of the town, contributes towards the separation between neighbouring urban areas and assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
787	Paul	Bocking	General	Supporting	None stated.	Support noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
787	Paul	Bocking	General	Supporting	None stated.	Support noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
787	Paul	Bocking	GB8	Support. Opportunity to deliver a community project that will develop the young of Woking. Supports the site to be released from the Green Belt between 2022 and 2027.	None stated.	Support noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1571	Dieter, Annemarie	Boettcher	GB10	Object to removal of the Green Belt.	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
1571	Dieter, Annemarie	Boettcher	GB11	Object to removal of the Green Belt.	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
1571	Dieter, Annemarie	Boettcher	GB14	Object to removal of the Green Belt.	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
1571	Dieter, Annemarie	Boettcher	GB10	The existing road network is gridlocked. Additional homes and school in the local area will make this much worse.	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 transport 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. 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	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, 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.	
1571	Dieter, Annemarie	Boettcher	GB11	The existing road network is gridlocked. Additional homes and school in the local area will make this much worse.	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 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1571	Dieter, Annemarie	Boettcher	GB14	The existing road network is gridlocked. Additional homes and school in the local area will make this much worse.	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 the development of the site will be required 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
						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. 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.	
1571	Dieter, Annemarie	Boettcher	GB10	Object as Green Belt should 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
1571	Dieter, Annemarie	Boettcher	GB11	Object as Green Belt should 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
1571	Dieter, Annemarie	Boettcher	GB14	Object as Green Belt should 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
1368	Louisa	Bohan	GB12	Understands the pressures of a growing population however does not think that Pyrford has sufficient infrastructure (school, doctor, nurseries etc) to support the proposals	None stated.	With regards to comments about housing need , this has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 1.0). Infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1368	Louisa	Bohan	GB13	Understands the pressures of a growing population however does not think that Pyrford has sufficient infrastructure (school, doctor, nurseries etc) to support the proposals	None stated.	With regards to comments about housing need , this has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 1.0). Infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1368	Louisa	Bohan	GB12	Object to proposals in Pyrford. The character of the area is in danger of becoming urbanised	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0, 19.0 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
1368	Louisa	Bohan	GB13	Object to proposals in Pyrford. The character of the area is in danger of becoming urbanised	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0, 19.0 and Section 7.0In 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1368	Louisa	Bohan	GB12	The roads are already heavily congested and trains are at capacity. It would be unimaginable how much worse it would be to go ahead.	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
1368	Louisa	Bohan	GB13	The roads are already heavily congested and trains are at capacity. It would be unimaginable how much worse it would be to go ahead.	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 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. 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</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
						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.	
529	Cliff	Bolton	GB12	States that no consideration has been given to road infrastructure or the impact of six to eight hundred additional cars using local roads. Roads are becoming more and more dangerous, particularly at school drop off and pick up times.	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
529	Cliff	Bolton	GB13	States that no consideration has been given to road infrastructure or the impact of six to eight hundred additional cars using local roads. Roads are becoming more and more dangerous, particularly at school drop off and pick up times.	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
529	Cliff	Bolton	GB12	Questions the individuals and Council's motives on this issues and their ability to govern. There seems to be no desire from the Council to have proper, open discussions with residents on these issues. The six week consultation period is totally inadequate and is in the Council's favour.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the consultation process has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0.</p> <p>The six week consultation period is consistent with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. As set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council has communicated with the public and key stakeholders as best it can within the available resources. The approach taken by the Council is also consistent with its Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p>It should be highlighted that the Regulation 18 consultation will be followed by another six week consultation period, known as Regulation 19 consultation. This will then be followed by an Examination in Public. Therefore there are still two more opportunities to express views and raise concerns on the DPD before the document is finalised and adopted by the Council.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
529	Cliff	Bolton	GB13	Questions the individuals and Council's motives on this issues and their ability to govern. There seems to be no desire from the Council to have proper, open discussions with residents on these issues. The six week consultation period is totally inadequate and in the Council's favour.	None stated.	The representation regarding the consultation process has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0. The six week consultation period is consistent with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. As set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council has communicated with the public and key stakeholders as best it can within the available resources. The approach taken by the Council is also consistent with its Statement of Community Involvement. It should be highlighted that the Regulation 18 consultation will be followed by another six week consultation period, known as Regulation 19 consultation. This will then be followed by an Examination in Public. Therefore there are still two more opportunities to express views and raise concerns on the DPD before the document is finalised and adopted by the Council.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
529	Cliff	Bolton	GB12	Objects to the proposals, the lack of consultation with residents and lack of easily accessible information. The internet is the main source of	None stated.	The representation regarding the consultation process has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0.	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
				information, but many residents, particularly the senior generation, have no internet, so no source of information at all.		<p>As set out in the Topic Paper, the Council has made copies of the documents available in the libraries across the Borough, attended various consultation events including meetings with Resident's Associations and Neighbourhood Forums and at other locations in the Borough such as railway stations and shopping centres and held an open day at Civic Offices.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that it has done what it can within the available resources to engage the community during the Regulation 18 consultation.</p>	
529	Cliff	Bolton	GB13	Objects to the proposals, the lack of consultation with residents and lack of easily accessible information. The internet is the main source of information, but many residents, particularly the senior generation, have no internet, so no source of information at all.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the consultation process has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0.</p> <p>As set out in the Topic Paper, the Council has made copies of the documents available in the libraries across the Borough, attended various consultation events including meetings with Resident's Associations and Neighbourhood Forums and at other locations in the Borough such as railway stations and shopping centres and held an open day at Civic Offices.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that it has done what it can within the available resources to engage the community during the Regulation 18 consultation.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
529	Cliff	Bolton	GB12	The Council has not given adequate thought to the consequences of building on Green Belt land, particularly as there are other options in the borough.	None stated.	<p>The Council has considered both the impacts of future development in the Green Belt as well as the consequences of not providing homes to meet local housing needs. This was considered at some length during the preparation and examination of the Core Strategy. More information is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The Council has explored and considered a number of other sites in the existing urban areas of the Borough to help meet existing and future development needs. This has been fully set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic paper. See Section 11.0 and 9.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
529	Cliff	Bolton	GB13	The Council has not given adequate thought to the consequences of building on Green Belt land, particularly as there are other options in the borough.	None stated.	<p>The Council has considered both the impacts of future development in the Green Belt as well as the consequences of not providing homes to meet local housing needs. This was considered at some length during the preparation and examination of the Core Strategy. More information is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The Council has explored and considered a number of other sites in the existing urban areas of the Borough to help meet existing and future development needs. This has been fully set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic paper. See Section 11.0 and 9.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
529	Cliff	Bolton	GB12	Has witnessed as much as 25% of Pyrford farmland being sold for development. The sale of land in this instance is for pure profit for landowners and developers with no consideration for residents or preserving the character of the village.	None stated.	<p>The character of Pyrford is recognised by the Council and is set out in the Heritage of Woking as well as the Woking Character Study. The Council has a robust policy framework in place to ensure that any future development responds to and protects local character. This is set out within the Core Strategy. Most of the housing need in the Borough is internally generated. Planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. 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</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. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	
529	Cliff	Bolton	GB13	Has witnessed as much as 25% of Pyrford farmland being sold for development. The sale of land in this instance is for pure profit for landowners and developers with no consideration for residents or preserving the character of the village.	None stated.	<p>The character of Pyrford is recognised by the Council and is set out in the Heritage of Woking as well as the Woking Character Study. The Council has a robust policy framework in place to ensure that any future development responds to and protects local character. This is set out within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Most of the housing need in the Borough is internally generated. Planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. 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
529	Cliff	Bolton	GB12	Pyrford is one of the crown of Woking Council with excellent views, substantial wildlife, farmland and a neighbourly village feel about it. Why destroy such a lovely little piece of ancient England so a few people can make a lot of money. Once it's built on it's gone forever.	None stated.	<p>The lancape and townscape character of Pyrford is well documented by the Council, as set out in the Heritage of Woking and the Woking Character Study. The Council has a robust planning policy framework in place to make sure that these features are protected, as set out in the Core Strategy and emerging Development Management Policies DPD.</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 of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view.</p> <p>In lancape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views.</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</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>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>As part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA.</p> <p>Overall it is envisaged that planning to meet local housing 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.</p>	
529	Cliff	Bolton	GB13	Pyrford is one of the crown of Woking Council with excellent views, substantial wildlife, farmland and a neighbourly village feel about it. Why destroy such a lovely little piece of ancient England so a few people can make a lot of money. Once it's built on it's gone forever.	None stated.	<p>The lancape and townscape character of Pyrford is well documented by the Council, as set out in the Heritage of Woking and the Woking Character Study. The Council has a robust planning policy framework in place to make sure that these features are protected, as set out in the Core Strategy and emerging Development Management Policies DPD. 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. In lancape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views. 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. 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</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 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. As part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA. Overall it is envisaged that planning to meet local housing 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.	
529	Cliff	Bolton	GB12	Surface water flooding is already an issue when there is heavy rain and water supply is marginal.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0 and 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.9.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
529	Cliff	Bolton	GB13	Surface water flooding is already an issue when there is heavy rain and water supply is marginal.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0 and 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.9.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
529	Cliff	Bolton	GB12	The process of communication is poorly administered and in many areas, under scrutiny, lacks robustness and logic.	None stated.	The representation regarding communication during the Regulation 18 consultation has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0, in particular paragraph 6.1.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
529	Cliff	Bolton	GB13	The process of communication is poorly administered and in many areas, under scrutiny, lacks robustness and logic.	None stated.	The representation regarding communication during the Regulation 18 consultation has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0, in particular paragraph 6.1.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
529	Cliff	Bolton	GB12	There is insufficient local infrastructure, particularly schools, and medical and health services. A new school at Maybury should be the first consideration before building more homes.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.8. With regard to health facilities, 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
529	Cliff	Bolton	GB13	There is insufficient local infrastructure, particularly schools, and medical and health services. A new school at Maybury should be the first consideration before building more homes.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.8. With regard to health facilities, 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
994	Yvette	Bolton	GB12	Object to Green Belt development in Pyrford. The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse and dangerous for other road users and pedestrians.	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
						<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>	
994	Yvette	Bolton	GB13	Object to Green Belt development in Pyrford. The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse and dangerous for other road users and pedestrians.	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. 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. 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</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
						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.	
994	Yvette	Bolton	GB12	Local schools are already at capacity and will be unable to cope with extra children.	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
994	Yvette	Bolton	GB13	Local schools are already at capacity and will be unable to cope with extra children.	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
994	Yvette	Bolton	GB12	Concerned the housing will not be affordable. Has a son living at home who is unable to buy or rent in the area. A house on the site is likely to be around £1million due to land costs. It is likely many will be bought by buy to let landlords. Landowners are only concerned by profit.	None stated.	Proposals will be required to comply with Core Strategy policy CS12 which sets out affordable housing requirements. It is important to note that it is through development that affordable housing will be delivered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
994	Yvette	Bolton	GB13	Concerned the housing will not be affordable. Has a son living at home who is unable to buy or rent in the area. A house on the site is likely to be around £1million due to land costs. It is likely many will be bought by buy to let landlords. Landowners are only concerned by profit.	None stated.	Proposals will be required to comply with Core Strategy policy CS12 which sets out affordable housing requirements. It is important to note that it is through development that affordable housing will be delivered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
994	Yvette	Bolton	GB12	Local sewage and storm drains will be unable to cope with additional housing increasing the chance of flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively 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
994	Yvette	Bolton	GB13	Local sewage and storm drains will be unable to cope with additional housing increasing the chance of flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively 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
299	John	Bond	General	Government policy and local residents supports the release of brownfield sites prior to the release of Green Belt land. Asks for careful consideration of alternatives before the release of Green Belt	Careful consideration of alternatives before the release of Green Belt	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
299	John	Bond	General	Concern that insufficient regard has been had on existing local infrastructure. For example the impact of proposals in Byfleet and West Byfleet on the Parvis Road. Parvis Road (A425) is a key link to the A3 and M25 and suffers severe congestion. The proposals will exacerbate the 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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0The 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. 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	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, 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.	
299	John	Bond	GB4	Concern that insufficient regard has been had on existing local infrastructure. For example the impact of proposals in Byfleet and West Byfleet on the Parvis Road. Parvis Road (A425) is a key link to the A3 and M25 and suffers severe congestion. The proposals will exacerbate the 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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0The 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
299	John	Bond	GB5	Concern that insufficient regard has been had on existing local infrastructure. For example the impact of proposals in Byfleet and West Byfleet on the Parvis Road. Parvis Road (A425) is a key link to the A3 and M25 and suffers severe congestion. The proposals will exacerbate the 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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0The 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	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
						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. 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.	
299	John	Bond	GB15	Concern that insufficient regard has been had on existing local infrastructure. For example the impact of proposals in Byfleet and West Byfleet on the Parvis Road. Parvis Road (A425) is a key link to the A3 and M25 and suffers severe congestion. The proposals will exacerbate the 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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0The 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. 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	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
						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.	
299	John	Bond	General	Although there have been some improvements this year, in general, Byfleet has been neglected in terms of flooding issues	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
299	John	Bond	GB4	Although there have been some improvements this year, in general, Byfleet has been neglected in terms of flooding issues	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
299	John	Bond	GB5	Although there have been some improvements this year, in general, Byfleet has been neglected in terms of flooding issues	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
299	John	Bond	GB15	Although there have been some improvements this year, in general, Byfleet has been neglected in terms of flooding issues	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
299	John	Bond	General	Given the significance and importance of the consultation topic . The Council should have publicised the consultation more widely and made documents more readily available. The six weeks consultation period was tight. Given the importance of the topic, the period of consultation is insufficient. There should be a more open and fuller public consultation in order for the Council to fully represent the views of residents. The Site Allocation consultation and evidence base is no robust and the document needs to be re-evaluated. Plans for Sheerwater is an example where there has been insufficient consultation which has led to delays for further investigation	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
299	John	Bond	General	Health facilities have been removed from the area and not replaced. Residents need to travel far to receive medical treatment. Concerned that the increase in housing will exacerbate the problem.	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. 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 24.0The 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. The Council has	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
						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.	
299	John	Bond	GB4	Health facilities have been removed from the area and not replaced. Residents need to travel far to receive medical treatment. Concerned that the increase in housing will exacerbate the problem.	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. 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 24.0The 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. 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	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 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.	
299	John	Bond	GB5	Health facilities have been removed from the area and not replaced. Residents need to travel far to receive medical treatment. Concerned that the increase in housing will exacerbate the problem.	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. 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 24.0The 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
299	John	Bond	GB15	Health facilities have been removed from the area and not replaced. Residents need to travel far to receive medical treatment. Concerned that the increase in housing will exacerbate the problem.	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. The representation regarding congestion	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 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 24.0The 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. 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.	
299	John	Bond	General	Objects to the Site Allocation DPD on the following: 1) An inadequate evidence base 2) A lack of substantive public consultation 3) An insufficient regard for existing local issues	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 8.0, Section 6.0 and Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
299	John	Bond	General	The GBBR has received widespread criticism but there was no public consultation or opportunity to comment on it. The Site Allocation DPD which is available for comment is not clear that it contains proposals for the release of Green Belt, and is therefore misleading in this respect. Public opinion is clearly against releasing the GB and therefore the Council should allow comment on the GBBR. If residents were aware early on that the GB may be threatened then they could have registered their views earlier	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, Section 1.0 particularly 1.13, Section 6.0 and Section 8.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
299	John	Bond	General	The GBBR was costly and is not considered sufficient evidence to be considered by itself. There is no equivalent study on brownfield sites, which may have demonstrated that there was no need to consider the release of GB land at all. There should be a similar independent study to	Undertake an independent study, equivalent to the GBBR which looks at alternatives to using the GB	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 16.0In addition, 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	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 GBBR that considers alternatives to using the GB. The GBBR sets a precedent where no part of the GB is safe. The name of the study might be misleading as it suggests minor adjustments-where this is not the case.It is unreasonable to remove concentrations of GB from some areas and leave other areas of GB untouched. E.g. significant areas of GB in Byfleet, West Byfleet.		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).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.	
299	John	Bond	General	Raises concern that a petition submitted by 2500 Byfleet residents and a questionnaire signed by 1600 regarding the release of GB in Byfleet have not been have not been taken into account.	Consideration is given to the petition and questionnaire submitted by Byfleet residents	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 Representer ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
299	John	Bond	GB4	Raises concern that a petition submitted by 2500 Byfleet residents and a questionnaire signed by 1600 regarding the release of GB in Byfleet have not been have not been taken into account.	Consideration is given to the petition and questionnaire submitted by Byfleet residents	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 Representer ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
299	John	Bond	GB5	Raises concern that a petition submitted by 2500 Byfleet residents and a questionnaire signed by 1600 regarding the release of GB in Byfleet have not been have not been taken into account.	Consideration is given to the petition and questionnaire submitted by Byfleet residents	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 Representer ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
509	Jane	Bond	GB4	Raises concern about the roads the sites are positioned by, particularly the A245 Parvis Road, and whether they will be able cope with the extra traffic generated by housing development. Careful consideration should be given to this, particularly with regard to sharp blind ben, busy junctions and congestion arising due to closures or issues on the A3 and M25.	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
509	Jane	Bond	GB5	Raises concern about the roads the sites are positioned by, particularly the A245 Parvis Road, and whether they will be able cope with the extra traffic generated by housing development. Careful consideration should be given to this, particularly with regard to sharp blind ben, busy junctions and congestion arising due to closures or issues on the A3 and M25.	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
509	Jane	Bond	GB4	Criticises the Council for not setting up a venue for 'informal chats' in Byfleet and argues that the	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0, particularly paragraph	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
				Council should have set up events in each location as part of the consultation exercise. Not doing so shows a lack of respect for the residents affected and gives out the message that our view don't count and that residents' local knowledge and expertise is not valued or recognised.		6.3.	of this representation
509	Jane	Bond	GB5	Criticises the Council for not setting up a venue for 'informal chats' in Byfleet and argues that the Council should have set up events in each location as part of the consultation exercise. Not doing so shows a lack of respect for the residents affected and gives out the message that our view don't count and that residents' local knowledge and expertise is not valued or recognised.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0, particularly paragraph 6.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
509	Jane	Bond	GB4	Questions how a Council can impose such incredulous plans on its residents, which appear to ignore their quality of life. Details of how such development can be sustained is omitted from the plans.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
509	Jane	Bond	GB5	Questions how a Council can impose such incredulous plans on its residents, which appear to ignore their quality of life. Details of how such development can be sustained is omitted from the plans.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
509	Jane	Bond	GB4	If the planned release of the Green Belt for future development goes ahead, the road system and all other associated works should be fully addressed before building starts, to avoid inevitable congestion.	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
509	Jane	Bond	GB5	If the planned release of the Green Belt for future development goes ahead, the road system and all other associated works should be fully addressed before building starts, to avoid inevitable congestion. Residents will need reassurance, evidence and proof that plans are in place for infrastructure improvements before agreeing to any release of Green Belt. Without the necessary preventative measures development has potential to do great damage to the environment.	None stated.	<p>This representation is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. The Council agrees that the environment should not be damaged as a result of development, and 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 Lancap 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.</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 lancape setting of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
509	Jane	Bond	GB5	Concerned about inaccuracies and local knowledge should by the authors of the report. Sites are misleadingly named, causing difficulty for local residents in identifying the sites, and creating a lack of faith in the whole exercise.	None stated.	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	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
						(SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	
509	Jane	Bond	GB4	Concerned about inaccuracies and local knowledge should by the authors of the report. Sites are misleadingly named, causing difficulty for local residents in identifying the sites, and creating a lack of faith in the whole exercise.	None stated.	The description of the sites is not in any way meant to be misleading. Each site is also accompanied by a map and aerial photograph showing the site's boundary to enable identification. The Council will consider whether there is a better way of naming this site in light of the comment made.	Consider whether the site could be named more clearly with regard to this comment.
509	Jane	Bond	GB4	Appreciates that more housing is required but surely land can be found on brownfield or infill sites either in Byfleet or elsewhere in the borough, without taking away Green Belt from an area already at capacity.	None stated.	This representation is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 3.0, 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
509	Jane	Bond	GB5	Appreciates that more housing is required but surely land can be found on brownfield or infill sites either in Byfleet or elsewhere in the borough, without taking away Green Belt from an area already at capacity.	None stated.	This representation is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 3.0, 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
509	Jane	Bond	GB4	The pockets of land have been viewed using a rough map only, with little regard to 'on the ground' evidence. Visits would have shown proximity to the road network and observations of volume and flow of traffic at different times.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0, particularly paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 8.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
509	Jane	Bond	GB5	The pockets of land have been viewed using a rough map only, with little regard to 'on the ground' evidence. Visits would have shown proximity to the road network and observations of volume and flow of traffic at different times.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0, particularly paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 8.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
509	Jane	Bond	GB4	Very concerned about the planned release of Green Belt in Byfleet. There is very little green space left in and around the village, and this needs to be preserved for residents to continue to enjoy.	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 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). 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. This representation is further addressed in Section 21.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
509	Jane	Bond	GB5	Very concerned about the planned release of Green Belt in Byfleet. There is very little green space left in and around the village, and this needs to be preserved for residents to continue to enjoy.	None stated.	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	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
						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.	
509	Jane	Bond	GB4	The apparent lack of local knowledge [of the sites] creates a huge lack of confidence among residents, and suggests a disregard for local communities who will have to live with development, which is inappropriate for this tight knit community. The is no more land to spare for additional housing.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
509	Jane	Bond	GB5	The apparent lack of local knowledge [of the sites] creates a huge lack of confidence among residents, and suggests a disregard for local communities who will have to live with development, which is inappropriate for this tight knit community. The is no more land to spare for additional housing.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1524	John	Bond	GB4	Registers the petition signed by some 2,500 residents, asking WBC to preserve the Green Belt in Byfleet, especially around Murray's Lane. At the time of the petition in 2013 it was believed the only Green Belt in Byfleet was threatened, and it was presented to WBC for safekeeping. The 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 our village.'	None stated.	The Council has a responsibility to identify sufficient land to deliver its housing requirement over the entire plan period. Against an objectively assessed housing need of 594 dwellings per year the Core Strategy commits the Council to make provision for the delivery of an annual average housing requirement of 292 dwellings. The 292 housing requirement was agreed by the Inspector of the Secretary of State on the basis that the Council will commit to the release of Green Belt land to enable the delivery of about 550 homes between 2022 and 2027. This is a policy of the Council as set out in Policies CS6: Green Belt and CS10: Housing Provision and Distribution of the Core Strategy. Against this backdrop it will be very difficult for the Council to get a sound Site Allocations DPD if it failed to identify sufficient land in the Green Belt to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027. The Council has recently reviewed its Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, and none of these studies changes the policy position of the Core Strategy. In line with guidance provided in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the Council has also decided that to ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary it will safeguard about 40 hectares of Green Belt land to meet future development needs between 2027 and 2040. The NPPF advises that when defining Green Belt boundaries, local planning authorities should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Where necessary, identify in their plans areas of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period; o Make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development. o Satisfy themselves that the Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period. Without the proposed safeguarded sites in the Site Allocations DPD, the Council will have to carry out another Green Belt boundary review and alter again the Green Belt boundary at the end of this plan period to meet future development needs beyond 2027. This will be contrary to the advice in the NPPF. The Inspector also prescribed the means for identifying the Green Belt land to meet housing need and the timing for doing so. He emphasised that 'a review of the Green Belt boundary will be carried out to inform the Site Allocations DPD and in any event	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>before 2016/17 to evaluate where it is appropriate to release land in the Green Belt for housing purposes and the size and scale of the release'. The Site Allocations DPD has been prepared in this context. To inform the DPD, the Council has carried out a Green Belt boundary review, Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites, Habitats Regulations Assessment and a Strategic Transport Assessment and other evidence base studies to make sure that sites that are proposed to be release from the Green Belt to meet future development needs will not undermine its purposes. In particular, to ensure that the allocated sites are the most sustainable when compared with other alternatives. A comprehensive list of the evidence base studies used to inform the Site Allocations DPD is at Appendix 1 of the draft Site Allocations DPD. Based on the evidence sites GB4 (land south of High Road, Byfleet) and GB5 (land to the south of Murray's Lane, Byfleet) have been identified to be safeguarded to contribute towards meeting future developments needs between 2027 and 2040. The evidence also demonstrates that the sites can be developed without significant damage to the overall purposes of the Green Belt. Officers are satisfied that the release of the two sites from the Green Belt will be in accordance with requirements of the NPPF, in particular, paragraph 85 and the Core Strategy. The questionnaire raises the same issue as the petition and as such is covered by the above Officer's response.</p>	
1524	John	Bond	GB5	<p>Registers the petition signed by some 2,500 residents, asking WBC to preserve the Green Belt in Byfleet, especially around Murray's Lane. At the time of the petition in 2013 it was believed the only Green Belt in Byfleet was threatened, and it was presented to WBC for safekeeping. The petition states 'We, the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of the Green Belt, especially in the areas surrounding Murray's Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around our village.'</p>	None stated.	<p>The Council has a responsibility to identify sufficient land to deliver its housing requirement over the entire plan period. Against an objectively assessed housing need of 594 dwellings per year the Core Strategy commits the Council to make provision for the delivery of an annual average housing requirement of 292 dwellings. The 292 housing requirement was agreed by the Inspector of the Secretary of State on the basis that the Council will commit to the release of Green Belt land to enable the delivery of about 550 homes between 2022 and 2027. This is a policy of the Council as set out in Policies CS6: Green Belt and CS10: Housing Provision and Distribution of the Core Strategy. Against this backdrop it will be very difficult for the Council to get a sound Site Allocations DPD if it failed to identify sufficient land in the Green Belt to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027. The Council has recently reviewed its Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, and none of these studies changes the policy position of the Core Strategy. In line with guidance provided in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the Council has also decided that to ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary it will safeguard about 40 hectares of Green Belt land to meet future development needs between 2027 and 2040. The NPPF advises that when defining Green Belt boundaries, local planning authorities should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Where necessary, identify in their plans areas of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period; o Make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development. o Satisfy themselves that the Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period. <p>Without the proposed safeguarded sites in the Site Allocations DPD, the Council will have to carry out another Green Belt boundary review and alter again the Green Belt boundary at the end of this plan period to meet future development needs beyond 2027. This will be contrary to the advice in the NPPF. 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
						Inspector also prescribed the means for identifying the Green Belt land to meet housing need and the timing for doing so. He emphasised that 'a review of the Green Belt boundary will be carried out to inform the Site Allocations DPD and in any event before 2016/17 to evaluate where it is appropriate to release land in the Green Belt for housing purposes and the size and scale of the release'. The Site Allocations DPD has been prepared in this context. To inform the DPD, the Council has carried out a Green Belt boundary review, Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites, Habitats Regulations Assessment and a Strategic Transport Assessment and other evidence base studies to make sure that sites that are proposed to be release from the Green Belt to meet future development needs will not undermine its purposes. In particular, to ensure that the allocated sites are the most sustainable when compared with other alternatives. A comprehensive list of the evidence base studies used to inform the Site Allocations DPD is at Appendix 1 of the draft Site Allocations DPD. Based on the evidence sites GB4 (land south of High Road, Byfleet) and GB5 (land to the south of Murray's Lane, Byfleet) have been identified to be safeguarded to contribute towards meeting future developments needs between 2027 and 2040. The evidence also demonstrates that the sites can be developed without significant damage to the overall purposes of the Green Belt. Officers are satisfied that the release of the two sites from the Green Belt will be in accordance with requirements of the NPPF, in particular, paragraph 85 and the Core Strategy. The questionnaire raises the same issue as the petition and as such is covered by the above Officer's response.	
1524	John	Bond	GB4	The Byfleet questionnaire in 2014 was a multi-page questionnaire with responses from some 1,600 residents. 'Building on the Green Belt' was a concern in 89% of replies, and the Green Belt areas around Murrays Lane and the Queen's Head public house were both considered important to the village by well over 80% respondents.	None stated.	The Council has a responsibility to identify sufficient land to deliver its housing requirement over the entire plan period. Against an objectively assessed housing need of 594 dwellings per year the Core Strategy commits the Council to make provision for the delivery of an annual average housing requirement of 292 dwellings. The 292 housing requirement was agreed by the Inspector of the Secretary of State on the basis that the Council will commit to the release of Green Belt land to enable the delivery of about 550 homes between 2022 and 2027. This is a policy of the Council as set out in Policies CS6: Green Belt and CS10: Housing Provision and Distribution of the Core Strategy. Against this backdrop it will be very difficult for the Council to get a sound Site Allocations DPD if it failed to identity sufficient land in the Green Belt to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027. The Council has recently reviewed its Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, and none of these studies changes the policy position of the Core Strategy. In line with guidance provided in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the Council has also decided that to ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary it will safeguard about 40 hectares of Green Belt land to meet future development needs between 2027 and 2040. The NPPF advises that when defining Green Belt boundaries, local planning authorities should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Where necessary, identify in their plans areas of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period; o Make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development. o Satisfy themselves that the Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period. Without the proposed safeguarded sites in 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
						<p>Allocations DPD, the Council will have to carry out another Green Belt boundary review and alter again the Green Belt boundary at the end of this plan period to meet future development needs beyond 2027. This will be contrary to the advice in the NPPF. The Inspector also prescribed the means for identifying the Green Belt land to meet housing need and the timing for doing so. He emphasised that 'a review of the Green Belt boundary will be carried out to inform the Site Allocations DPD and in any event before 2016/17 to evaluate where it is appropriate to release land in the Green Belt for housing purposes and the size and scale of the release'. The Site Allocations DPD has been prepared in this context. To inform the DPD, the Council has carried out a Green Belt boundary review, Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites, Habitats Regulations Assessment and a Strategic Transport Assessment and other evidence base studies to make sure that sites that are proposed to be release from the Green Belt to meet future development needs will not undermine its purposes. In particular, to ensure that the allocated sites are the most sustainable when compared with other alternatives. A comprehensive list of the evidence base studies used to inform the Site Allocations DPD is at Appendix 1 of the draft Site Allocations DPD. Based on the evidence sites GB4 (land south of High Road, Byfleet) and GB5 (land to the south of Murray's Lane, Byfleet) have been identified to be safeguarded to contribute towards meeting future developments needs between 2027 and 2040. The evidence also demonstrates that the sites can be developed without significant damage to the overall purposes of the Green Belt. Officers are satisfied that the release of the two sites from the Green Belt will be in accordance with requirements of the NPPF, in particular, paragraph 85 and the Core Strategy. The questionnaire raises the same issue as the petition and as such is covered by the above Officer's response.</p>	
1524	John	Bond	GB5	<p>The Byfleet questionnaire in 2014 was a multi-page questionnaire with responses from some 1,600 residents. 'Building on the Green Belt' was a concern in 89% of replies, and the Green Belt areas around Murrays Lane and the Queen's Head public house were both considered important to the village by well over 80% respondents.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Council has a responsibility to identify sufficient land to deliver its housing requirement over the entire plan period. Against an objectively assessed housing need of 594 dwellings per year the Core Strategy commits the Council to make provision for the delivery of an annual average housing requirement of 292 dwellings. The 292 housing requirement was agreed by the Inspector of the Secretary of State on the basis that the Council will commit to the release of Green Belt land to enable the delivery of about 550 homes between 2022 and 2027. This is a policy of the Council as set out in Policies CS6: Green Belt and CS10: Housing Provision and Distribution of the Core Strategy. Against this backdrop it will be very difficult for the Council to get a sound Site Allocations DPD if it failed to identity sufficient land in the Green Belt to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027. The Council has recently reviewed its Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, and none of these studies changes the policy position of the Core Strategy. In line with guidance provided in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the Council has also decided that to ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary it will safeguard about 40 hectares of Green Belt land to meet future development needs between 2027 and 2040. The NPPF advises that when defining Green Belt boundaries, local planning authorities should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Where necessary, identify in their plans areas of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period; o Make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land 	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>should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development.o Satisfy themselves that the Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period.Without the proposed safeguarded sites in the Site Allocations DPD, the Council will have to carry out another Green Belt boundary review and alter again the Green Belt boundary at the end of this plan period to meet future development needs beyond 2027. This will be contrary to the advice in the NPPF.The Inspector also prescribed the means for identifying the Green Belt land to meet housing need and the timing for doing so. He emphasised that 'a review of the Green Belt boundary will be carried out to inform the Site Allocations DPD and in any event before 2016/17 to evaluate where it is appropriate to release land in the Green Belt for housing purposes and the size and scale of the release'. The Site Allocations DPD has been prepared in this context. To inform the DPD, the Council has carried out a Green Belt boundary review, Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites, Habitats Regulations Assessment and a Strategic Transport Assessment and other evidence base studies to make sure that sites that are proposed to be release from the Green Belt to meet future development needs will not undermine its purposes. In particular, to ensure that the allocated sites are the most sustainable when compared with other alternatives. A comprehensive list of the evidence base studies used to inform the Site Allocations DPD is at Appendix 1 of the draft Site Allocations DPD. Based on the evidence sites GB4 (land south of High Road, Byfleet) and GB5 (land to the south of Murray's Lane, Byfleet) have been identified to be safeguarded to contribute towards meeting future developments needs between 2027 and 2040. The evidence also demonstrates that the sites can be developed without significant damage to the overall purposes of the Green Belt. Officers are satisfied that the release of the two sites from the Green Belt will be in accordance with requirements of the NPPF, in particular, paragraph 85 and the Core Strategy.The questionnaire raises the same issue as the petition and as such is covered by the above Officer's response.</p>	
366	J	Bone	GB10	<p>Object to the removal of GB land GB10, GB11 and GB14. One of the main purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns/villages. The proposals would do the opposite and removing the separation between Mayford, Woking and Guildford.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0</p>	<p>No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation</p>
366	J	Bone	GB11	<p>Object to the removal of GB land GB10, GB11 and GB14. One of the main purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns/villages. The proposals would do the opposite and removing the separation between Mayford, Woking and Guildford.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0</p>	<p>No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation</p>
366	J	Bone	GB14	<p>Object to the removal of GB land GB10, GB11 and GB14. One of the main purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns/villages. The proposals would do the opposite and removing the separation between Mayford, Woking and Guildford.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0</p>	<p>No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation</p>
366	J	Bone	GB10	<p>The GBBR assessments recommend the sites on the basis of proximity to a local centre. The local centre has a post office and barbers and no additional supporting infrastructure. Residents will</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</p>	<p>No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation</p>

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				be isolated from local services/facilities		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.	
366	J	Bone	GB11	The GBBR assessments recommend the sites on the basis of proximity to a local centre. The local centre has a post office and barbers and no additional supporting infrastructure. Residents will be isolated from local services/facilities	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
366	J	Bone	GB14	The GBBR assessments recommend the sites on the basis of proximity to a local centre. The local centre has a post office and barbers and no additional supporting infrastructure. Residents will be isolated from local services/facilities	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
366	J	Bone	GB10	The local transport infrastructure will not cope with the increase in use. Egley Road is often congested. It is likely that other roads will see greater use (e.g. Hill Lane) which has a little bridge. The network cannot cope with new housing, retail park and school.	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, 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 comprehensively addressed through the development management process. 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	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
						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.	
366	J	Bone	GB11	The local transport infrastructure will not cope with the increase in use. Egley Road is often congested. It is likely that other roads will see greater use (e.g. Hill Lane) which has a little bridge. The network cannot cope with new housing, retail park and school.	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. 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
366	J	Bone	GB14	The local transport infrastructure will not cope with the increase in use. Egley Road is often congested. It is likely that other roads will see greater use (e.g. Hill Lane) which has a little bridge. The network cannot cope with new housing, retail park and school.	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. 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</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
						comprehensively addressed through the development management process. 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 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.	
366	J	Bone	GB10	The proposed housing density of 30dph is not grossly excessive compared with current average density of 5.5 dph or less	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
366	J	Bone	GB11	The proposed housing density of 30dph is not grossly excessive compared with current average density of 5.5 dph or less	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
366	J	Bone	GB10	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area- this is questioned.	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
366	J	Bone	GB11	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area- this is questioned.	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
366	J	Bone	GB14	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area- this is questioned.	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
366	J	Bone	GB10	No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that Woking has exhausted Brownfield sites.	Provide evidence to demonstrate that WBC has exhausted brownfield sites	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
366	J	Bone	GB11	No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that Woking has exhausted Brownfield sites.	Provide evidence to demonstrate that WBC has exhausted brownfield sites	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
366	J	Bone	GB14	No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that Woking has exhausted Brownfield sites.	Provide evidence to demonstrate that WBC has exhausted brownfield sites	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
366	J	Bone	GB10	WBC openly states that land ownership makes the removal of land from the GB more viable. The	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				ownership of land should have no bearing on whether it should be GB or not.			of this representation
366	J	Bone	GB11	WBC openly states that land ownership makes the removal of land from the GB more viable. The ownership of land should have no bearing on whether it should be GB 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
366	J	Bone	GB14	WBC openly states that land ownership makes the removal of land from the GB more viable. The ownership of land should have no bearing on whether it should be GB 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
1360	S	Bonito	GB12	Health care facilities are at capacity and will not cope with more people	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
1360	S	Bonito	GB13	Health care facilities are at capacity and will not cope with more people	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
1360	S	Bonito	GB12	Objects to proposals. Warns of the significant traffic that will result from the new development.	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</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
						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.	
1360	S	Bonito	GB13	Objects to proposals. Warns of the significant traffic that will result from the new development.	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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0The 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
273	E	Booth	GB8	Concerned about impact on archaeology	None stated.	Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS20: Heritage and Conservation. This seeks to protect Areas of High Archaeological Potential from harmful development and requires an archaeological evaluation and investigation for development proposals on sites greater than 0.4 ha. The Council also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM20: Heritage Assets and their settings. 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
						<p>The County Archaeologist has also provided comments on the proposal sites (see Rep ID 1240). These will also be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0</p>	
273	E	Booth	GB8	Keep Green Belt for the purpose it was intended for. To protect the countryside, wildlife and for future generations	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to the Green Belt in line with Government priorities. The reason for the proposed release of small areas within the Green Belt 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
273	E	Booth	GB8	Concerned about increased crime	None stated.	The likelihood of increased crime as a result of development proposals is an unknown factor. However all development proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy. The policy requires that proposals meet the criteria set out, including to create safe and secure environments, where opportunities for crime are minimised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
273	E	Booth	GB8	Concerned about increased noise	None stated.	Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with 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 also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM7 Noise and Light pollution. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
273	E	Booth	GB8	Concerned about increased traffic	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly 3.6 and Section 20.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
273	E	Booth	GB8	Concerned about loss of arable and amenity land	None stated.	The loss of some green field land is inevitable however the Council has sought to identify areas that would have the least impact- this is demonstrated through the Sustainability Appraisal. In addition, all proposals will need to comply with other development plan policies, including Policy CS17: Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation where developer contributions will be sought to make provision for green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
273	E	Booth	GB8	Concerned about loss of green fiel and lancape features (Escarpments)	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>Please also see Section 7.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
273	E	Booth	GB8	Objects to removal of land from Green Belt	Don't remove land from the Green Belt	The Council sympathises with these objections however it is necessary for the Council to identify sites within the Green Belt to deliver sufficient housing in the Borough to meet the identified	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
						housing need. This has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0	
273	E	Booth	GB8	Concerned about increased pollution	None stated.	<p>Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with 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 also has draft policies in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) to ensure a healthy built environment, including Policies DM5-DM8 to mitigate against various types of pollution.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
273	E	Booth	GB8	Suggests consideration of other brownfield sites	Consider alternative brownfield sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 16.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
273	E	Booth	GB8	Concerned about loss of 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. 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
273	E	Booth	GB8	Concerned about the merging of Woking and Mayford	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
861	Esther	Booth	GB11	My property abuts the site GB11. Goes against the purpose of Green Belt to prevent urban sprawl. Would result in Hook Heath and Mayford being continuously developed with little green space. The delineation of areas is the objective of Green Belt. The current strip of Green Belt is already narrow in this area.	Sites closer to Woking that have already been developed or are in need of regeneration.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
861	Esther	Booth	GB11	There are good reasons for the Green Belt policy and it should only be lifted in exceptional circumstances, not convenience. Reduction to the Green Belt should only be necessary and proportionate. This is not the case here as the Council has gone beyond the Core Strategy housing requirement of 550 and until 2027.	Sites closer to Woking that have already been developed or are in need of regeneration.	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 2.0	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
861	Esther	Booth	GB11	Local infrastructure doesn't support this scale of development. Abutting roads and roads leading to the site will not cope with both additional and construction traffic as they are narrow (causing passing problems), have weak road bridges over the railway and are already busy. Including Egley Road and Sanders Lane.	Sites closer to Woking that have already been developed or are in need of regeneration.	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
861	Esther	Booth	GB11	Proposed 30dph is excessive compared to local densities (5.5dph Hook Heath and lower in Fishers Hill CA). The development would be out of keeping with the surrounding area.	Sites closer to Woking that have already been developed or are in need of regeneration.	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
861	Esther	Booth	GB11	The site is an important community amenity used for leisure activities and a natural environment home to lots of flora and fauna including bats. Green Belt is intended to protect this type of habitat.	Sites closer to Woking that have already been developed or are in need of regeneration.	Objection noted. The representation regarding the loss of amenity has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0. 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. 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. The Council note the proposed modification. In response, the Council's approach to Green Belt development and safeguarding for future development needs has been set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0. In addition, the Council has carried out a comprehensive assessment of the existing urban area of the borough. This is set out in Section 11.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
422	M	Boschier	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common, an SSSI. The proposal would decrease the visual amenity and increase the risk to wildlife.	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 Lancap 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 Lancap grounds. The Lancap Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD 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
						<p>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 lancape 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>	
422	M	Boschier	GB8	It is recommended that land is released from the GB on the basis of creating a defensible Green Belt Boundary. The removal of the escarpment would make the boundary weaker.	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
422	M	Boschier	GB8	Development would increase traffic on local roads. Saunders Lane is already heavily congested at peak times	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
422	M	Boschier	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane include Escarpment and Rising Ground, based on CS24 and NE7 the site should not be developed	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
422	M	Boschier	GB8	Mayford is a key rainwater absorption area. Development will increase surface water and increase flood risk.	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
422	M	Boschier	GB7	The views of the local community need to be taken into consideration- who will be most impacted by the proposals	None stated.	The Council values the comments raised by residents. The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
422	M	Boschier	GB8	The views of the local community need to be taken into consideration- who will be most impacted by the proposals	None stated.	The Council values the comments raised by residents. The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
422	M	Boschier	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
422	M	Boschier	GB7	Object to GB7. Woking's Traveller sites are focussed in this part of the Borough. Mayford already provides a major contribution 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
422	M	Boschier	GB8	Object to proposals. We brought this property for our Children so they	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0.	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
				can explore the surrounding countryside it offers and not be brought up on an estate with no parks, just endless housing hanging around street corners.		Please also see Section 3.0 paragraph 3.7	of this representation
422	M	Boschier	GB8	The GBBR has been undertaken without a landscape character assessment. This brings into question the 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 and 10.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
422	M	Boschier	GB8	The GBBR recommended Mayford due to its proximity to the Local Centre. The Local Centre is a Post Office and barbers- there is no other supporting infrastructure or facilities to meet the needs	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. 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
422	M	Boschier	GB8	The GBBR recommended Mayford for ease of access to the Town Centre. The estimated travel times based on google maps are inaccurate with actual travel times higher. Woking would need to be radically changed to accommodate the growth	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
422	M	Boschier	GB8	Local roads and single lane bridges will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.	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
422	M	Boschier	GB8	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot and proposals will increase traffic here.	None stated.	The Council is aware of deficiencies in public transport. 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	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>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 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>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p>	
547	Anne	Botcherby	GB15	Appendix: sets out 12 principles for development affecting the River Wey Corridor in Woking Borough between Bowers Lock and Byfleet Bridge.	None stated.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
547	Anne	Botcherby	GB17	Appendix: sets out 12 principles for development affecting the River Wey Corridor in Woking Borough between Bowers Lock and Byfleet Bridge.	None stated.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
547	Anne	Botcherby	GB15	The site allocation outlines the need for cycle and pedestrian infrastructure as part of any proposal, and given such a need, questions how 'sustainable' the site is and how much weight has been given to infrastructure needs in putting forward the site for development. Objects to the proposed removal from the Green Belt and allocation for housing development.	None stated.	This point is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Cycling and pedestrian links and provision are particularly supported by the Council, and the Council will ensure that in 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. This is included as something to be addressed in a Key Requirement (which would need to be met for development to proceed) within the draft allocation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
547	Anne	Botcherby	GB15	Supports the requirement for proposals to consider the impact upon flooding, however requests that the policy specifically requires consideration of the impact on the water table, and the structural integrity of the Navigations.	Include a requirement for consideration of the impact on the water table, and the structural integrity of the Navigations.	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. Assessment to understand the water table and structural integrity of the site will be required prior to site preparation and ground works taking place.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
547	Anne	Botcherby	GB15	The Trust would need a full assessment of potential surface water that might be deposited in this section of the Navigation before consent is granted. As the adjacent section of the Wey navigation is not a river section it has no significant flow. Therefore a large increase in surface water could have a significant impact on water quality. Also there would need to be consideration about the impact of and ability to control water entering New Haw Lock, a weir downstream of the site.	Include wording to require assessment of potential surface water on the Navigation, including its impact on New Haw Lock.	The comment is noted and the Trust will certainly be consulted on any specific proposal that comes forward for development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
547	Anne	Botcherby	GB15	Despite the objection to the principle of the allocation, supports Policy SA1 which confirms the site will not be considered for release until 2022 and only if evidence demonstrates significant under provision of housing (with no indication that the shortfall can be met on previously developed land).	None stated.	Support for SA1 is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
547	Anne	Botcherby	SA1	Despite the objection to the principle of the allocation, supports Policy SA1 which confirms the site will not be considered for release until 2022 and only if evidence demonstrates	None stated.	Support for SA1 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
				significant under provision of housing (with no indication that the shortfall can be met on previously developed land).			
547	Anne	Botcherby	GB15	Supports the specific policy requirement to provide a strong lancape edge to the development site, however there also needs to be specific reference to a requirement for a Lancape Visual Impact Assessment LVIA (not just a lancape assessment focussing on biodiversity), with consideration of the scale, bulk and massing of the development on the setting, and visual impact on the River Wey Navigation and associated Conservation Area.	Include a requirement for a Lancape Visual Impact Assessment LVIA (not just a lancape assessment focussing on biodiversity), with consideration of the scale, bulk and massing of the development on the setting and visual impact on the River Wey Navigation and associated Conservation Area.	The requirements of the proposal seek to protect the general lancape character of the area. Policies CS17 of the Core Strategy and DM4 of the Development Management Policies DPD specifically seeks to protect the lancape visual impact of development that could impact on the canal visually. Any additional layer of requirement as suggested will be duplication.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
547	Anne	Botcherby	GB15	Outlines the greenfield nature of the site and the lancape character detail as described in the Green Belt Review. The Trust considers the site functions in terms of three key purposes of the Green Belt – to check the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas, to protect neighbouring towns merging into one another and to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. The Green Belt Review acknowledges the site is of critical importance to two Green Belt purposes. Notwithstanding this, the Green Belt Review concludes that there is 'very high potential to deliver sustainable development' which sufficiently outweighs the harm to the lancape character and the site's importance to Green Belt purposes, and such that it is recommended for release from the Green Belt. In reaching such a conclusion, the historical significance of the River Wey Navigation has not been considered nor a proper lancape assessment undertaken.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 19.0. The Council will continue to engage with the National Trust in the development of this document.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
547	Anne	Botcherby	GB17	For the site to be designated as a SANG, it will need to fulfil criteria set by Natural England, including ensuring adequate parking, accessibility and clear signposting.	The SANG would be required to fulfil Natural England criteria including ensuring adequate parking, accessibility and clear signposting.	The Council note the in principle support for the site to be allocated as a SANG. The Council has and is committed to working with Natural England and other key stakeholders in bringing forward the site as a SANG. It will ensure that it meets the Natural England SANG criteria at a later detailed stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
547	Anne	Botcherby	GB17	The historical and lancape significance of the River Wey Navigation should be identified in the policy and inform the location and design of any car park, signage and accessibility proposals in terms of its impact on the setting of the Navigations and Conservation Area.	The historical and lancape significance of the River Wey Navigation should be identified and inform the local and design of any car park, signage and accessibility proposals, in terms of impact on the setting of the Navigations and Conservation Area.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0 and 19.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
547	Anne	Botcherby	GB17	The National Trust is experienced in delivering lancape sensitive signage and paths for all abilities, and would welcome the opportunity to be involved in development of the SANG, particularly with regard to whether the Wey Navigation can provide any additional recreational benefits to the SANG. Would like to continue to be consulted on this document and any planning applications at these sites.	None stated.	Support and comments on assisting in the delivery of the allocation is welcomed. The National Trust will continue to be consulted as the DPD and site progresses.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
547	Anne	Botcherby	General	The National Trust own and manage the River Wey and Godalming Navigations, which flow through the borough. It has a statutory obligation	None stated.	The Council will work with the National Trust in the development of the Draft Site Allocations DPD, and in any subsequent development proposal that may affect the Navigations. Statutory	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 'permanently protect places of natural beauty or historic interest for the benefit of the nation'. Any proposals that affect or could affect the Navigation and waterway corridors will need to have regard to these statutory obligations.		obligations will be met as part of this process.	
547	Anne	Botcherby	GB15	Objects to the proposal. Outlines the national significance of the River Wey Navigation as one of the earliest waterways to be made navigable, and with the Godalming navigation forms the most southerly operational navigation in Britain. The Navigations, their development and use over the last 350 years are locally very important in terms of history, commerce, townscape and lancape. They are environmentally sensitive and important examples of industrial archaeology and social history.	None stated.	Land at West Hall is not covered by any specific environmental designation. The Council's evidence demonstrates that it can be released from the Green Belt without undermining its overall purpose and integrity. The Council recognises the importance of the adjacent features to the site. However, the proposal include a range of key requirements to make sure that these feature are not adversely affected to any extent that they cannot be appropriately mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
547	Anne	Botcherby	GB15	The Navigations are a designated Conservation Area. They form a visually important open corridor through a variety of landscapes from tranquil flood plain meadows to busy urban centres. The Navigations are also an important leisure asset for walking, cycling, rowing, fishing, canoeing and boating. This section of the Navigation has a strong rural character throughout nearly all of its length. The principal issues are to protect the rural character, and preserve the open character of the visual setting of the Navigations in in focal point areas around each lock.	None stated.	Land at West Hall is not covered by any specific environmental designation. The Council's evidence demonstrates that it can be released from the Green Belt without undermining its overall purpose and integrity. The Council recognises the importance of the adjacent features to the site. However, the proposal include a range of key requirements to make sure that these feature are not adversely affected to any extent that they cannot be appropriately mitigated. There are already robust policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management policies DPD to protect river corridors and the Conservation Area status of Canal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
547	Anne	Botcherby	GB15	Seeks to protect and enhance the special historic and lancape character and quality of the Navigations, and views from them in accordance with the Council Local Plan and Core Strategy policies. Appends the Trusts principles for development in the internal document 'Planning Guidance for development next to the River Wey and Godalming Navigations'.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0 and 19.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
449	P	Bourne	GB10	Exceptional circumstances has not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in the GB	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 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
449	P	Bourne	GB11	Exceptional circumstances has not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in the GB	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 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
449	P	Bourne	GB10	The sites are not in close proximity to a local centre	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
449	P	Bourne	GB11	The sites are not in close proximity to a local centre	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
449	P	Bourne	GB10	The transport infrastructure will be overloaded	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. 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. 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
449	P	Bourne	GB11	The transport infrastructure will be overloaded	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. 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</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
						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. 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.	
449	P	Bourne	GB10	The density is not compatible with the surrounding 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
449	P	Bourne	GB11	The density is not compatible with the surrounding 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
449	P	Bourne	GB10	It is important that open spaces between villages are maintained.	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
449	P	Bourne	GB11	It is important that open spaces between villages are maintained.	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
449	P	Bourne	GB14	It is important that open spaces between villages are maintained.	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
449	P	Bourne	GB10	Object to the GB10, GB11, GB14 as it will increase urban sprawl	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0 and 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
449	P	Bourne	GB11	Object to the GB10, GB11, GB14 as it will increase urban sprawl	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0 and 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
449	P	Bourne	GB14	Hook Hill Lane is very narrow with a weak bridge. The Lane is essentially a single lane, not wide enough for vehicles travelling in opposite directions to pass. There is no pavement and no scope for adding one. The road is very dangerous for road safety.	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	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
						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. 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.	
1654	T	Bourne	GB15	Local infrastructure and facilities are of concern. The heath centre is at capacity as are the two schools in West Byfleet.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8.</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>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant public transport 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
1654	T	Bourne	GB16	Local infrastructure and facilities are of concern. The heath centre is at capacity as are the two schools in West Byfleet.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8. 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. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant public transport operators and providers to see how best they can</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
						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.	
1654	T	Bourne	GB4	Local infrastructure and facilities are of concern. The heath centre is at capacity as are the two schools in West Byfleet.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8.</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>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant public transport 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
1654	T	Bourne	GB5	Local infrastructure and facilities are of concern. The heath centre is at capacity as are the two schools in West Byfleet.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8.</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>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant public transport 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
1654	T	Bourne	GB15	Development at West Hall will have a significant impact on the Wey Navigation which is a wildlife corridor. The established ecosystem will be disturbed. It is important that this is protected.	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	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>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).</p>	
1654	T	Bourne	GB16	Development at West Hall will have a significant impact on the Wey Navigation which is a wildlife corridor. The established ecosystem will be disturbed. It is important that this is protected.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1654	T	Bourne	GB15	The proposals will place additional strain on infrastructure. The main concern being the increase in traffic on the A245. It is already congested and new development will not be supported by the current infrastructure without impacting the community.	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, in particular paragraphs 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 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1654	T	Bourne	GB16	The proposals will place additional strain on infrastructure. The main concern being the increase in traffic on the A245. It is already congested and new development will not be supported by the current infrastructure without impacting the community.	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, in particular paragraphs 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 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. 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	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 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.	
1654	T	Bourne	GB4	Development will add strain to the local infrastructure. The volume of traffic on the A245 will result in gridlock. Any development here would not be supported by the current infrastructure without seriously impacting the community.	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, in particular paragraphs 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 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1654	T	Bourne	GB5	Development will add strain to the local infrastructure. The volume of traffic on the A245 will result in gridlock. Any development here would not be supported by the current infrastructure without seriously impacting the community.	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, in particular paragraphs 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	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 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. 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.	
1654	T	Bourne	GB4	The proposals are not sustainable, improve the area or meet a number of criteria set out against which development on Green Belt land can be considered.	None stated.	As part of the process of identifying sites for development, the Council undertook a comprehensive Sustainability Appraisal, which assessed each site against 17 Sustainability Criteria. In combination with the evidence base studies used to inform the Site Allocations DPD, the Council is satisfied that the sites selected are the most sustainable and suitable compared to the reasonable alternatives. The representation regarding the principle of developing on Green Belt land 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
1654	T	Bourne	GB5	The proposals are not sustainable, improve the area or meet a number of criteria set out against which development on Green Belt land can be considered.	None stated.	As part of the process of identifying sites for development, the Council undertook a comprehensive Sustainability Appraisal, which assessed each site against 17 Sustainability Criteria. In combination with the evidence base studies used to inform the Site Allocations DPD, the Council is satisfied that the sites selected are the most sustainable and suitable compared to the reasonable alternatives. The representation regarding the principle of developing on Green Belt land 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
1654	T	Bourne	GB15	The proposals are not sustainable, improve the area or meet a number of criteria set out against which development on Green Belt land can be considered.	None stated.	As part of the process of identifying sites for development, the Council undertook a comprehensive Sustainability Appraisal, which assessed each site against 17 Sustainability Criteria. In combination with the evidence base studies used to inform the Site Allocations DPD, the Council is satisfied that the sites selected are the most sustainable and suitable compared to the reasonable alternatives. The representation regarding the principle of developing on Green	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
						Belt land has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	
1654	T	Bourne	GB16	The proposals are not sustainable, improve the area or meet a number of criteria set out against which development on Green Belt land can be considered.	None stated.	As part of the process of identifying sites for development, the Council undertook a comprehensive Sustainability Appraisal, which assessed each site against 17 Sustainability Criteria. In combination with the evidence base studies used to inform the Site Allocations DPD, the Council is satisfied that the sites selected are the most sustainable and suitable compared to the reasonable alternatives. The representation regarding the principle of developing on Green Belt land 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
1654	T	Bourne	GB4	Development will increase the volume of run off and surface water, which will increase the risk of flooding within the wider area. This is a material concern to all residents.	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
1654	T	Bourne	GB5	Development will increase the volume of run off and surface water, which will increase the risk of flooding within the wider area. This is a material concern to all residents.	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
1654	T	Bourne	GB15	Development will increase the volume of run off and surface water, which will increase the risk of flooding within the wider area. This is a material concern to all residents.	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
1654	T	Bourne	GB16	Development will increase the volume of run off and surface water, which will increase the risk of flooding within the wider area. This is a material concern to all residents.	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
1654	T	Bourne	GB15	The Green Belt plays a key role in reducing noise to West Byfleet. The Green Belt and Wey Navigation are a natural buffer between Byfleet and West Byfleet. The trees also act as a noise buffer between the M25 and residential properties along Parvis Road. The noise from the M25 is constant both day and night.	None stated.	<p>The key requirements for the site note that due to the significant traffic on the M25, the development will need to consider the impacts on noise and ensure mitigation measures are implemented to protect residential amenity. A Noise Impact Assessment would be required, which would also include impacts from Parvis Road. The Council also has a robust policy framework to make sure that developments near sources of noise provide mitigation measures.</p> <p>The key requirements for the site also state that lancape / ecological / tree surveys will be required to protect valuable lancape features as well as provide new and improved green infrastructure. This will make sure that the site layout and design creates a strong lancape edge to development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1654	T	Bourne	GB16	The Green Belt plays a key role in reducing noise to West Byfleet. The Green Belt and Wey Navigation are a natural buffer between Byfleet and West Byfleet. The trees also act as a noise buffer between the M25 and residential properties along Parvis Road. The noise from the M25 is constant both day and night.	None stated.	<p>The key requirements for the site note that due to the significant traffic on the M25, the development will need to consider the impacts on noise and ensure mitigation measures are implemented to protect residential amenity. A Noise Impact Assessment would be required, which would also include impacts from Parvis Road. The Council also has a robust policy framework to make sure that developments near sources of noise provide mitigation measures.</p> <p>The key requirements for the site also state that new and improved green infrastructure will be required. This will make sure that the site layout and design creates a strong lancape edge to development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1654	T	Bourne	GB4	The Green Belt plays a key role in reducing noise to West Byfleet. The Green Belt and Wey Navigation are a natural buffer between Byfleet and West Byfleet. The trees also act as a noise buffer between the M25 and residential properties	None stated.	The key requirements for the site note that due to the significant traffic on the M25, the development will need to consider the impacts on noise and ensure mitigation measures are implemented to protect residential amenity. A Noise Impact Assessment would be required as well as landscaping to create a	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
				along Parvis Road. The noise from the M25 is constant both day and night.		buffer to the M25. The Council also has a robust policy framework to make sure that developments near sources of noise provide mitigation measures. The key requirements for the site also state that new and improved green infrastructure will be required. This will make sure that the site layout and design creates a strong lancape edge to development.	
1654	T	Bourne	GB5	The Green Belt plays a key role in reducing noise to West Byfleet. The Green Belt and Wey Navigation are a natural buffer between Byfleet and West Byfleet. The trees also act as a noise buffer between the M25 and residential properties along Parvis Road. The noise from the M25 is constant both day and night.	None stated.	The key requirements for the site note that due to the significant traffic on the M25, the development will need to consider the impacts on noise and ensure mitigation measures are implemented to protect residential amenity. A Noise Impact Assessment would be required as well as landscaping to create a buffer to the M25. The Council also has a robust policy framework to make sure that developments near sources of noise provide mitigation measures. The key requirements for the site also state that lancape / ecological / tree surveys will be required to protect valuable lancape features as well as provide new and improved green infrastructure. This will make sure that the site layout and design creates a strong lancape edge to development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1654	T	Bourne	GB15	There is little natural green space in West Byfleet and the encroachment to the Wey Navigation is precious to local people. It is also of historic importance.	None stated.	The Council notes the comment regarding the lack of open space in West Byfleet whilst agreeing that the Wey Navigation is an important lancape corridor in the Borough. The Council also recognises that it is well used for recreational activities. The key requirements for the site note that additional green infrastructure could also be provided on land to the east which is within the same land ownership as GB15. This would act as a buffer to the Wey Navigation corridor with its distinctive character and wildlife corridor function. The proposed allocation also states that 4.7ha of public open space will be required to be provided as part of any development scheme.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1654	T	Bourne	GB16	There is little natural green space in West Byfleet and the encroachment to the Wey Navigation is precious to local people. It is also of historic importance.	None stated.	The Council notes the comment regarding the lack of open space in West Byfleet whilst agreeing that the Wey Navigation is an important lancape corridor in the Borough. The Council also recognises that it is well used for recreational activities. The key requirements for the site note that additional green infrastructure could also be provided on land to the east which is within the same land ownership as GB15. This would act as a buffer to the Wey Navigation corridor with its distinctive character and wildlife corridor function. The proposed allocation also states that 4.7ha of public open space will be required to be provided as part of any development scheme.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1654	T	Bourne	General	Strongly oppose to development in the Green Belt in Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford for housing, commercial uses and a school which will all lead to high volumes of traffic in the area. Understand the need for progression in West Byfleet, but the proposed developments will have a negative impact on the area.	None stated.	Objection to the proposed allocation of sites GB4, GB5, GB12, GB13, GB15 and GB16 noted. It should be noted that the draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the Broadoaks site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits. The representation regarding traffic increases has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
648	Joan	Boutell	GB4	Do not build in Byfleet, we are on a flood plain.	Do not build in Byfleet	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters	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
						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.	of this representation
648	Joan	Boutell	GB5	Do not build in Byfleet, we are on a flood plain.	Do not build in Byfleet	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
648	Joan	Boutell	GB4	Green Belt must be protected.	Green Belt must be protected.	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
648	Joan	Boutell	GB5	Green Belt must be protected.	Green Belt must be protected.	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
648	Joan	Boutell	GB4	Roads are gridlocked at peak times. More houses means more congestion.	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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0The 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
648	Joan	Boutell	GB5	Roads are gridlocked at peak times. More houses means more congestion.	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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking	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
						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. 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.	
991	Manuela	Bowden	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
991	Manuela	Bowden	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
991	Manuela	Bowden	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
991	Manuela	Bowden	GB7	The site does not have the supporting	The site should be removed	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.	from the DPD for the reasons stated.	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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
991	Manuela	Bowden	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. 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
991	Manuela	Bowden	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, paragraph 1.9 and Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
991	Manuela	Bowden	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 How 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.	<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</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 siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area.	
991	Manuela	Bowden	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
991	Manuela	Bowden	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 lancape 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
991	Manuela	Bowden	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 Policy H (?) 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
991	Manuela	Bowden	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	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>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.</p>	
991	Manuela	Bowden	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.	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. 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 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
991	Manuela	Bowden	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
991	Manuela	Bowden	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
991	Manuela	Bowden	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.	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	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 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.		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 lancape 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.	
991	Manuela	Bowden	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.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10. 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 lancape 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
991	Manuela	Bowden	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
991	Manuela	Bowden	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. The DPD uses the term from the GBR of 'intensification' of Ten Acre Farm which is incorrect. The TTA term of 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD proposal.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
991	Manuela	Bowden	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	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, paragraph 9.2	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
				Lye) are the only sites put forward.			
991	Manuela	Bowden	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
991	Manuela	Bowden	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 street scene.	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 4.0, in particular paragraph 4.3 and 4.8. It is important to note, the Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites' 2008 guidance does recommend a maximum of 15 pitches per site to ensure a comfortable living environment and also allows for easy management. Nevertheless, the maximum of 15 pitches per site is guidance and is not a prescribed limit. The Council is aware of other Gypsy and Traveller sites in adjoining boroughs and elsewhere in the country which exceed this recommended limit, where there is no known amenity issues or management issues. Please note that Development Plan Policies, including those in the Core Strategy and emerging Development Management Policies will also need to be met.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
991	Manuela	Bowden	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.	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
1662	Jonathan	Bowden	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.	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 thorough 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. 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 Council fully acknowledge the existing public transport provision in the local area. As part of Transport for Woking, 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
						<p>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 lancape 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>	
1662	Jonathan	Bowden	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 lancape 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1662	Jonathan	Bowden	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
1662	Jonathan	Bowden	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 Lancape</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>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 lancape setting of the area.</p>	
1662	Jonathan	Bowden	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. 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. Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	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 Lancap 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 lancape grounds. The Lancap Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. 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. 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. 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
1662	Jonathan	Bowden	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
1662	Jonathan	Bowden	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.	<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). 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</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
						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.	
1662	Jonathan	Bowden	GB7	<p>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.</p> <p>The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.</p>	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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1662	Jonathan	Bowden	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
1662	Jonathan	Bowden	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
1662	Jonathan	Bowden	GB7	<p>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.</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>	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
1662	Jonathan	Bowden	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
1662	Jonathan	Bowden	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	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
						implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	
1662	Jonathan	Bowden	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
372	Ashley	Bowes	General	The Site Allocations DPD is unsound because the proposed allocations GB12 and GB13 are not in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In particular, the necessary exceptional circumstances to justify release of those sites from the Green Belt are not supported by the conclusions of the evidence upon which the Council rely. A number of planning judgments about site-specific impacts of development at GB12 and GB13 made within the interim Sustainability Appraisal are not supported by adequate evidence. The DPD could be made sound by either deleting reference to GB12 and GB13 entirely as the need for such extensive safeguarding has not been made out, or allocating alternative more sustainable sites. With Sheerwater potentially delivering 952 units and a resolution to grant 392 units in the Town Centre the need to safeguard quite so much land in the Green Belt is neither proportionate nor justified. In any event a safeguarded policy can be contrary to paragraph 83 of the NPPF if the proposed land to be safeguarded is not suitable for release. The only evidence relied upon by the Council to allocate GB12 and GB13 as bearing exceptional circumstances for the release of Green Belt land is the Green Belt boundary review. Parcel 9 which contains both GB12 and GB13 scored as having very low suitability as an area of search for sites and as critical to check urban sprawl and assist safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Based on this their allocation will be contrary to the NPPF because their allocation is not supported by evidence. GB12 – The interim SA scores the site as having double negative impact in the short, medium and long term on the natural and historic landscape. However, neither the SA Report nor the DPD as a whole is informed by a Landscape Character Assessment or an updated heritage survey. Less weight should be attached to the landscape and heritage context. The scale of highway works to the Pyrford Common road and Upshott Lane junction will be significant. Both roads are part of the heritage asset for the area. The works will alter the significance of the road. The SA failed to assess the extent of high grade agricultural soil. It merely asserts that the land is not of high agricultural quality. This is a significant omission because the NPPF places significant weight on high value agricultural land. The planning judgments within the SA are not based on proportionate evidence to justify alteration of the Green Belt boundary in this	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD is informed by credible and robust evidence, and its requirements are in general conformity with the NPPF. Officers would therefore disagree that it is unsound by reason of allocating sites GB12 and GB13 to contribute towards meeting the housing requirement of the Core Strategy. The in-principle exceptional circumstances case for the release of Green Belt land to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027 has already been made at the Core Strategy preparation stage and is now a clear policy of the Council as expressed in Policies CS6: Green Belt and CS10: Housing provision and distribution. The Inspector of the Secretary of State had already agreed that the need to meet the housing requirement (292 dwellings per annum) against the objectively assessed housing need (594 dwellings per annum) is of sufficient weight to justify the release of Green Belt land to deliver housing at the latter period of the Core Strategy. The Inspector makes this comment in his report: subject to the recommended modifications, the Core Strategy takes a justified and effective approach to issues relating to the Green Belt and the natural environment which is consistent with national planning policy. The overall approach by the Council to release Green Belt land is therefore sound. Nevertheless, the Council is also mindful that any sites that are recommended to be released from the Green Belt should be in sustainable locations, justified by appropriate evidence and are the most sustainable to meet its development requirements when compared against other reasonable alternatives. Based on the available evidence including the Green Belt boundary review, the Sustainability Appraisal Report, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Assessment of existing constraints in the area, Habitats Regulations Assessment and others, Officers are satisfied that sites GB12 and GB13 should be allocated to make a significant contribution towards the housing requirement. Officers are satisfied that the Sustainability Appraisal is informed by adequate and appropriate evidence. Appendix 1 of the SA Report is a list of other plans, programmes, strategies and policies that were taken into account in preparing the SA Report. Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations DPD is also a list of evidence base studies that have informed planning judgments of the SA report. Information provided by stakeholders, including the statutory consultees has also been useful information to inform the SA Report. It is incorrect for the representation to suggest that the SA Report has not been informed by adequate evidence. The planning judgments made are also informed by the decision making criteria of the SA Framework to ensure consistency in the thought process. Whilst the representation may disagree with the planning judgments made by the Council, there is no doubt that those judgments are informed by evidence. The case for allocating sites GB12 and GB13 to make a contribution towards the housing requirements has been made above, and it is not intended to repeat that. Their allocation is justified by the available evidence and the Council's overall response to the representations will explain further why the sites should be allocated. It is for the same reasons emphasised by paragraph 83 of the NPPF that it is important that sufficient amount of land is identified to meet development needs over 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
				<p>location. In particular, the failure to undertake a Borough-wide Lancap Character Assessment, commission a soil report or update the heritage evidence. The SA concludes that the site is unsustainable in terms of its accessibility to services and facilities. The Green Belt boundary review concluded that site GB13 is highly sensitive to change. GB12 and GB13 score negatively against conservation of biodiversity and double negative against Lancap and heritage impacts. The SHLAA in 2014 does not identify this site as having any potential to be removed from the Green Belt for residential development. The SA fails to assess the soil quality of GB12 and for these reasons GB12 and GB13 are unsustainable locations for residential development. The SA failed to assess the extent to which the settlement hierarchy would be altered by the allocation of 500 extra units in Pyrford. It also failed to assess the extent to which such a strategic allocation would change the way Pyrford functions as a local centre and the impact on its local character. The Council has failed to appraise a clear alternative as part of the SA. Land to the east of A320, Horsell East and Woodham (subject to the grant of now revoked planning permission PLAN/2011/0823). The Council has failed to score alternative sites fairly and consistently. For example, land to the east of Martyrs Lane and GB12 and GB213 scored similarly and yet land to the east of Martyrs Lane is rejected because it would result in isolated development in the Green Belt and could have a significant impact on character.</p>		<p>next plan period to ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary. Paragraph 83 of the NPPF should be read in conjunction with paragraph 85 and indeed all the other relevant policies of the NPPF as encouraged by paragraph 6. Paragraph 85 is clear about the benefits of safeguarding sites to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period. This is necessary to achieve the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary. The entire number of sites identified to be safeguarded will be needed to meet development needs if the Council is to avoid another review of the Green Belt boundary in the next Core Strategy period. The Topic paper on issues and matters deals with safeguarding in detail, and this response should be read in conjunction with that to avoid repetition. Appendix 4 of the draft Site Allocations DPD is a Table of the indicative capacities of the proposed allocations. The 392 units referred to is already listed in the Table to contribute towards the housing requirement. The Sheerwater scheme involves the demolition of about 500 dwellings and the building of 952 units. 250 units have already been counted towards the overall supply of housing in the Table. The net additional units to be gained from this scheme that is not yet counted is only 202 units. This will compensate for shortfalls elsewhere such as the revised yield on the Coal Yard/Aggregate Yard site. Overall, the Council is not over providing against its requirement. It is important to note that a planning application for the development of the Sheerwater scheme has just been submitted. The net total yield for the site will be confirmed when the application is determined. The Green Belt boundary review report is not the only evidence used to inform the Site Allocations DPD. The Habitats Regulations Assessment and the SA Report amongst others are all useful evidence to inform the allocation of GB12 and GB13. The introduction section of the Green Belt boundary review report sets out the methodology used to carry out the review. It clearly emphasises that potential sites within parcels whether the parcels were recommended for removal or not were also considered. This was done to find out whether these individual sites might be viewed differently from the larger parcel within which they are situated. Whilst the representation does not agree with the allocation of GB12, the recommendation to allocate it conforms to the agreed methodology used to undertake the study. GB13 also follow the recommendations of the SA Report. Table 7 of the SA Report summarises the reasons why the sites are allocated. The SA Report concluded that overall the site will enable the delivery of housing including Affordable Housing. It will make a contribution towards the overall housing requirement. Site is in Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged. Site is in reasonable walking and cycling distance to the Neighbourhood Centre. Consequently, it will help reduce the need to travel by the car. It has a good accessibility to a range of services and facilities such as a primary school. The same is said for GB12. It is incorrect for the representation to suggest that the DPD in general and site GB12 in particular is not informed by an appropriate Lancap Character Assessment. The issue about Lancap Character Assessment is covered in detail in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is correct that at the time of carrying out the Green Belt boundary review or preparing the SA Report no up to date comprehensive Borough-wide Lancap Character Assessment had been carried out. In this regard, the Green Belt boundary review did not have an existing local up to date Lancap character baseline to work from. The consultants rightly considered the national character areas and Surrey 1997 character areas and decided that the scale of the two</p>	

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>assessments are too large to be useful. Specialist consultants were therefore engaged to carry out their own assessment of the character of the sites and assessed alongside this the capacity for change based on lancape character and sensitivity. The advantage of the consultant's own study is that the scale of the small land parcels is more appropriate for a sensitivity and character study to inform the site allocations because of the extra amount of detail regarding lancape character and sensitivity to change. Lancape Sensitivity and Character Assessment is proven to be effective in informing the allocation of sites. The Countryside Agency guidance of 2002 provides useful guidance of its effectiveness and how to undertake it. Since the publication of the Site Allocations DPD for Regulation 18 consultation the Council has received its up to date Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment, which it jointly commissioned with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities. The considerations about lancape character in the Peter Brett's Report and the Borough-wide study complement each other. There is nothing in the Borough-wide study that would have led the Council to make different planning judgments about any of the proposed allocations on lancape grounds. The Peter Brett's Lancape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment is robust and well considered and a reliable study to inform the DPD. The key requirements of the allocations also require applicants to carry out detailed lancape character assessment to identify any site specific mitigation measures that will be necessary to address any adverse impacts on the lancape character of the area, in particular, the relationship between the individual sites and the surrounding townscape and hinterland...The Heritage of Woking Study (2000) provides an inventory of the Heritage Assets of the area. Policy CS20: Heritage and conservation of the Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework for the protection and conservation of the Heritage Assets of the area. Historic England has confirmed that they are satisfied that the relationship of the Site Allocations DPD to the policies of the Woking Core Strategy will ensure that development takes place in a sustainable form that reflects the requirements of the NPPF, and by definition, this includes the objective to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. The idea that the DPD would fail to protect the heritage assets of the area and or is unsound because of lack of evidence is incorrect. The Site Allocation DPD does prescribe in detail the extent of highways works that will be needed to the Pyrford Common Road and Upshott Lane junction. The Strategic Transport Assessment carried out to inform the DPD has concluded that the transport impacts of delivering the DPD can be satisfactorily mitigated. There are key requirements for detailed transport assessment to be carried out as part of any planning application for the development of the sites. This will enable appropriate mitigation measures to be identified to address any potential adverse impacts. It would be premature to second guess at this stage what the appropriate mitigation measures would be. The DPD and the SA Report are informed by appropriate information on agricultural soil quality. DEFRA and Natural England has provided sufficient and appropriate quality of information to enable informed planning judgments about whether or not any of the sites are or part of the most versatile agricultural land in the area. Matters relating to lancape assessment and heritage assets have already been addressed. Contrary to the above, the SA concludes that GB12 and GB13 are both in sustainable locations because they are in reasonable walking and cycling distance to a range of services and facilities. With the</p>	

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						exception of the comments on the SHLAA, all the other representations have already been addressed. As a matter of principle, the SHLAA does not recommend for any Green Belt land to be allocated, and approach taken makes that clear. It is not for the SHLAA to make decision about what land should be released from the Green Belt. The Council has carried out a Green Belt boundary review and other studies to enable those decisions to be made through the plan making process (Site Allocations DPD). The outcome of the Site Allocations process will be reflected in future versions of the SHLAA. In this regard, it would have been inappropriate for the SHLAA to identify GB12 and GB13 as having the potential to be removed from the Green Belt. Table 2 of the Core Strategy deals with the Hierarchy of Centres and their functions. This has been established in the context of the overall spatial strategy of the Core Strategy. It would be inappropriate to use the Site Allocation DPD to review a policy that is the remit of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy has its own mechanism for monitoring and review. If after the adoption of the Site Allocations DPD the Council felt that it has implications for the Hierarchy of Centres, it will take appropriate action to consider the review of the Core Strategy. The Council do not accept that it has failed to score alternative sites fairly and consistent. The planning judgments that are made are based on the overall scoring against the SA objectives. An SA framework incorporating a decision making criteria, baseline information and effect criteria has been used to ensure consistency in the assessment process. Appendix 6 of the SA Report includes the SA Framework. It is important to note that the location of a site in the Green Belt is a consideration when safeguarding land for future development (paragraph 85 of NPPF).	
833	Liz	Bowes	Sustainability Appraisal findings	The council has omitted to appraise a clear alternative and has not been consistent. The site is capable of meeting the identified objectives of the Core Strategy and should be assessed as a potential safeguarded site.	Assess the site known as Land to the east of the A320, Horsell East and Woodham as a Safeguarded site.	At the time of publication of the draft Site Allocations DPD, the site had the benefit of planning permission for employment uses. The landowner at the time had indicated their intention to develop the site in accordance with the approved plans. Since the publication of the draft Site Allocations DPD, McLaren has been granted planning permission for employment uses on their existing site. One of the conditions of this planning permission is that the site identified in the representation can not be developed. Consequently, this site has been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the proposed use suggested in the representation and based on the evidence, the Council's view is that the site is not suitable for residential development. This is set out in the SA.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
833	Liz	Bowes	GB12	The site forms part of a rural corridor to the River Wey. Road improvement works will detract from the character of the area. The SA does not consider the high grade agricultural soil quality which is given great weight in the NPPF. As the site was not recommended in the GBBR as it performs strongly against Green Belt functions.	None stated.	It is envisaged by the Council that planning to meet local housing 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. The representation regarding heritage and character has also 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	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
						that the development of the site is sustainable. As part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA. The representation regarding the Green Belt boundary review recommendations has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0.	
833	Liz	Bowes	GB13	The site assessment in the Sustainability Assessment is negative for accessibility to services and facilities, conservation of biodiversity and double negatively against lancape and heritage impact. The SHLAA also does not recommend the site to be removed from the Green Belt. The SA does not consider the high grade agricultural soil quality which is important. As the site was not recommended in the GBBR it is unsound for development.	None stated.	<p>The key requirements for the site note that development would be required to improve pedestrian and cycle links to Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre and West Byfleet District Centre. It would also need to address the existing public transport in the area in order to reduce the need to travel by car. The site is within walking distance of Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre which meets the day to day needs of local people.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact on heritage and lancape has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0 and 7.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS24 of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity, local character and lancape. 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 representation regarding the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0.</p> <p>As part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA.</p> <p>Whilst the Council notes the matters raised in the representation, the Council 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
833	Liz	Bowes	GB13	This is a highly sensitive lancape and not recommended in the GBBR	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
438	Gerald and Marion	Bowler	GB4	Object to the removal of most of the GB in Byfleet whilst the rest of Woking	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 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	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 in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).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.	
438	Gerald and Marion	Bowler	GB5	Object to the removal of most of the GB in Byfleet whilst the rest of Woking	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
438	Gerald and Marion	Bowler	GB4	Object to proposals in Byfleet to add more houses.It will exacerbate traffic problems, particularly towards Woking or Cobham.	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 24.0The 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. 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</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
						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.	
438	Gerald and Marion	Bowler	GB5	Object to proposals in Byfleet to add more houses.It will exacerbate traffic problems, particularly towards Woking or Cobham.	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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0The 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
671	Robin	Boxall	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
671	Robin	Boxall	GB7	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
671	Robin	Boxall	GB8	Concerned about the impact on wildlife on the sites and on nearby heaths	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	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>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).</p>	
671	Robin	Boxall	GB9	Concerned about the impact on wildlife on the sites and on nearby heaths	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. 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
671	Robin	Boxall	GB10	Concerned about the impact on wildlife on the sites and on nearby heaths	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. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife. 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</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 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.	
671	Robin	Boxall	GB11	Concerned about the impact on wildlife on the sites and on nearby heaths	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. 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
671	Robin	Boxall	GB7	Object to proposed increase of Traveller pitches. When identifying sites for Travellers, urban areas must be considered first. No urban sites have been identified and this raises doubts about the validity of claims that there are no identifiable or suitable sites across the urban areas of the Borough. I believe that where no urban sites are available the next consideration should be to look at sites on the edge of urban areas that provide good access to jobs, local amenities such as shops and other infrastructure and services. Mayford does not satisfy any of these 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
671	Robin	Boxall	GB8	<p>Objects to housing on this site. The housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, thereby turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing greatly the risk of merging Woking and Guildford.</p> <p>No consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement to Woking nor the impact on the character of the village</p>	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
671	Robin	Boxall	GB9	<p>Objects to housing on this site. The housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, thereby turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing greatly the risk of merging Woking and Guildford.</p> <p>No consideration for preserving Mayford as a</p>	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</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
				separate settlement to Woking nor the impact on the character of the village		by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	
671	Robin	Boxall	GB10	Objects to housing on this site. The housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, thereby turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing greatly the risk of merging Woking and Guildford. No consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement to Woking nor the 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
671	Robin	Boxall	GB11	Objects to housing on this site. The housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, thereby turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing greatly the risk of merging Woking and Guildford. No consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement to Woking nor the 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
671	Robin	Boxall	GB10	Please reconsider the plans. Mayford as a village is unique.	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 Represor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
671	Robin	Boxall	GB11	Please reconsider the plans. Mayford as a village is unique.	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 Represor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
671	Robin	Boxall	GB8	Please reconsider the plans. Mayford as a village is unique.	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 Represor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
671	Robin	Boxall	GB9	Please reconsider the plans. Mayford as a village is unique.	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

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 Represntor ID 563.	
671	Robin	Boxall	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. More people will result in more cars and strain on transport infrastructure. There are no plans to upgrade the roads, bridges or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people walking to the station.	None stated.	It is fully acknowledged that the existing public transport is infrequent. 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 Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of pavements on local roads 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. This representation has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
671	Robin	Boxall	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. More people will result in more cars and strain on transport infrastructure. There are no plans to upgrade the roads, bridges or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people walking to the station.	None stated.	It is fully acknowledged that the existing public transport is infrequent. 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 Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of pavements on local roads 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. This representation has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
671	Robin	Boxall	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. More people will result in more cars and strain on transport infrastructure. There are no plans to upgrade the roads, bridges or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people walking to the station.	None stated.	It is fully acknowledged that the existing public transport is infrequent. 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 Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of pavements on local roads 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						This representation has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	
671	Robin	Boxall	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. More people will result in more cars and strain on transport infrastructure. There are no plans to upgrade the roads, bridges or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people walking to the station.	None stated.	It is fully acknowledged that the existing public transport is infrequent. 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 Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of pavements on local roads 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. This representation has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
671	Robin	Boxall	GB8	No robust solutions to deal with the proposed traffic issues on Egley Road. Already the traffic is an issue from Woking into Mayford, which will worsen with more development, including the proposed school and Kingsmoor Park.	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
671	Robin	Boxall	GB9	No robust solutions to deal with the proposed traffic issues on Egley Road. Already the traffic is an issue from Woking into Mayford, which will worsen with more development, including the proposed school and Kingsmoor Park.	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
671	Robin	Boxall	GB10	No robust solutions to deal with the proposed traffic issues on Egley Road. Already the traffic is an issue from Woking into Mayford, which will worsen with more development, including the proposed school and Kingsmoor Park.	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
671	Robin	Boxall	GB11	No robust solutions to deal with the proposed traffic issues on Egley Road. Already the traffic is an issue from Woking into Mayford, which will worsen with more development, including the proposed school and Kingsmoor Park.	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
671	Robin	Boxall	GB7	Site is adjacent to SSSI and development would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area. Also would pose an increased risk to wildlife.	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 Lancape 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 lancape grounds. The Lancape 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 lancape of the immediate area 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
						<p>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>	
671	Robin	Boxall	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. The village has no supporting infrastructure and future potential residents will be isolated if they do not own 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. 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
671	Robin	Boxall	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. The village has no supporting infrastructure and future potential residents will be isolated if they do not own 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
671	Robin	Boxall	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. The village has no supporting infrastructure and future potential residents will be isolated if they do not own 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</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 will further support the daily needs of local people.	
671	Robin	Boxall	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. The village has no supporting infrastructure and future potential residents will be isolated if they do not own 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
1267	Leslie	Boxall	UA28	Local infrastructure (roads, school, healthcare, police) is stretched and only just cover current needs.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1267	Leslie	Boxall	UA29	Local infrastructure (roads, school, healthcare, police) is stretched and only just cover current needs.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1267	Leslie	Boxall	UA28	Does not consider it necessary to intensify already highly populated areas.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 in particular paragraph 1.5 and 1.9. Please also see Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1267	Leslie	Boxall	UA29	Does not consider it necessary to intensify already highly populated areas.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 in particular paragraph 1.5 and 1.9. Please also see Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1267	Leslie	Boxall	UA28	The privacy of existing properties will be compromised by the proposals	None stated.	With regards to the representation on privacy and impact on local amenity, 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 significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1267	Leslie	Boxall	UA29	The privacy of existing properties will be compromised by the proposals	None stated.	With regards to the representation on privacy and impact on local amenity, 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 significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1267	Leslie	Boxall	UA28	<p>Fundamental issues have been overlooked.</p> <p>The area is already densely populated. The roads are inadequate to cope with increased growth.</p> <p>Also highlights parking issues on the road.</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, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0.</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 proposals include effective access arrangements to ensure highway safety. It is also noted that major highway improvements are likely to be required.</p> <p>The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific</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
						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.	
1267	Leslie	Boxall	UA29	<p>Fundamental issues have been overlooked.</p> <p>The area is already densely populated. The roads are inadequate to cope with increased growth.</p> <p>Also highlights parking issues on the road.</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, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0.</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 proposals include effective access arrangements to ensure highway safety.</p> <p>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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1497	Colin	Boxer	GB12	Objects on the grounds of the road infrastructure not being adequate for the increase in 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
1497	Colin	Boxer	GB13	Objects on the grounds of the road infrastructure not being adequate for the increase in 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
1497	Colin	Boxer	GB12	Objects to the proposals. Attracted to move to Pyrford as it was a village in a rural setting. Uses the Sandy Lane path between the field to run. The development puts the rural setting and village at risk and will make Pyrford merely an outer suburb of Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0. and 15.0. The proposed allocations in Pyrford would not reduce the separateness of Pyrford as they are located on the outer (southern) edge of Pyrford. The north and western sides of Pyrford are already joined to West Byfleet, and the proposals do not affect this. It should also be noted that the landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study, and would be maintained through existing policies on Design, and Landscape and Townscape (Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24, and the Design SPD) and the draft allocation's key requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1497	Colin	Boxer	GB13	Objects to the proposals. Attracted to move to Pyrford as it was a village in a rural setting. Uses the Sandy Lane path between the field to run. The development puts the rural setting and village at risk and will make Pyrford merely an outer suburb of Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0. and 15.0. The proposed allocations in Pyrford would not reduce the separateness of Pyrford as they are located on the outer (southern) edge of Pyrford. The north and western sides of Pyrford are already joined to West Byfleet, and the proposals do not affect this. It should also be noted that the landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study, and would be maintained through existing policies on Design, and Landscape and Townscape (Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24, and the Design SPD) and the draft allocation's key requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1497	Colin	Boxer	GB12	Realises that houses have to be built somewhere but they should be on brownfield sites or at the very least waste land, not on land in productive agricultural use.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 9.0 and 11.0. In addition, as part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA. Whilst it is agreed that agricultural land is important for sustainable food production, it should be noted that this particular site is of low soil quality.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1497	Colin	Boxer	GB13	Realises that houses have to be built somewhere	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				but they should be on brownfield sites or at the very least waste land, not on land in productive agricultural use.		Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 9.0 and 11.0. In addition, as part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA. Whilst it is agreed that agricultural land is important for sustainable food production, it should be noted that this particular site is of low soil quality.	is proposed as a result of this representation
84	Barbara	Boyse	GB7	Object to the site being considered for Travellers as there are already three sites in the vicinity (Burdenshott Road, Hatchington and Brookwood Lye).	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
84	Barbara	Boyse	GB7	Object to the site being considered for Travellers. The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath (SSSI)	None stated.	The justification for the proposal 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 Lancape 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 lancape grounds. The Lancape 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 lancape 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
84	Barbara	Boyse	GB8	Strongly object proposed release of GB in Mayford. There is no infrastructure to support more houses and cars	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
84	Barbara	Boyse	GB8	More housing will exacerbate problems on already congested roads in the surrounding area.	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	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
				It can take 45 mins to travel from Mayford to Woking at peak times.		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.	
84	Barbara	Boyse	GB8	There is a strong sense of community in Mayford Village. Suggests reappraising plans and keep areas identified in Mayford in the GB	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. It is not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the sense of community in Mayford. This matter is addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
84	Barbara	Boyse	GB8	Proposals will mean that the wildlife in the area will not survive- especially on Smarts Heath	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
84	Barbara	Boyse	GB9	Strongly object proposed release of GB in Mayford. There is no infrastructure to support more houses and cars	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. 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	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 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.	
84	Barbara	Boyse	GB9	More housing will exacerbate problems on already congested roads in the surrounding area. It can take 45 mins to travel from Mayford to Woking at peak times.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
84	Barbara	Boyse	GB9	There is a strong sense of community in Mayford Village. Suggests reappraising plans and keep areas identified in Mayford in the GB	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
84	Barbara	Boyse	GB9	Proposals will mean that the wildlife in the area will not survive- especially on Smarts Heath	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
84	Barbara	Boyse	GB10	Strongly object proposed release of GB in Mayford. There is no infrastructure to support more houses and cars	None stated.	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
84	Barbara	Boyse	GB10	More housing will exacerbate problems on already congested roads in the surrounding area. It can take 45 mins to travel from Mayford to Woking at peak times.	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	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
						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.	
84	Barbara	Boyse	GB10	There is a strong sense of community in Mayford Village. Suggests reappraising plans and keep areas identified in Mayford in the GB	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
84	Barbara	Boyse	GB10	Proposals will mean that the wildlife in the area will not survive- especially on Smarts Heath	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
84	Barbara	Boyse	GB11	Strongly object proposed release of GB in Mayford. There is no infrastructure to support more houses and cars	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>	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
						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	
84	Barbara	Boyse	GB11	More housing will exacerbate problems on already congested roads in the surrounding area. It can take 45 mins to travel from Mayford to Woking at peak times.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
84	Barbara	Boyse	GB11	There is a strong sense of community in Mayford Village. Suggests reappraising plans and keep areas identified in Mayford in the GB	None stated.	The strong sense of community that exist in Mayford is acknowledged. It is not envisaged that the proposals will undermine that. The matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
84	Barbara	Boyse	GB11	Proposals will mean that the wildlife in the area will not survive- especially on Smarts Heath	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	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
						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.	
85	Ronald Alan	Boyse	GB7	Object to the site being considered for Travellers as there are already three sites in the vicinity (Burdenshott Road, Hatchington and Brookwood Lye).	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
85	Ronald Alan	Boyse	GB7	Object to the site being considered for Travellers. The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath (SSSI)	None stated.	The justification for the proposal 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 Lancap 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 lancap grounds. The Lancap 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 lancap 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
85	Ronald Alan	Boyse	GB8	Strongly object proposed release of GB in Mayford. There is no infrastructure to support more houses and cars	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	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
						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.	
85	Ronald Alan	Boyse	GB8	More housing will exacerbate problems on already congested roads in the surrounding area. It can take 45 mins to travel from Mayford to Woking at peak times.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
85	Ronald Alan	Boyse	GB8	There is a strong sense of community in Mayford Village. Suggests reappraising plans and keep areas identified in Mayford in the GB	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. It is not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the sense of community in Mayford. This matter is addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
85	Ronald Alan	Boyse	GB8	Proposals will mean that the wildlife in the area will not survive- especially on Smarts Heath	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
85	Ronald Alan	Boyse	GB9	Strongly object proposed release of GB in Mayford. There is no infrastructure to support	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues	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
				more houses and cars		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.	of this representation
85	Ronald Alan	Boyse	GB9	More housing will exacerbate problems on already congested roads in the surrounding area. It can take 45 mins to travel from Mayford to Woking at peak times.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
85	Ronald Alan	Boyse	GB9	There is a strong sense of community in Mayford Village. Suggests reappraising plans and keep areas identified in Mayford in the GB	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	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. 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.	
85	Ronald Alan	Boyse	GB9	Proposals will mean that the wildlife in the area will not survive- especially on Smarts Heath	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
85	Ronald Alan	Boyse	GB10	Strongly object proposed release of GB in Mayford. There is no infrastructure to support more houses and cars	None stated.	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
85	Ronald Alan	Boyse	GB10	More housing will exacerbate problems on already congested roads in the surrounding area. It can take 45 mins to travel from Mayford to Woking at peak times.	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	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
						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.	
85	Ronald Alan	Boyse	GB10	There is a strong sense of community in Mayford Village. Suggests reappraising plans and keep areas identified in Mayford in the GB	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23. The Council believes that the proposals will not undermine the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
85	Ronald Alan	Boyse	GB10	Proposals will mean that the wildlife in the area will not survive- especially on Smarts Heath	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
85	Ronald Alan	Boyse	GB11	Strongly object proposed release of GB in Mayford. There is no infrastructure to support more houses and cars	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	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
						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	
85	Ronald Alan	Boyse	GB11	More housing will exacerbate problems on already congested roads in the surrounding area. It can take 45 mins to travel from Mayford to Woking at peak times.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
85	Ronald Alan	Boyse	GB11	There is a strong sense of community in Mayford Village. Suggests reappraising plans and keep areas identified in Mayford in the GB	None stated.	The strong sense of community that exist in Mayford is acknowledged. It is not envisaged that the proposals will undermine that. The matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
85	Ronald Alan	Boyse	GB11	Proposals will mean that the wildlife in the area will not survive- especially on Smarts Heath	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	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 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.	
1559	Neil	Brackley	General	Strongly object to the proposed development as infilling is a better solution.	None stated.	Policy CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy is clear that Mayford Village, as defined on the Proposals Map (2012), is designated as an infill only settlement within the Green Belt and is subject to the strict development criteria set out in the policy. Paragraph 5.7 of the policy notes that this is to make sure that development does not have an adverse effect on the character of the Green Belt. The proposed site allocations will safeguard sites outside of Mayford Village. It is envisaged that planning to meet the local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. The Core Strategy, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD and the Design SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of future development that will come forward on the proposed allocated sites is of high standard and sympathetic to the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1559	Neil	Brackley	GB8	Development would ruin the rural 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
1559	Neil	Brackley	GB9	Development would ruin the rural 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
1559	Neil	Brackley	GB10	Development would ruin the rural 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
1559	Neil	Brackley	GB7	Object as there is already two Travellers sites in Mayford and one in Brookwood. Why are they all in one area of the borough. Applications previously for the site have been refused on Green Belt policies.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1559	Neil	Brackley	GB8	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
1559	Neil	Brackley	GB9	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1559	Neil	Brackley	GB10	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
1559	Neil	Brackley	General	The DPD only considers housing provision and not retail, public transport, roads and other infrastructure. These services can only just about cope at the moment. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The Site Allocations DPD sets out development sites throughout the Borough for a wide range of uses, including residential, commercial and retail floor space as well as recreational uses. The Core Strategy also notes that it is fundamental that residential development is supported by adequate infrastructure and employment opportunities. This is set out in the spatial vision for the Borough.</p> <p>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. The representation regarding infrastructure in general has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Represor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1559	Neil	Brackley	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked.	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
1559	Neil	Brackley	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked.	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
1559	Neil	Brackley	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked.	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
1559	Neil	Brackley	GB8	The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and redevelopment will result in less retail space.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1559	Neil	Brackley	GB9	The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and redevelopment will result in less retail space.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1559	Neil	Brackley	GB10	The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and redevelopment will result in	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 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
				less retail space.		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.	of this representation
394	Fred	Bradley	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
394	Fred	Bradley	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
394	Fred	Bradley	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
394	Fred	Bradley	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
394	Fred	Bradley	UA28	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. This is of particular concern to this resident because they work from home. Concern about potential overlooking and impact on natural light of proposals on existing properties.	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
394	Fred	Bradley	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. This is of particular concern to this resident because they work from home. Concern about potential overlooking and impact on natural light of proposals on existing properties.	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
389	Rebecca	Brahaw	GB15	Concerned that there has been a lack of thought given to infrastructure provision given the proposed level of new housing for West Byfleet. Infrastructure provision needs to be expanded and improved- including roads, schools. Suggests that part of the site be dedicated for community use e.g. a health centre or multifunctional community hall/facility.	Due consideration given to infrastructure provision Part of the site should be dedicated for community use	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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	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>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 local community will receive a proportion of the CIL income from development proposals that come forward for the area.</p>	
389	Rebecca	Brahaw	GB16	Aware of recent proposals for Broadoaks West Byfleet which appears to be well designed and would make good use of a vacant site. Disappointed that the proposed school is to be private when there is a need for more state schools. Suggests a proportion of affordable housing where West Byfleet residents get priority- as many people are being priced out of the area. Is there any regulation on the number of houses that could be bought and rented out by private landlords?	Suggests a proportion of affordable housing where West Byfleet residents get priority- as many people are being priced out of the area.	It is important to distinguish between that the current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school and the proposed site allocation. The private school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process. The site allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. Nevertheless, there are robust Development Plan policies including policy CS12 which will ensure that new proposals meet the Council's affordable housing requirements. With respect to the suggestion of giving local residents priority for local affordable housing, this is not a planning issue but it will be raised with the Housing team who are responsible for social housing distribution. Unfortunately there is no local mechanism which restricts the purchase of homes by buy to rent landlords. However the issue is recognised by Central Government, who have proposed tax increases to landlords of buy to rent properties in order to curtail the problem. The tax increase will be phased in from 2017 and fully implemented by 2020	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
389	Rebecca	Brahaw	General	It is important for future generations to have the benefits of living in a community with sufficient services, facilities and general quality of life experienced by existing residents. It is therefore very important that the proposals for the area integrate well and contribute to local infrastructure	New development should contribute to the provision of local infrastructure	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1150	James, Mrs Helen	Braiden	General	No land needs to be released from any of the Green Belt, development should be restricted to brown field sites only.	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. In addition to development that has taken place and those likely to come forward in the urban area, there will still be the need to identify Green Belt land to meet future development needs. A Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out to ensure that the environmental, social and economic impacts of the proposals are taken into account and any adverse impacts minimised	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1150	James, Mrs Helen	Braiden	General	<p>Pyrford Common (Parcel E) already has a robust boundary, there is no need to create a new boundary, undermining the integrity of the Common.</p> <p>Both sides of the Common is registered as a village green and designated a Site of Nature Conservation Importance. These protections do not justify removal from the Green Belt.</p>	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals in Pyrford would cause irreparable damage to its historic and designated environmental assets. This is confirmed by representations received from Heritage England. The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1150	James, Mrs Helen	Braiden	GB12	The consultants methodology led to the conclusion that Parcel 9 is not suitable for removal from the Green Belt. Randall's Field (Parcel 9a) has been chosen simply for its attractiveness to developers. Developers not residents were consulted in preparing the report.	None stated.	Site GB12 was recommended for release in the Green Belt boundary review report. The Council has used a range of evidence such as the Sustainability Appraisal to inform the Site Allocations DPD. They collectively support the allocation of site GB13.	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
10	R N	Brandman	GB7	Object strongly, the site is not suitable for the following reasons. Such sites should not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity and character of the area; adjacent Smarts Heath Common is used for leisure and Smarts Heath Road is a residential road with 2 Grade Two listed buildings.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
10	R N	Brandman	GB7	Urban areas should be preferred to Green Belt areas; we have no evidence that any urban areas have been considered or that no suitable urban areas exist.	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
10	R N	Brandman	GB7	Site GB7 is not near access to employment shops or other infrastructure, which are priority considerations.	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
10	R N	Brandman	GB7	Existing traveller sites are concentrated in one area within three miles of Ten Acre Farm. There should be no further expansion in this area.	None stated.	This matter is 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
10	R N	Brandman	GB7	Over many years planning inspectors have refused applications on this site as they adversely affect the Green Belt, such considerations should not be discarded.	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
10	R N	Brandman	GB8	Strongly object to the housing on this site. The proposal will greatly diminish open space between Woking Town and Mayford, will encourage a further merger with Guildford, the Green Belt partly exists to resist such encroachment. The character of Mayford as an historic village separate from Woking will be destroyed.	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. 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
10	R N	Brandman	GB9	Strongly object to the housing on this site. The proposal will greatly diminish open space between Woking Town and Mayford, will encourage a further merger with Guildford, the Green Belt partly exists to resist such encroachment. The character of Mayford as an historic village separate from Woking will be destroyed.	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	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 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.	
10	R N	Brandman	GB10	Strongly object to the housing on this site. The proposal will greatly diminish open space between Woking Town and Mayford, will encourage a further merger with Guildford, the Green Belt partly exists to resist such encroachment. The character of Mayford as an historic village separate from Woking will be destroyed.	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 of the Core Strategy provides a robust policy to protect the character of Mayford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
10	R N	Brandman	GB11	Strongly object to the housing on this site. The proposal will greatly diminish open space between Woking Town and Mayford, will encourage a further merger with Guildford, the Green Belt partly exists to resist such encroachment. The character of Mayford as an historic village separate from Woking will be destroyed.	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 lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape 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. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
10	R N	Brandman	GB8	Existing infrastructure is totally inadequate to support the population increase that development will bring. Roads are unsuitable, lack pavements and bridges are single lane. No plans show how to remedy these defects.	None stated.	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. 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).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
10	R N	Brandman	GB9	Existing infrastructure is totally inadequate to support the population increase that development will bring. Roads are unsuitable, lack pavements and bridges are single lane. No plans show how to remedy these defects.	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. 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
10	R N	Brandman	GB10	Existing infrastructure is totally inadequate to support the population increase that development will bring. Roads are unsuitable, lack pavements and bridges are single lane. No plans show how to remedy these defects.	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	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 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	
10	R N	Brandman	GB11	Existing infrastructure is totally inadequate to support the population increase that development will bring. Roads are unsuitable, lack pavements and bridges are single lane. No plans show how to remedy these defects.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
10	R N	Brandman	GB8	Destruction of open land will adversely affect wildlife populations and corridors and neighbouring protected areas.	None staged.	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	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
						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.	
10	R N	Brandman	GB9	Destruction of open land will adversely affect wildlife populations and corridors and neighbouring protected areas.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
10	R N	Brandman	GB10	Destruction of open land will adversely affect wildlife populations and corridors and neighbouring protected areas.	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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
10	R N	Brandman	GB11	Destruction of open land will adversely affect wildlife populations and corridors and	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters	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
				neighbouring protected areas.		Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape 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. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. 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.	of this representation
10	R N	Brandman	General	Woking Borough Council has not followed National Policy that Green Belt Boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" and "housing need including Traveller Sites does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development"; these proposals are entirely driven by a perception of housing need and are inappropriate.	None stated.	The exceptional circumstances case for allocating Green Belt land has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1. The case for releasing Green Belt land to meet the needs of Travellers has also been comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. Overall the Council is satisfied that the proposed allocations has the in-principle support of national policy behind them.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
10	R N	Brandman	General	There is no independent evidence that the Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its plan.	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 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
10	R N	Brandman	General	The separation of Woking from Mayford by open land is critical to the preservation of Mayford as a separate entity. The Green Belt Review incorrectly classed this as only "important". Mayford will become a suburb of Woking.	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 12. The Green Belt boundary review report recognises the importance to ensure separation between settlements. It is one of the purposes of the Green Belt, which sites have been assessed against. It concluded that Mayford will continue to have its unique identity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
10	R N	Brandman	General	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent: a) Land to the north of Saunders Lane has long been designated as "Escarpment and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" in Woking Local Plan Policy NE7 and Woking 2027 therefore should not be considered for development, yet the Green Belt Review proposes boundary changes to remove this land from the Green Belt without a Lancape Character Assessment. This is unacceptable. b) The Green Belt Review indicates a school on Egley Road would maintain	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review assessed all the identified parcels of land consistently against a set of criteria. It acknowledged the lancape importance of the Escarpment and the rising ground. However, it recommended that the sites site identified for release from the Green Belt could be development without significantly impacting on the amenity of the area. The Green Belt boundary review is informed by lancape sensitivity and capacity assessment, which is appropriate to test the capacity of the sites to accommodate change. Since the publication of the DPD the Council has published a lancape assessment. There is nothing in this study that would require the Council to change its	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
				openness of the area; with housing development on either side of the school, this is highly questionable. c) The Green Belt Review itself rejected the 10 Acre Site as a Travellers site. d) the assertion that the Green Belt Review would create "a defensible Green Belt Boundary" is highly contentious as the existing boundary is highly defensible and removal of the escarpment destroys a significant physical landscape feature that is itself a strong defensible boundary. e) The Green Belt Review erroneously quotes a 7 minute travel time between Mayford and Woking; at peak times this journey time can easily be 30 minutes. The major proposed school, housing development, poor road network and single lane bridges are a recipe for gridlock on the roads.		conclusions on the proposed allocations in this area. The matter of whether the Council have carried out a landscape assessment to inform the Site Allocations DPD has been comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The 10 Acre site is an established Travellers' site. The Council believes that intensifying the use of the site to deliver additional 12 pitches is the most sustainable approach to meet the needs of Travellers. This matter has also been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 4 and 22. The Council will work with all the relevant interested parties to ensure that the traffic impacts of the specific scheme that comes forward, including their cumulative impacts are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation measures identified to address the impacts.	
11	T M	Brandman	GB7	Object strongly, the site is not suitable for the following reasons. Such sites should not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity and character of the area; adjacent Smarts Heath Common is used for leisure and Smarts Heath Road is a residential road with 2 Grade Two listed buildings.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
11	T M	Brandman	GB7	Urban areas should be preferred to Green Belt areas; we have no evidence that any urban areas have been considered or that no suitable urban areas exist.	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
11	T M	Brandman	GB7	Site GB7 is not near access to employment shops or other infrastructure, which are priority considerations.	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
11	T M	Brandman	GB7	Existing traveller sites are concentrated in one area within three miles of Ten Acre Farm. There should be no further expansion in this 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
11	T M	Brandman	GB7	Over many years planning inspectors have refused applications on this site as they adversely affect the Green Belt, such considerations should not be discarded.	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
11	T M	Brandman	GB8	Strongly object to the housing on this site. The proposal will greatly diminish open space between Woking Town and Mayford, will encourage a further merger with Guildford, the Green Belt partly exists to resist such encroachment. The character of Mayford as an historic village separate from Woking will be destroyed.	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. This matter 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 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
11	T M	Brandman	GB9	Strongly object to the housing on this site. The proposal will greatly diminish open space between Woking Town and Mayford, will encourage a further merger with Guildford, the Green Belt partly exists to resist such encroachment. The character of Mayford as an historic village separate from Woking will be destroyed.	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 lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape 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
11	T M	Brandman	GB10	Strongly object to the housing on this site. The proposal will greatly diminish open space between Woking Town and Mayford, will encourage a further merger with Guildford, the Green Belt partly exists to resist such encroachment. The character of Mayford as an historic village separate from Woking will be destroyed.	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 of the Core Strategy provides a robust policy to protect the character of Mayford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
11	T M	Brandman	GB11	Strongly object to the housing on this site. The proposal will greatly diminish open space between Woking Town and Mayford, will encourage a further merger with Guildford, the Green Belt partly exists to resist such encroachment. The character of Mayford as an historic village separate from Woking will be destroyed.	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 lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape 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. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
11	T M	Brandman	GB8	Existing infrastructure is totally inadequate to support the population increase that development will bring. Roads are unsuitable, lack pavements and bridges are single lane. No plans show how to remedy these defects.	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. 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	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
						Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area	
11	T M	Brandman	GB9	Existing infrastructure is totally inadequate to support the population increase that development will bring. Roads are unsuitable, lack pavements and bridges are single lane. No plans show how to remedy these defects.	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. 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
11	T M	Brandman	GB10	Existing infrastructure is totally inadequate to support the population increase that development will bring. Roads are unsuitable, lack pavements and bridges are single lane. No plans show how to remedy these defects.	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
11	T M	Brandman	GB11	Existing infrastructure is totally inadequate to support the population increase that development will bring. Roads are unsuitable, lack pavements and bridges are single lane. No plans show how to remedy these defects.	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	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>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. 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>	
11	T M	Brandman	GB8	Destruction of open land will adversely affect wildlife populations and corridors and neighbouring protected areas.	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. 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
11	T M	Brandman	GB9	Destruction of open land will adversely affect wildlife populations and corridors and neighbouring protected areas.	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. 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</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 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.	
11	T M	Brandman	GB10	Destruction of open land will adversely affect wildlife populations and corridors and neighbouring protected areas.	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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
11	T M	Brandman	GB11	Destruction of open land will adversely affect wildlife populations and corridors and neighbouring protected areas.	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 lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape 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. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. 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	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
						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.	
11	T M	Brandman	General	Woking Borough Council has not followed National Policy that Green Belt Boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" and "housing need including Traveller Sites does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development"; these proposals are entirely driven by a perception of housing need and are inappropriate.	None stated.	The exceptional circumstances case for allocating Green Belt land has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1. The case for releasing Green Belt land to meet the needs of Travellers has also been comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. Overall the Council is satisfied that the proposed allocations has the in-principle support of national policy behind them.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
11	T M	Brandman	General	There is no independent evidence that the Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its plan.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Whilst there is no independent study of brownfield land, the Council has published a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment to identify brownfield land that are available and developable for housing. The Council is satisfied this is sufficiently robust and does not need an independent study to inform the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
11	T M	Brandman	General	The separation of Woking from Mayford by open land is critical to the preservation of Mayford as a separate entity. The Green Belt Review incorrectly classed this as only "important". Mayford will become a suburb of Woking.	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 12. The Green Belt boundary review report recognises the importance to ensure separation between settlements. It is one of the purposes of the Green Belt, which sites have been assessed against. It concluded that Mayford will continue to have its unique identity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
11	T M	Brandman	General	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent: a) Land to the north of Saunders Lane has long been designated as "Escarpment and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" in Woking Local Plan Policy NE7 and Woking 2027 therefore should not be considered for development, yet the Green Belt Review proposes boundary changes to remove this land from the Green Belt without a Lancap Character Assessment. This is unacceptable. b) The Green Belt Review indicates a school on Egley Road would maintain openness of the area; with housing development on either side of the school, this is highly questionable. c) The Green Belt Review itself rejected the 10 Acre Site as a Travellers site. d) the assertion that the Green Belt Review would create "a defensible Green Belt Boundary" is highly contentious as the existing boundary is highly defensible and removal of the escarpment destroys a significant physical lancap feature that is itself a strong defensible boundary. e) The Green Belt Review erroneously quotes a 7 minute travel time between Mayford and Woking; at peak times this journey time can easily be 30 minutes. The major proposed school, housing development, poor road network and single lane bridges are a recipe for gridlock on the roads.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review assessed all the identified parcels of land consistently against a set of criteria. It acknowledged the lancap importance of the Escarpment and the rising ground. However, it recommended that the sites identified for release from the Green Belt could be development without significantly impacting on the amenity of the area. The Green Belt boundary review is informed by lancap sensitivity and capacity assessment, which is appropriate to test the capacity of the sites to accommodate change. Since the publication of the DPD the Council has published a lancap assessment. There is nothing in this study that would require the Council to change its conclusions on the proposed allocations in this area. The matter of whether the Council have carried out a lancap assessment to inform the Site Allocations DPD has been comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The 10 Acre site is an established Travellers' site. The Council believes that intensifying the use of the site to deliver additional 12 pitches is the most sustainable approach to meet the needs of Travellers. This matter has also been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 4 and 22. The Council will work with all the relevant interested parties to ensure that the traffic impacts of the specific scheme that comes forward, including their cumulative impacts are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation measures identified to address the impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
778	Carla	Brannan	GB15	Concerned about the proposed development of 742 homes on West Byfleet's Green Belt. Object to the loss of Green Belt in West Byfleet.	None stated.	This representation regarding the loss of Green Belt land for development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. In addition it should also be noted that the Site Allocations DPD is proposing 592 dwellings at site GB15 as well as some residential accommodation at GB16. The existing proposal for a secondary	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
						school and 155 dwellings at GB16 is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.	
778	Carla	Brannan	GB15	Building disruption whilst the development is underway	None stated.	It is noted that there will be some disruption during the construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
778	Carla	Brannan	GB15	Object to the development in its entirety	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
778	Carla	Brannan	GB15	Inadequate school places to accommodate additional homes	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
778	Carla	Brannan	Methodology	Neutral	None stated.	Noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
778	Carla	Brannan	GB16	Objecting. The proposal for housing and a school will increase traffic and congestion.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact 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
778	Carla	Brannan	Introduction	There has been no consideration of traffic and impact on residents.	None stated.	The strategic impact of the proposed developments on the road network has been considered by the Council as part of the ongoing work alongside the County Highways Agency. The Council is committed to working with the CHA to address the strategic transport issues of the Borough. As noted within the DPD, the development of the sites will be required to carry out a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage to clearly demonstrate the impact of the proposal on the road network and the specific mitigation measure that will be implemented to minimise the impacts of development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
778	Carla	Brannan	GB15	Traffic problems in the area and a roundabout opposite Blackwood Close will only add to delays	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 key requirements for Site GB15 note that a roundabout should be provided in order to achieve a safe entrance onto the site from Parvis Road. This is based on the findings of the County Highways Authority who are responsible for the highways in the area as well as highways safety. 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	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
						application stage.	
836	Paul	Brannan	GB15	The loss of 45 per cent of West Byfleet's Green Belt will be damaging.	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. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
836	Paul	Brannan	GB15	Objects. Will cause traffic congestion in the area.	The development should be relocated to an alternative brown field site that has supporting road infrastructure.	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
836	Paul	Brannan	General	Neutral	None stated.	Neutral representation noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
836	Paul	Brannan	General	Neutral	None stated.	Neutral representation noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1306	Suzanne	Brannan	GB15	Roads in and around Byfleet and West Byfleet are regularly congested especially when there are problems on the A3. A significant increase in population will have a negative impact on traffic. Other services/issues that will be affected include schools, doctors surgery, trains and parking. Understands the need for Broadoaks but not in addition to GB15.	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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0The 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. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the 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
						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. Both proposals GB15 and GB16 are being proposed to meet the housing need in the Borough within the Plan period up to 2027. Further explanation can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 1.0	
1306	Suzanne	Brannan	GB15	Consider a greenfield site along the A3 which can cope with additional traffic and accommodate parking	Site suggestion. A greenfield site along the A3 for a new town	The representation did not provide any specific details regarding the area of land to be considered by the Council. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1306	Suzanne	Brannan	GB15	Consider a greenfield site along the A3 which can cope with additional traffic and accommodate parking	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 8.0. See also Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1306	Suzanne	Brannan	GB15	Repeat comments regarding local infrastructure, local wellbeing and environment	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0. With regards to comments about the local environment and general well being, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 21.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1306	Suzanne	Brannan	GB15	The site should be considered unsuitable due to the lack of ability to improve local infrastructure.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1602	T.F.	Brass	GB15	Concerned about the impact of the proposals on the road network and traffic. The A245 is congested already. Although some residents and school pupils will travel by public transport, many will use cars and add to the issue as well as impact other local roads. This will have an effect on air pollution. Mitigation works are unlikely to be effective due to land constraints and the flow and volume of traffic. There are no reasonable alternatives to the A245 and therefore due to the increase in traffic and congestion, the proposed developments should not be taken forward.	None stated.	It should be noted that the draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits. 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 transport studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road	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>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. 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. The Council monitors air quality throughout the Borough to make sure pollution levels remain below the recommended/legal limit. In terms of Planning Policy, Core Strategy Policy CS21 as well as the Development Management Policies DPD set out a robust policy framework to make sure that new development does not have a significant impact on air quality. Where a negative impact is identified, the Council will require mitigation measures to be implemented. This can only be determined at the planning application stage, when development proposals are considered in more detail and where up to date evidence can be used to establish air quality levels. The Council note the suggested transport infrastructure options and will draw the County Council's attention to this as they are the highways authority for the Borough.</p>	
1602	T.F.	Brass	GB16	<p>Concerned about the impact of the proposals on the road network and traffic. The A245 is congested already. Although some residents and school pupils will travel by public transport, many will use cars and add to the issue as well as impact other local roads. This will have an effect on air pollution. Mitigation works are unlikely to be effective due to land constraints and the flow and volume of traffic. There are no reasonable alternatives to the A245 and therefore due to the increase in traffic and congestion, the proposed developments should not be taken forward.</p>	None stated.	<p>It should be noted that the draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits. 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 transport 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</p>	<p>No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation</p>

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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 require. 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 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. The Council monitors air quality throughout the Borough to make sure pollution levels remain below the recommended/legal limit. In terms of Planning Policy, Core Strategy Policy CS21 as well as the Development Management Policies DPD set out a robust policy framework to make sure that new development does not have a significant impact on air quality. Where a negative impact is identified, the Council will require mitigation measures to be implemented. This can only be determined at the planning application stage, when development proposals are considered in more detail and where up to date evidence can be used to establish air quality levels. The Council note the suggested transport infrastructure options and will draw the County Council's attention to this as they are the highways authority for the Borough.	
982	Maureen	Brewer	GB5	Object to development on Green Belt in Byfleet. The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. There are no GPs and few facilities for children.	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 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). Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford,	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
						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. 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 representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular 3.8.	
982	Maureen	Brewer	GB16	Object to development that will increase traffic on Parvis Road. A private school will bring many cars to the area.	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 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. 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. The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
982	Maureen	Brewer	GB5	The road network is at capacity and further	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				development will increase the number of cars and make the situation worse.		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 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. 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. The principle of Green Belt development and safeguarding land for future development needs is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.	is proposed as a result of this representation
1018	Micheal	Bridport	GB4	Byfleet will lose a substantial amount of Green Belt however the Borough retains 98%. Questions if the Council investigated sites in Hook Heath.	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. The Green Belt boundary review considered all of the Green Belt in 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
						Borough for development needs. The review and its methodology are published on the Council's website.	
1018	Micheal	Bridport	GB5	Byfleet will lose a substantial amount of Green Belt however the Borough retains 98%. Questions if the Council investigated sites in Hook Heath.	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 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). 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. The Green Belt boundary review considered all of the Green Belt in the Borough for development needs. The review and its methodology are published on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1018	Micheal	Bridport	GB4	Additional houses increases the flood risk. Flood tanks have not been effective.	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
1018	Micheal	Bridport	GB5	Additional houses increases the flood risk. Flood tanks have not been effective.	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
1018	Micheal	Bridport	GB4	The road network is already at development 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; 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</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 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.	
1018	Micheal	Bridport	GB5	The road network is already at development and further development will make the situation worse.	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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0The 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1018	Micheal	Bridport	GB4	Use of Green Belt is unacceptable to residents. Additional houses will require more infrastructure which do not appear to have been addressed.	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 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	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>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. See Section 3.0</p>	
1018	Micheal	Bridport	GB5	Use of Green Belt is unacceptable to residents. Additional houses will require more infrastructure which do not appear to have been addressed.	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). 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. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1018	Micheal	Bridport	GB4	The Council has ignored the wishes of the residents.	None stated.	<p>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 Represor ID 1524.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1018	Micheal	Bridport	GB5	The Council has ignored the wishes of the residents.	None stated.	<p>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 Represor ID 1524.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1068	Chris	Brier	GB12	I would like to record my deep concerns regarding the proposed housing. Development would radically change the nature of the village and its environs, add stress to local infrastructure and degrade the area for residents and local wildlife. I understand the Borough has departed from the advice given by Peter Brett Associates and ignored representations from the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum. Sites identified in the Green Belt Review have not all been subject to	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. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can</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 same level of detailed assessment.		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. The Council has carried out a number of studies to inform the DPD, including the Green Belt boundary review. It has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternatives sites. Collectively, the evidence suggests supports the allocation of the sites and there is no inconsistency in the decisions made by the Council in that regard. The SA Report sets out why site have been supported and/or rejected for allocation.	
1068	Chris	Brier	GB13	I would like to record my deep concerns regarding the proposed housing. Development would radically change the nature of the village and its environs, add stress to local infrastructure and degrade the area for residents and local wildlife. I understand the Borough has departed from the advice given by Peter Brett Associates and ignored representations from the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum. Sites identified in the Green Belt Review have not all been subject to the same level of detailed assessment.	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. The Council has carried out a number of studies to inform the DPD, including the Green Belt boundary review. It has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternatives sites. Collectively, the evidence suggests supports the allocation of the sites and there is no inconsistency in the decisions made by the Council in that regard. The SA Report sets out why site have been supported and/or rejected for allocation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1068	Chris	Brier	GB12	Of particular concern is the effect on local road usage. Upshot Lane and Coldharbour Road are already congested at peak times. More traffic will mean gridlock. Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum has identified many more relevant points that need to be considered before a final decision is made, which I will not reiterate. Urge Woking Borough Council to carry out a detailed review of all local objections before approving the plans.	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	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
						impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Council has considered all representations received to inform the subsequent stages of the DPD.	
1068	Chris	Brier	GB13	Of particular concern is the effect on local road usage. Upshot Lane and Coldharbour Road are already congested at peak times. More traffic will mean gridlock. Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum has identified many more relevant points that need to be considered before a final decision is made, which I will not reiterate. Urge Woking Borough Council to carry out a detailed review of all local objections before approving the plans.	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
332	Clare	Brierley	GB10	Consideration should be given to local highways. The roads (inc Egley Road) are already often congested.	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
332	Clare	Brierley	GB11	Consideration should be given to local highways. The roads (inc Egley Road) are already often congested.	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
332	Clare	Brierley	GB14	Consideration should be given to local highways. The roads (inc Egley Road) are already often congested.	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
332	Clare	Brierley	GB10	The proposed densities of 30 dph are excessive to the average density of 5.5 dph in the area. 30 dph could only lead to a proliferation of apartments, not houses	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
332	Clare	Brierley	GB11	The proposed densities of 30 dph are excessive to the average density of 5.5 dph in the area. 30 dph could only lead to a proliferation of apartments, not houses	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
332	Clare	Brierley	GB14	The proposed densities of 30 dph are excessive to the average density of 5.5 dph in the area. 30 dph could only lead to a proliferation of apartments, not houses	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
332	Clare	Brierley	GB10	Consideration should be given to local services/facilities. It can take weeks to get doctors appointment	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
332	Clare	Brierley	GB11	Consideration should be given to local services/facilities. It can take weeks to get doctors appointment	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	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
						Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
332	Clare	Brierley	GB14	Consideration should be given to local services/facilities. It can take weeks to get doctors appointment	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
332	Clare	Brierley	GB10	National policy allows for the release of GB land in exceptional circumstances. The Core Strategy requires the identification of 550 homes within the GB up to 2027. However WBC have not demonstrated exceptional circumstances for the further identification of land for 1200 post 2027	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 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
332	Clare	Brierley	GB11	National policy allows for the release of GB land in exceptional circumstances. The Core Strategy requires the identification of 550 homes within the GB up to 2027. However WBC have not demonstrated exceptional circumstances for the further identification of land for 1200 post 2027	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 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
332	Clare	Brierley	GB14	National policy allows for the release of GB land in exceptional circumstances. The Core Strategy requires the identification of 550 homes within the GB up to 2027. However WBC have not demonstrated exceptional circumstances for the further identification of land for 1200 post 2027	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 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
332	Clare	Brierley	GB10	The Hook Heath area is unique because of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
332	Clare	Brierley	GB11	The Hook Heath area is unique because of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
332	Clare	Brierley	GB14	The Hook Heath area is unique because of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
332	Clare	Brierley	GB10	The purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and prevent the coalescence of towns. The development of these areas will lead to the merging of Mayford, Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
332	Clare	Brierley	GB11	The purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and prevent the coalescence of towns. The development of these areas will lead to the merging of Mayford, Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
332	Clare	Brierley	GB14	The purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and prevent the coalescence of towns. The development of these areas will lead to the merging of Mayford, Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
332	Clare	Brierley	GB10	Understands the pressure placed on the Council to identify land for future development but considers the identification of the Green Belt as	Consider the longer term and innovative solutions into the next 100 years.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 3.0, 8.0, 9.0, 10.0, 11.0 and 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
				the easy option. Suggests that WBC consider innovative approaches within the urban area. Making these vibrant urban communities. For example by concentrating shops, services and facilities near the station this would avoid the need to drive. Open spaces can then be retained for recreation. We need to look to the longer term, into the next 100 years. Consider medium/ high rise development near train links and creation of great parks.	Maximise development near train hubs creating vibrant urban centres.		
332	Clare	Brierley	GB11	Understands the pressure placed on the Council to identify land for future development but considers the identification of the Green Belt as the easy option. Suggests that WBC consider innovative approaches within the urban area. Making these vibrant urban communities. For example by concentrating shops, services and facilities near the station this would avoid the need to drive. Open spaces can then be retained for recreation. We need to look to the longer term, into the next 100 years. Consider medium/ high rise development near train links and creation of great parks.	Consider the longer term and innovative solutions into the next 100 years. Maximise development near train hubs creating vibrant urban centres.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 3.0, 8.0, 9.0, 10.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
332	Clare	Brierley	GB14	Understands the pressure placed on the Council to identify land for future development but considers the identification of the Green Belt as the easy option. Suggests that WBC consider innovative approaches within the urban area. Making these vibrant urban communities. For example by concentrating shops, services and facilities near the station this would avoid the need to drive. Open spaces can then be retained for recreation. We need to look to the longer term, into the next 100 years. Consider medium/ high rise development near train links and creation of great parks.	Consider the longer term and innovative solutions into the next 100 years. Maximise development near train hubs creating vibrant urban centres.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 3.0, 8.0, 9.0, 10.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
332	Clare	Brierley	GB10	Poor planning in the 1970s had a negative impact. WBC has sought to improve the areas since. The GB functions as open amenity space and add to character of Woking, enabling easy access to the wider countryside.	None stated.	The Council has made significant public realm improvements to various parts of Woking, particularly the Town Centre. It has completed a number of initiatives to improve local amenity and access to open spaces, case studies are provided in the Council's Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure Strategy 'Natural Woking'. Natural Woking sets out the strategic approach to GI in the Borough, identifying existing network and identifying potential future opportunities. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
332	Clare	Brierley	GB11	Poor planning in the 1970s had a negative impact. WBC has sought to improve the areas since. The GB functions as open amenity space and add to character of Woking, enabling easy access to the wider countryside.	None stated.	The Council has made significant public realm improvements to various parts of Woking, particularly the Town Centre. It has completed a number of initiatives to improve local amenity and access to open spaces, case studies are provided in the Council's Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure Strategy 'Natural Woking'. Natural Woking sets out the strategic approach to GI in the Borough, identifying existing network and identifying potential future opportunities. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
332	Clare	Brierley	GB14	Poor planning in the 1970s had a negative	None stated.	The Council has made significant public realm improvements to	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				impact. WBC has sought to improve the areas since. The GB functions as open amenity space and add to character of Woking, enabling easy access to the wider countryside.		various parts of Woking, particularly the Town Centre. It has completed a number of initiatives to improve local amenity and access to open spaces, case studies are provided in the Council's Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure Strategy 'Natural Woking'. Natural Woking sets out the strategic approach to GI in the Borough, identifying existing network and identifying potential future opportunities. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0	is proposed as a result of this representation
1476	Gordon	Brierley	GB12	The sites are assessed in the GBR as unsuitable for release as they fulfil two critical Green Belt purposes, have poor sustainability and high landscape sensitivity. They play an important role in containing the southern edge of Woking, provide a strong landscape context for Pyrford village and are a rare example of a rural landscape not lost or degraded by golf course development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1476	Gordon	Brierley	GB13	The sites are assessed in the GBR as unsuitable for release as they fulfil two critical Green Belt purposes, have poor sustainability and high landscape sensitivity. They play an important role in containing the southern edge of Woking, provide a strong landscape context for Pyrford village and are a rare example of a rural landscape not lost or degraded by golf course development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1476	Gordon	Brierley	GB12	There are serious access and transport issues to be considered. Roads are already extremely busy with traffic, particularly at peak times, and the proposals would exacerbate this.	None stated.	This point is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Site specific measures would be required to ensure the roads, junctions and roundabouts that are used to access the sites can operate safely and efficiently.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1476	Gordon	Brierley	GB13	There are serious access and transport issues to be considered. Roads are already extremely busy with traffic, particularly at peak times, and the proposals would exacerbate this.	None stated.	This point is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Site specific measures would be required to ensure the roads, junctions and roundabouts that are used to access the sites can operate safely and efficiently.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1476	Gordon	Brierley	GB12	The lack of footways in the immediate area, together with the need to increase road width in Upshot Lane will mean a major programme of tree and shrub removal, which will greatly reduce the useable site area.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths in the site's vicinity 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. Road improvements may be necessary as part of the developments, however the site's are large enough to accommodate this as part of a comprehensively planned development. It should also be noted that the allocation's key requirements seek to retain boundary planting along Upshot Lane or provide new planting, taking account of Highway Safety.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1476	Gordon	Brierley	GB13	The lack of footways in the immediate area, together with the need to increase road width in Upshot Lane will mean a major programme of tree and shrub removal, which will greatly reduce the useable site area.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths in the site's vicinity 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. Road improvements may be necessary as part of the developments, however the site's are large enough to accommodate this as part of a comprehensively planned development. It should also be noted that the allocation's key requirements seek to retain boundary planting along Upshot Lane or provide new planting, taking	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
						account of Highway Safety.	
1476	Gordon	Brierley	GB12	This wholly inappropriate development would have a major impact on local infrastructure, particularly Pyrford Primary School (rebuilt to meet anticipated demand by not accounting for these new homes), health and emergency services, and care for the elderly.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraph 3.8. 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
1476	Gordon	Brierley	GB13	This wholly inappropriate development would have a major impact on local infrastructure, particularly Pyrford Primary School (rebuilt to meet anticipated demand by not accounting for these new homes), health and emergency services, and care for the elderly.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraph 3.8. 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
1476	Gordon	Brierley	GB12	This wholly inappropriate development would have a major impact on the environment, especially pollution and wear and tear on local roads due to traffic.	None stated.	These issues would need to meet Council and wider, national standards. The Council's environmental standards are outlined in the Core Strategy (2012) and emerging Development Management Policies DPD (examination in May 2016), and development would need to be considered as appropriate with regard to these standards at the planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1476	Gordon	Brierley	GB13	This wholly inappropriate development would have a major impact on the environment, especially pollution and wear and tear on local roads due to traffic.	None stated.	These issues would need to meet Council and wider, national standards. The Council's environmental standards are outlined in the Core Strategy (2012) and emerging Development Management Policies DPD (examination in May 2016), and development would need to be considered as appropriate with regard to these standards at the planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1476	Gordon	Brierley	GB12	This wholly inappropriate development would have a major impact on water resource, hydrology and wildlife and protected species, together with additional light pollution.	None stated.	<p>This part of the representation is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 5.0. e. 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</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>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). 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.</p>	
1476	Gordon	Brierley	GB13	This wholly inappropriate development would have a major impact on water resource, hydrology and wildlife and protected species, together with additional light pollution.	None stated.	<p>This part of the representation is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 5.0. e. 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 this site 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). 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1476	Gordon	Brierley	GB12	Proposals of this scale will have a detrimental	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				impact on an already overburdened rail service, particularly to Central London at rush hour.		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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
1476	Gordon	Brierley	GB13	Proposals of this scale will have a detrimental impact on an already overburdened rail service, particularly to Central London at rush hour.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1476	Gordon	Brierley	GB12	Objects for the key reasons below. 1. The Council have approved the draft Site Allocations DPD without fully taking account of all representations received, particularly those made by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum.	None stated.	Objection noted. However, as noted the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1476	Gordon	Brierley	GB13	Objects for the key reasons below. 1. The Council have approved the draft Site Allocations DPD without fully taking account of all representations received, particularly those made by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum.	None stated.	Objection noted. However, as noted the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1476	Gordon	Brierley	GB12	Whilst accepting that additional homes are required by an expanding population, such a wholesale change to the character of a rural area steeped in history is too much of a 'quick fix'. Suggests targeting derelict and underused brownfield land, redesignating empty commercial property and affordable renting of accommodation over shops.	Use derelict and underused brownfield land, re-designate empty commercial property and rent accommodation over shops at affordable prices.	The lancape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing 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 Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) 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 and design standards in accordance with the environmental and 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. The representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0, 11.0, 19.0 and 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1476	Gordon	Brierley	GB13	Whilst accepting that additional homes are required by an expanding population, such a wholesale change to the character of a rural area steeped in history is too much of a 'quick fix'. Suggests targeting derelict and underused brownfield land, redesignating empty commercial	Use derelict and underused brownfield land, re-designate empty commercial property and rent accommodation over shops at affordable prices.	The lancape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of	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
				property and affordable renting of accommodation over shops.		the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) 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 and design standards in accordance with the environmental and 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. The representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0, 11.0, 19.0 and 21.0.	
890	Iain and Laura	Bright	GB12	Goes against all five of the stated purposes of the Green Belt.	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
890	Iain and Laura	Bright	GB13	Goes against all five of the stated purposes of the Green Belt.	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
890	Iain and Laura	Bright	GB12	Will put village infrastructure and roads under pressure. Will damage views from Pyrford towards the North Downs.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The representation regarding views and lancape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In lancape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
890	Iain and Laura	Bright	GB13	Will put village infrastructure and roads under pressure.Will damage views from Pyrford towards the North Downs.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.The representation regarding views and lancape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In lancape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
890	Iain and Laura	Bright	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Use the fiel for recreation.	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. 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	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>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 land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>It should be noted that the densities set out in the draft Site Allocations DPD are indicative and will be agreed at the Development Management stage. Nevertheless the proposed densities are consistent with those set out in the Core Strategy. It should also be highlighted that a lower density development would result in the Council having to identify more land in the Green Belt for future development needs. In combination with the Development Plan Documents, the Council believes that development of this site can have a satisfactory relationship with the local context.</p>	
890	Iain and Laura	Bright	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Use the field for recreation.	None stated.	<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. 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 land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest. It should be noted that the densities set out in the draft Site Allocations DPD are indicative</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 will be agreed at the Development Management stage. Nevertheless the proposed densities are consistent with those set out in the Core Strategy. It should also be highlighted that a lower density development would result in the Council having to identify more land in the Green Belt for future development needs. In combination with the Development Plan Documents, the Council believes that development of this site can have a satisfactory relationship with the local context.	
890	Iain and Laura	Bright	GB12	Object to development proposals in the Green Belt. Goes against government statements to redevelop brownfield sites. Consider brownfield alternatives.	Reconsider alternative locations and fulfil your housing obligations an a braver, more innovative and less damaging way.	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
890	Iain and Laura	Bright	GB13	Object to development proposals in the Green Belt. Goes against government statements to redevelop brownfield sites. Consider brownfield alternatives.	Reconsider alternative locations and fulfil your housing obligations an a braver, more innovative and less damaging way.	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
427	Colin	Bristow	GB15	Object to the loss of GB land forever	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
427	Colin	Bristow	GB16	Object to the loss of GB land forever	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
427	Colin	Bristow	GB15	Object to proposals in West Byfleet with no proposed supporting infrastructure	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
427	Colin	Bristow	GB16	Object to proposals in West Byfleet with no proposed supporting infrastructure	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1556	Molley	Britten	GB15	Object to Green Belt development. The 592 houses and school at Broadoaks will add a significant number of vehicles onto the A245 which is congested. An additional 592 houses at West Hall beggars belief.	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 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. 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	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 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. The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.	
1556	Molley	Britten	GB16	Object to Green Belt development. The 592 houses and school at Broadoaks will add a significant number of vehicles onto the A245 which is congested. An additional 592 houses at West Hall beggars belief.	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 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. 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. The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be	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
						assessed on its own merits.	
1182	Debbie	Brocklehurst	GB12	The area is extremely busy, particularly through the village and on the Pyrford Common Road, and at peak times. This will increase congestion to unsafe levels.	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
1182	Debbie	Brocklehurst	GB13	The area is extremely busy, particularly through the village and on the Pyrford Common Road, and at peak times. This will increase congestion to unsafe levels.	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
1182	Debbie	Brocklehurst	GB12	I object to as: Woking Borough Council are substantially ignoring the recommendations of Peter Brett Associates, independent advisers - why?	None stated.	The Council has used a range of evidence base to inform the Site Allocations DPD, including the Green Belt boundary review report. The Council believes that the Green Belt boundary review report is robust to provide reliable information to inform the DPD. However it is one of many for the Council to take into account. This matter is addressed in detail in Sections 10 and 17 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Collectively, the evidence justifies the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1182	Debbie	Brocklehurst	GB13	I object to as: Woking Borough Council are substantially ignoring the recommendations of Peter Brett Associates, independent advisers - why?	None stated.	The Council has used a range of evidence base to inform the Site Allocations DPD, including the Green Belt boundary review report. The Council believes that the Green Belt boundary review report is robust to provide reliable information to inform the DPD. However it is one of many for the Council to take into account. This matter is addressed in detail in Sections 10 and 17 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Collectively, the evidence justifies the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1182	Debbie	Brocklehurst	GB13	Woking Borough Council should concentrate their efforts on a smaller development, providing more	None stated.	Most of the development proposals in the DPD are on relatively small previously developed sites in the urban area. The Council	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
				affordable homes for people who have grown up in Pyrford but are unable to buy a home themselves.		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. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals are necessary to contributing to the long term development needs of 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, 2 and 4.	of this representation
1182	Debbie	Brocklehurst	GB12	Woking Borough Council should concentrate their efforts on a smaller development, providing more affordable homes for people who have grown up in pyriform but are unable to buy a home themselves.	None stated.	The Council will make sure that any development that comes forward is of the right mix and type to meet local need. The Council has a robust policy in the form of policy CS12 of the Core Strategy to secure the necessary affordable housing as part of development. The proposals are however needed to meet the development needs 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 lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape 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
1042		Brockman	GB12	The Council have ignored two letters from the Pyrford NF which raised concerns about the GBBR. The Executive published the DPD without reviewing valid representations.	None stated.	As noted at the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representer ID 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1042		Brockman	GB13	The Council have ignored two letters from the Pyrford NF which raised concerns about the GBBR. The Executive published the DPD without reviewing valid representations.	None stated.	As noted at the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representer ID 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1042		Brockman	GB13	Acknowledges some change must occur however there are other ways of achieving this whilst protecting Pyrford's character. The Council should engage with the Pyrford NF.	None stated.	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 lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review.	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, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS21, 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 lancape 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 lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features.</p> <p>The Council has engaged with the local community (see Section 6.0). The Council has also assisted Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum PNF in the preparation of their Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Please note that representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 573 and Representations submitted by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 19.</p>	
1042		Brockman	GB12	Acknowledges some change must occur however there are other ways of achieving this whilst protecting Pyrford's character. The Council should engage with the Pyrford NF.	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 lancape 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 CS21, 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 lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features. The Council has engaged with the local community (see Section 6.0). The Council has also assisted Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum PNF in the preparation of their Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 573 and Representations submitted by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 19.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1042		Brockman	GB12	The road network 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, 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>	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>	
1042		Brockman	GB13	The road network 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, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0. The various transport 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. 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
1042		Brockman	GB12	Pyrford's residents live here in part because of its	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				pleasant environment and countryside. Development would damage Pyrford's environment and heritage assets, including historic buildings and CA's which are valued nationally.		Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0.	is proposed as a result of this representation
1042		Brockman	GB13	Pyrford's residents live here in part because of its pleasant environment and countryside. Development would damage Pyrford's environment and heritage assets, including historic buildings and CA's which are valued nationally.	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
1679	Paul	Brooks	General	Object. Development will increase surface water runoff and increase flood risk to adjacent properties.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
49	Colin	Brown	GB7	The purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban encroachment.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that this objective will be compromised. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
49	Colin	Brown	GB7	This and the other developments along Saunders Lane will ruin what is quite pretty tranquil community	None stated.	The issues has been comprehensively addressed in Sections 7, 12, 23 and 19 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Overall, based on the evidence the Council is satisfied that the character of area will not be significantly undermined. In particular, the character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
49	Colin	Brown	GB8	The purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban encroachment.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
49	Colin	Brown	GB8	This and the other developments along Saunders Lane will ruin what is quite pretty tranquil community	None stated.	The issues has been comprehensively addressed in Sections 7, 12, 23 and 19 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Overall, based on the evidence the Council is satisfied that the character of area will not be significantly undermined. In particular, the character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
49	Colin	Brown	GB9	The purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban encroachment.	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	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
						underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape 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.	
49	Colin	Brown	GB9	This and the other developments along Saunders Lane will ruin what is quite pretty tranquil community	None stated.	The issues has been comprehensively addressed in Sections 7, 12, 23 and 19 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Overall, based on the evidence the Council is satisfied that the character of area will not be significantly undermined. In particular, the character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
49	Colin	Brown	GB10	The purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban encroachment.	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
49	Colin	Brown	GB10	This and the other developments along Saunders Lane will ruin what is quite pretty tranquil community	None stated.	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 lancape 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
49	Colin	Brown	GB11	The purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban encroachment.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals would lead to significant urban sprawl. 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 lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape 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
49	Colin	Brown	GB11	This and the other developments along Saunders Lane will ruin what is quite pretty tranquil community	None stated.	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 lancape to accommodate the proposals 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
						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.	
61	Heidi	Brown	GB12	I submit my strong opposition to this. My husband, young son and I moved to Pyrford from London earlier this year. One of the main attractions of moving to the area was that it offers so many green open spaces.	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
61	Heidi	Brown	GB12	West Byfleet and Pyrford is already congested with traffic, particularly morning, late afternoon into the evening. Adding these properties will only bring further traffic congestion, traffic pollution and noise. I urge you not to build on these two fies. Instead consider alternative brownfield development elsewhere within the borough.	None stated.	The traffic implications of the proposals in the Site Allocations DOD is addressed comprehensively in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of brownfield land to meet development needs of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter 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
61	Heidi	Brown	GB13	I submit my strong opposition to this. My husband, young son and I moved to Pyrford from London earlier this year. One of the main attractions of moving to the area was that it offers so many green open spaces.	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	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
						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.	
61	Heidi	Brown	GB13	West Byfleet and Pyrford is already congested with traffic, particularly morning, late afternoon into the evening. Adding these properties will only bring further traffic congestion, traffic pollution and noise. I urge you not to build on these two fiel. Instead consider alternative brownfield development elsewhere within the borough.	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 study acknowledges the traffic impacts on the A245. 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 general approach to dealing with this issues is set out in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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 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. Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council has been working with neighbouring authorities to ensure that the cross boundary implications of their proposals are assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts. 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</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
						issues of the area.	
71	Ian	Brown	DPOLSA1	Concerns raised over the release of Green Belt sites for development. Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and protects the rural environment and historic towns. The release of Green Belt land now will result in more being lost to development in the future.	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 Section 1, 2, 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
71	Ian	Brown	GB12	Unclear what 'safeguarded' means and would like to know what safeguards are in place to prevent the site from coming forward for development before 2027.	None stated.	Safeguarded sites are those sites that are identified to meet future development needs beyond 2027. They are not allocated for development before 2027. Their release will only be through the review of the Core Strategy and/or the Site Allocations DPD. Policy SA1 of the DPD sets this out clearly.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
71	Ian	Brown	GB13	Unclear what 'safeguarded' means and would like to know what safeguards are in place to prevent the site from coming forward for development before 2027.	None stated.	The safeguarded land is land that has been identified to meet future development needs beyond 2027 to 2040. They are not allocated for development during this plan period. They will only be release for development as part of the review of the Core Strategy and/or the Site Allocations DPD. This protection is clearly specified in policy SA1 of the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
119	Matthew	Brown	GB12	Pyrford offers green open space and development will have a negative impact on local people, the rural character of the area and the natural environment.	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
119	Matthew	Brown	GB13	Pyrford offers green open space and development will have a negative impact on local people, the rural character of the area and the natural environment.	None stated.	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	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
						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.	
119	Matthew	Brown	GB12	Traffic is already an issue in Pyrford and additional housing will make the situation worse.	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
119	Matthew	Brown	GB13	Traffic is already an issue in Pyrford and additional housing will make the situation worse.	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
119	Matthew	Brown	GB12	Alternative brownfield sites should be considered instead of this site.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter 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
						comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
119	Matthew	Brown	GB13	Alternative brownfield sites should be considered instead of this site.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
191	Jackie	Brown	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 4. Whilst Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect the purpose of the Green Belt, it also commits the Council to release Green Belt land to meet development requirements of the Core Strategy. The proposal is therefore not contrary to Policy CS6 or the NPPF.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
191	Jackie	Brown	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.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The representation has been 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
191	Jackie	Brown	GB10	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. 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 or the impact on the character of the village.	Reconsider your plans or at least the scale of the 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 carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape 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. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
191	Jackie	Brown	GB11	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. Housing 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 to impact on its character.	Reconsider your plans or at least the scale of the 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 carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the lancape 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
191	Jackie	Brown	GB8	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14, 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.	Reconsider your plans or at least the scale of the 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 proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape 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	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
						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.	
191	Jackie	Brown	GB9	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14, 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.	Reconsider your plans or at least the scale of the 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 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
191	Jackie	Brown	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.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	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
191	Jackie	Brown	GB11	Little consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More people means more cars and strain on transport infrastructure. There will be gridlock. Prey Heath Road will become more dangerous (there are no pavements).	Reconsider your plans or at least the scale of the plans.	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	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. 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.	
191	Jackie	Brown	GB10	Little consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More people means more cars and strain on transport infrastructure. There will be gridlock. Prey Heath Road will become more dangerous (there are no pavements).	Reconsider your plans or at least the scale of the plans.	<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
191	Jackie	Brown	GB8	Little consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More people means more cars and strain on transport infrastructure. There will be gridlock. Prey Heath Road will become more dangerous (there are no pavements).	Reconsider your plans or at least the scale of the plans.	<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. 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</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
						Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area	
191	Jackie	Brown	GB9	Little consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More people means more cars and strain on transport infrastructure. There will be gridlock. Prey Heath Road will become more dangerous (there are no pavements).	Reconsider your plans or at least the scale of the plans.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
191	Jackie	Brown	GB10	There will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected heathlands (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) due to the proximity of the development. Please reconsider the plans or at least their scale, they will have devastating effects on the village and quality of life. I support the views of Mayford Village Society.	Reconsider your plans or at least the scale of the plans.	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
191	Jackie	Brown	GB11	There will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. Please reconsider the plans or scale these down. Development will have a devastating impact on Mayford village and quality of life. Please also see the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Reconsider your plans or at least the scale of the plans.	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.	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
						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.	
191	Jackie	Brown	GB8	There will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. Please reconsider the plans or scale these down. Development will have a devastating impact on Mayford village and quality of life. Please also see the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Reconsider your plans or at least the scale of the plans.	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
191	Jackie	Brown	GB9	There will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. Please reconsider the plans or scale these down. Development will have a devastating impact on Mayford village and quality of life. Please also see the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Reconsider your plans or at least the scale of the plans.	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
191	Jackie	Brown	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is not currently deliverable as the	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.	Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
400	Derek	Brown	GB10	Proposals are contrary to the Core Strategy which requires proposals to have positive benefit to the lancape and townscape character.	None stated.	There is no contradiction. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 paragraph 7.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
400	Derek	Brown	GB11	Proposals are contrary to the Core Strategy which requires proposals to have positive benefit to the lancape and townscape character.	None stated.	There is no contradiction. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 paragraph 7.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
400	Derek	Brown	GB14	Proposals are contrary to the Core Strategy which requires proposals to have positive benefit to the lancape and townscape character.	None stated.	There is no contradiction. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 paragraph 7.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
400	Derek	Brown	GB10	The local infrastructure (inc transport and local amenities) will not cope with the projected growth	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
400	Derek	Brown	GB11	The local infrastructure (inc transport and local amenities) will not cope with the projected growth	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, 20.0 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 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</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
						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.	
400	Derek	Brown	GB14	The local infrastructure (inc transport and local amenities) will not cope with the projected growth	None stated.	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, 20.0 and 24.0. The various transport 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
400	Derek	Brown	GB10	The proposed density is greater than the average density in Hook Heath	None stated.	The key requirements for the proposal 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
400	Derek	Brown	GB11	The proposed density is greater than the average density in Hook Heath	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
400	Derek	Brown	GB14	The proposed density is greater than the average density in Hook Heath	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
400	Derek	Brown	GB10	Exceptional circumstances has not been demonstrated for 1200 homes.	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 2.0	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
400	Derek	Brown	GB11	Exceptional circumstances has not been demonstrated for 1200 homes.	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 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
400	Derek	Brown	GB14	Exceptional circumstances has not been demonstrated for 1200 homes.	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 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
400	Derek	Brown	GB10	Object to GB10, GB11 and GB14. The release of the GB here will remove the separation between Mayford, Hook Heath and Woking	None stated.	The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
400	Derek	Brown	GB11	Object to GB10, GB11 and GB14. The release of the GB here will remove the separation between Mayford, Hook Heath and Woking	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
400	Derek	Brown	GB14	Object to GB10, GB11 and GB14. The release of the GB here will remove the separation between Mayford, Hook Heath and Woking	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
405	Jonathan	Brown	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI. The site is used by residents for leisure purposes. An increase of traveller pitches on the site will increase the risk to 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 Lancape 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 lancape grounds. The Lancape 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 lancape 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
405	Jonathan	Brown	GB7	Object to Traveller Pitches on GB7. Traveller pitches are concentrated in this part of the Borough and therefore Mayford provides a major contribution to the Traveller community. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
405	Jonathan	Brown	GB8	Wildlife on Smarts Heath, Prey Heath and the developed areas will be at risk or wiped out by the plans	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</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>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>	
405	Jonathan	Brown	GB9	Wildlife on Smarts Heath, Prey Heath and the developed areas will be at risk or wiped out by the plans	None stated.	<p>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 recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife. 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
405	Jonathan	Brown	GB10	Wildlife on Smarts Heath, Prey Heath and the developed areas will be at risk or wiped out by the plans	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</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
						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.	
405	Jonathan	Brown	GB11	Wildlife on Smarts Heath, Prey Heath and the developed areas will be at risk or wiped out by the plans	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0In 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.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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
405	Jonathan	Brown	GB14	Wildlife on Smarts Heath, Prey Heath and the developed areas will be at risk or wiped out by the plans	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</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
						approval of the development.	
405	Jonathan	Brown	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
405	Jonathan	Brown	GB8	Reconsider plans. Mayford is unique and 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. Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0 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
405	Jonathan	Brown	GB9	Reconsider plans. Mayford is unique and 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> <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> <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
405	Jonathan	Brown	GB10	Reconsider plans. Mayford is unique and 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> <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> <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
405	Jonathan	Brown	GB11	Reconsider plans. Mayford is unique and	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				mentioned in the Domesday Book.		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. Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	is proposed as a result of this representation
405	Jonathan	Brown	GB14	Reconsider plans. Mayford is unique and 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> <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> <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
405	Jonathan	Brown	GB8	<p>Strongly object to proposals GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14.</p> <p>There appears to be no consideration for the impact on Mayford infrastructure. Proposals will put a strain on the transport infrastructure which are already congested at peak times. There appears to be no plans to upgrade roads, bridges, rail provision to address any of the existing problems and to support further growth. Also concerned about road safety issues, particularly on Prey Heath Road to Worplesdon Station.</p> <p>The roads are already getting busier than elsewhere, there is a disproportionate amount of development on the west side of Woking which has poor infrastructure. This is not helped by the river which makes the navigating to central Woking a problem</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6 and Section 24.0</p> <p>In addition, the proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. 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 'key requirements', including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
405	Jonathan	Brown	GB9	Strongly object to proposals GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. There appears to be no	None stated.	This representation 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				consideration for the impact on Mayford infrastructure. Proposals will put a strain on the transport infrastructure which are already congested at peak times. There appears to be no plans to upgrade roads, bridges, rail provision to address any of the existing problems and to support further growth. Also concerned about road safety issues, particularly on Prey Heath Road to Worplesdon Station. The roads are already getting busier than elsewhere, there is a disproportionate amount of development on the west side of Woking which has poor infrastructure. This is not helped by the river which makes the navigating to central Woking a problem		and Section 24.0In addition, the proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. 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 'key requirements', including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.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.	of this representation
405	Jonathan	Brown	GB10	Strongly object to proposals GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. There appears to be no consideration for the impact on Mayford infrastructure. Proposals will put a strain on the transport infrastructure which are already congested at peak times. There appears to be no plans to upgrade roads, bridges, rail provision to address any of the existing problems and to support further growth. Also concerned about road safety issues, particularly on Prey Heath Road to Worplesdon Station. The roads are already getting busier than elsewhere, there is a disproportionate amount of development on the west side of Woking which has poor infrastructure. This is not helped by the river which makes the navigating to central Woking a problem	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6 and Section 24.0 In addition, the proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. 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 'key requirements', including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
405	Jonathan	Brown	GB11	Strongly object to proposals GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. There appears to be no consideration for the impact on Mayford infrastructure. Proposals will put a strain on the transport infrastructure which are already congested at peak times. There appears to be no plans to upgrade roads, bridges, rail provision to address any of the existing problems and to support further growth. Also concerned about road safety issues, particularly on Prey Heath Road to Worplesdon Station. The roads are already getting busier than elsewhere, there is a disproportionate amount of development on the west side of Woking which has poor infrastructure. This is not helped by the river which makes the navigating to central Woking a problem	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6 and Section 24.0 In addition, the proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. 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 'key requirements', including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this	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
						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.	
405	Jonathan	Brown	GB14	Strongly object to proposals GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. There appears to be no consideration for the impact on Mayford infrastructure. Proposals will put a strain on the transport infrastructure which are already congested at peak times. There appears to be no plans to upgrade roads, bridges, rail provision to address any of the existing problems and to support further growth. Also concerned about road safety issues, particularly on Prey Heath Road to Worplesdon Station. The roads are already getting busier than elsewhere, there is a disproportionate amount of development on the west side of Woking which has poor infrastructure. This is not helped by the river which makes the navigating to central Woking a problem	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6 and Section 24.0. In addition, the proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. 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 'key requirements', including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
709	D	Brown	GB12	It will not safeguard the countryside from encroachment.	None stated.	Whilst the Green Belt boundary review notes the importance of the site to prevent encroachment into the countryside, the Council 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
709	D	Brown	GB13	It will not safeguard the countryside from encroachment.	None stated.	Whilst the Green Belt boundary review notes the importance of the site to prevent encroachment into the countryside, the Council 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
709	D	Brown	GB12	The above concerns do not take into account the other planned development in West Byfleet.	None stated.	The Council and infrastructure providers including the County Highways Authority, have considered the cumulative impact of the proposed Site Allocations DPD. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the infrastructure providers throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic infrastructure issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
709	D	Brown	GB13	The above concerns do not take into account the other planned development in West Byfleet.	None stated.	The Council and infrastructure providers including the County Highways Authority, have considered the cumulative impact of the proposed Site Allocations DPD. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the infrastructure providers throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic infrastructure issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
709	D	Brown	GB13	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	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 transport 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	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 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. 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.	
709	D	Brown	GB12	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	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 transport 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. 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.	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
709	D	Brown	GB12	Expansion of education and health facilities would create further development.	None stated.	<p>The housing need in the Borough is clearly stated in the Core Strategy and the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. Infrastructure provision is not likely to generate more development as provision is usually aligned to proposed development. This matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>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 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
709	D	Brown	GB13	Expansion of education and health facilities would create further development.	None stated.	<p>The housing need in the Borough is clearly stated in the Core Strategy and the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. Infrastructure provision is not likely to generate more development as provision is usually aligned to proposed development. This matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>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 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
709	D	Brown	GB12	The proposals will change the local environment and will contradict the purposes of Green Belt, including preventing urban sprawl and prevent towns merging together, in this case Woking and Pyrford.	None stated.	The representation regarding the impact of the proposed allocation on the local environment and lancape has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.The representation regarding urban sprawl has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0.The Green Belt boundary review notes that the site provides little or no contribution to the purpose of Green Belt to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. This is because there is no significant outlying settlement. Development of this site would be contained by Pyrford Common Road and as such would create a defensible Green Belt boundary.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
709	D	Brown	GB13	The proposals will change the local environment and will contradict the purposes of Green Belt, including preventing urban sprawl and prevent towns merging together, in this case Woking and Pyrford.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed allocation on the local environment and lancape has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding urban sprawl has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review notes that the site provides little or no contribution to the purpose of Green Belt to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. This is because there is no significant outlying settlement. Development of this site would be contained by Church Hill and as such would create a defensible Green Belt boundary.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1053	Rebekah	Brown	GB4	The road network is at capacity and therefore the building of the development will cause severe traffic problems.	None stated.	It is noted that there will be some disruption during the construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1053	Rebekah	Brown	GB5	The road network is at capacity and therefore the building of the development will cause severe traffic problems.	None stated.	It is noted that there will be some disruption during the construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1053	Rebekah	Brown	GB15	The road network is at capacity and therefore the	None stated.	It is noted that there will be some disruption during the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				building of the development will cause severe traffic problems.		construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution.	is proposed as a result of this representation
1053	Rebekah	Brown	GB16	The road network is at capacity and therefore the building of the development will cause severe traffic problems.	None stated.	It is noted that there will be some disruption during the construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1053	Rebekah	Brown	GB4	Object to release of Green Belt land. The development will be built on the area's main flood plain. This will flood previously safe properties and reduce their value. Plans for managing the flood risk of new run-off patterns are required. Sinking tanks in Redcar were not effective.	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. In addition, the Council can confirm that none of the proposed development sites are located within a functional floodplain, whilst proposed site GB4 is located within Flood Zone 1, where development is encouraged to take place due to the low flood risk.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1053	Rebekah	Brown	GB5	Object to release of Green Belt land. The development will be built on the area's main flood plain. This will flood previously safe properties and reduce their value. Plans for managing the flood risk of new run-off patterns are required. Sinking tanks in Redcar were not effective.	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
1053	Rebekah	Brown	GB15	Object to release of Green Belt land. The development will be built on the area's main flood plain. This will flood previously safe properties and reduce their value. Plans for managing the flood risk of new run-off patterns are required. Sinking tanks in Redcar were not effective.	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
1053	Rebekah	Brown	GB16	Object to release of Green Belt land. The development will be built on the area's main flood plain. This will flood previously safe properties and reduce their value. Plans for managing the flood risk of new run-off patterns are required. Sinking tanks in Redcar were not effective.	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
1053	Rebekah	Brown	GB4	The local infrastructure is already at capacity, questions where the new residents will access services.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly 3.8. 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
1053	Rebekah	Brown	GB5	The local infrastructure is already at capacity, questions where the new residents will access services.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly 3.8. 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
1053	Rebekah	Brown	GB15	The local infrastructure is already at capacity, questions where the new residents will access services.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly 3.8.	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 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.	
1053	Rebekah	Brown	GB16	The local infrastructure is already at capacity, questions where the new residents will access services.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly 3.8.</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
1364	Ann	Brown	GB12	The road infrastructure will be seriously impacted and have road safety implications	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 23.0The 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 24.0The 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. 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</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
						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.	
1364	Ann	Brown	GB13	The road infrastructure will be seriously impacted and have road safety implications	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 23.0. 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 transport 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. 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
1364	Ann	Brown	GB12	Oppose development at Upshot Lane, the proposals are disproportionate for the village and its character. The GB is a precious commodity and will be eroded as a result.	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 are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The Core Strategy, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD and the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites is of high standard and sympathetic to the general character 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.	
1364	Ann	Brown	GB13	Oppose development at Upshot Lane, the proposals are disproportionate for the village and its character. The GB is a precious commodity and will be eroded as a result.	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 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 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. The Core Strategy, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD and the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites is of high standard and sympathetic to the general character 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
1364	Ann	Brown	GB12	The local infrastructure including school and transport links are already inadequate of the existing population	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. See also Section 20.0 and 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1364	Ann	Brown	GB13	The local infrastructure including school and transport links are already inadequate of the existing population	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. See also Section 20.0 and 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1446	Alan	Brown	GB12	Opposes the proposed housing development. Asks the Council not to grant planning approval.	None stated.	Objection noted. 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
1446	Alan	Brown	GB13	Opposes the proposed housing development. Asks the Council not to grant planning approval.	None stated.	Objection noted. 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,	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
						Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	
526	Sheilia and David	Buckley	GB12	Concerned about the impact on already dangerously overstretched infrastructure and services e.g. schools, doctors, sewage flooding and narrow roads, which will become gridlocked with traffic. Also points to resulting pollution.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
526	Sheilia and David	Buckley	GB13	Concerned about the impact on already dangerously overstretched infrastructure and services e.g. schools, doctors, sewage flooding and narrow roads, which will become gridlocked with traffic. Also points to resulting pollution.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
526	Sheilia and David	Buckley	GB12	Concerned about the effect of the proposals on road safety, on Pyrford Road at junctions of Hollybank Road with Dodds Lane. Raises concern about traffic, particularly if there's a problem on the M25.	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
526	Sheilia and David	Buckley	GB13	Concerned about the effect of the proposals on road safety, on Pyrford Road at junctions of Hollybank Road with Dodds Lane. Raises concern about traffic, particularly if there's a problem on the M25.	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
526	Sheilia and David	Buckley	GB12	Objects to the proposals as the Green Belt forms as essential part of our community and an important reason why people live here. The proposals will ruin the environment and ambiance of the village.	None stated.	The lancape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing 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 Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) 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 and design standards in accordance with the environmental and 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. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. The issues raised are further addressed in Sections 7.0 and 21.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
526	Sheilia and David	Buckley	GB13	Objects to the proposals as the Green Belt forms as essential part of our community and an important reason why people live here. The proposals will ruin the environment and ambiance of the village.	None stated.	The lancape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing 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 Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) 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 and design standards in accordance with the environmental and 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. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. The issues raised are further addressed in Sections 7.0 and 21.0 of	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's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
229	Teresa	Bullen	GB8	The running track only proposed as the Council wants to resite Sheerwater Track to use brownfield land in Sheerwater for housing. This is not a reason for removing Green Belt land in Mayford. The school does not need the track. This is not an appropriate use in a village, we object strongly, what hidden agenda is behind this application.	None stated.	The school and leisure centre now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
229	Teresa	Bullen	GB8	We are aware there can be very special circumstances to site a school on Green Belt but this is not the right place. No consideration of alternative sites. The A320 is already very heavily congested, fears of gridlocking. Surrey County council already plan expansion of local secondary school to deal with short fall of places; this would negate the immediate need for a school in south Woking. The Council should be more imaginative. Perhaps rethink the old Highlands secondary school site currently used for Adult Education and Westfield School (large field area could be redeveloped).	None stated.	The school now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
229	Teresa	Bullen	GB10	Object to GB10, GB11 and GB14 as proposed for housing despite the Council's pledges that the village should have only infill development. This area will become another Goldsworth Park or Brookwood Hospital site. Green Space cannot be restored.	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. Mayford will continue to be protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
229	Teresa	Bullen	GB11	Object to GB10, GB11 and GB14 as proposed for housing despite the Council's pledges that the village should have only infill development. This area will become another Goldsworth Park or Brookwood Hospital site. Green Space cannot be restored.	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. Mayford will continue to be protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
229	Teresa	Bullen	GB14	Object to GB10, GB11 and GB14 as proposed for housing despite the Council's pledges that the village should have only infill development. This area will become another Goldsworth Park or Brookwood Hospital site. Green Space cannot be restored.	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. Mayford will continue to be protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
229	Teresa	Bullen	GB9	Very disconcerting that the old nursery buildings of a busy and popular garden centre have been put into this release for more homes and another supermarket/shopping parade. This Garden Centre provides pleasure to many residents, employment and a facility for small businesses. I strongly object to its release. Woking is overladen with supermarkets, it does not need more than existing local Post Office/shop.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
229	Teresa	Bullen	GB10	This area has a vast flood plain - further building will exacerbate the problem.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed comprehensively in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a Flood Risk	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
						Assessment and a Sequential Test to inform the DPD.	
229	Teresa	Bullen	GB11	This area has a vast flood plain - further building will exacerbate the problem.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed comprehensively in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a Flood Risk Assessment and a Sequential Test to inform the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
229	Teresa	Bullen	GB14	This area has a vast flood plain - further building will exacerbate the problem.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed comprehensively in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a Flood Risk Assessment and a Sequential Test to inform the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
229	Teresa	Bullen	GB8	Blocking three very distinct applications under one umbrella is very devious. If a precedent is set, Woking Borough Council will use it as a 'legitimate' justification to proceed with filling remaining space with houses. Strain on road networks. Completely against Green Belt policy. The buildings will dwarf existing neighbouring properties, contrary to local and national Green Belt character policies. Adverse impact to well-being of local residents. I strongly object.	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 traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
229	Teresa	Bullen	GB8	GB8 targeted to facilitate purported need for a secondary school in south Woking. However this live planning application, being considered under special circumstances, is conveniently attached to two very significant and major additions which are not 'special' circumstances. The leisure facility is not a school facility. The Council wrongly claims there is a need for a leisure centre; there are existing, often unused, facilities nearby. This is a business enterprise being covertly pushed through.	None stated.	The school and the leisure centre has already got planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
229	Teresa	Bullen	GB7	All Woking's Traveller sites are currently concentrated in one part of the Borough. Mayford's contribution is already greater than the rest of the Borough. There is no reason for further expansion in Mayford. Proposals contradict the council's own guidelines that any prospective site should have, regarding space for business activities, infrastructure and on-site utilities, access to schools and other facilities. Several applications already refused on Green Belt openness grounds. The use would compromise the lifestyle and enjoyment of local residents as it is used for leisure. This will be ruined.	None stated.	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
229	Teresa	Bullen	GB10	The road and transport is poor and overloaded with congestion, bottlenecks, single track roads and a tunnel. The A320, the only north/south arterial road, becomes gridlocked. The area is unsuitable for further development.	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	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 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.	
229	Teresa	Bullen	GB11	The road and transport is poor and overloaded with congestion, bottlenecks, single track roads and a tunnel. The A320, the only north/south arterial road, becomes gridlocked. The area is unsuitable for further development.	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
229	Teresa	Bullen	GB14	The road and transport is poor and overloaded with congestion, bottlenecks, single track roads and a tunnel. The A320, the only north/south arterial road, becomes gridlocked. The area is unsuitable for further development.	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
229	Teresa	Bullen	GB11	Woking Borough Council is determined to develop and in the process destroy the area. It has already purchased a plot at Havering Farm for SANGs, pre-empting a decision and any public response. Suggest you reconsider ways to meet borough housing commitments and strongly object to any loss of Green Belt in Mayford as it will ruin the whole community and surrounding area.	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. The provision of SANG land is vital to ensure 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
						protection of the SPA. The acquisition of any land by the Council for the purposes of a SANG would be to ensure the sustainable delivery of housing need in accordance with the European Directive and national planning policy.	
229	Teresa	Bullen	GB10	Woking Borough Council is determined to develop and in the process destroy the area. It has already purchased a plot at Havering Farm for SANGs, pre-empting a decision and any public response. Suggest you reconsider ways to meet borough housing commitments and strongly object to any loss of Green Belt in Mayford as it will ruin the whole community and surrounding area.	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 Section 1 and 2. The Council is satisfied that the site can be development without significant impacts on the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
229	Teresa	Bullen	GB14	Woking Borough Council is determined to develop and in the process destroy the area. It has already purchased a plot at Havering Farm for SANGs, pre-empting a decision and any public response. Suggest you reconsider ways to meet borough housing commitments and strongly object to any loss of Green Belt in Mayford as it will ruin the whole community and surrounding area.	None stated.	The provision of SANGs is necessary to protect the integrity of SPAs in the area due to housing development. Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy requires development to contribute towards the provision of SANGs to mitigate against the impacts of development on the designated SPS. Any purchase of land for this purpose should therefore be welcome.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
229	Teresa	Bullen	General	The proposals will have a significant impact on Mayford Village, the environment surrounding home and our lifestyle. Government requires that Green Belt should be protected at all costs. Development would be contrary to the Core Strategy, which allows only infill development, what has changed?	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
1580	D D	Bunce	GB12	Farmland is essential for survival.	None stated.	As part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA. Whilst it is agreed that agricultural land is important for sustainable food production, it should be noted that this particular site is of low soil quality.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1580	D D	Bunce	GB13	Farmland is essential for survival.	None stated.	As part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA. Whilst it is agreed that agricultural land is important for sustainable food production, it should be noted that this particular site is of low soil quality.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1580	D D	Bunce	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Aware of the impact of the proposes for the wider area and the impact they will have on the community. Green Belt development should be resisted.	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
1580	D D	Bunce	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Aware of the impact of the proposes for the wider area and the impact they will have on the community. Green Belt development should be resisted.	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
1580	D D	Bunce	GB12	Green Belt was designed by people with a long term plan and it should be retained.	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
1580	D D	Bunce	GB13	Green Belt was designed by people with a long term plan and it should be retained.	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
1217	Frances	Bunting	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI used by residents of Mayford for leisure purposes. Increased use of the site would	PLEASE RECONSIDER your plans	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	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
				decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife due to increased number of domestic animals in close proximity. Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.		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 Lancape 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 lancape grounds. The Lancape 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 lancape 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.	
1217	Frances	Bunting	GB7	I strongly object. 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 DPD has not led to an increase in the number of Traveller sites in the Borough. It will however be intensifying the use of existing sites, and the Council accepts that this will lead to an increase in the number of pitches and consequently Travellers population in this part of the Borough. The existing sites have so far been well managed and there is every indication that they will continue to be well managed when additional pitches are delivered. Based on the sequential approach, the Council believes that the proposed site allocations relatively offer the most sustainable locations to meet Travellers accommodation needs when compared against other alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1217	Frances	Bunting	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. Please reconsider, plans will have dire effects on this historic village. I support the views of Mayford Village Society.	PLEASE RECONSIDER your plans	<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. 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
1217	Frances	Bunting	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there	PLEASE RECONSIDER your	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford, a historic, unique village. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	plans	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. 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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
1217	Frances	Bunting	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. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford, a historic, unique village. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	PLEASE RECONSIDER your plans	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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1217	Frances	Bunting	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. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford, a historic, unique village. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	PLEASE RECONSIDER your plans	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. 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	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 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.	
1217	Frances	Bunting	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. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford, a historic, unique village. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	PLEASE RECONSIDER your plans	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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1217	Frances	Bunting	GB10	I strongly object to the proposed housing on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking, with increased risk of merging Woking and Guildford. No thought given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement.	PLEASE RECONSIDER your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals are informed by an assessment of the landscape to accommodate change. It is not envisaged that the landscape character of the area will be significantly undermined. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals will also not undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This issue is addressed specifically in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1217	Frances	Bunting	GB11	I strongly object to the proposed housing on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking, with increased risk of merging Woking and Guildford. No thought given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement.	PLEASE RECONSIDER your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals are informed by an assessment of the landscape to accommodate change. It is not envisaged that the landscape character of the area will be significantly undermined. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals will also not undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This issue is addressed specifically in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1217	Frances	Bunting	GB14	I strongly object to the proposed housing on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking, with increased risk of merging Woking and Guildford. No thought given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement.	PLEASE RECONSIDER your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals are informed by an assessment of the landscape to accommodate change. It is not envisaged that the landscape character of the area will be significantly undermined. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues	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 Matters Topic Paper. The proposals will also not undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This issue is addressed specifically in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
1217	Frances	Bunting	GB8	I strongly object to the proposed housing on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking, with increased risk of merging Woking and Guildford. No thought given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement.	PLEASE RECONSIDER your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals are informed by an assessment of the landscape to accommodate change. It is not envisaged that the landscape character of the area will be significantly undermined. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals will also not undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This issue is addressed specifically in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1217	Frances	Bunting	GB9	I strongly object to the proposed housing on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking, with increased risk of merging Woking and Guildford. No thought given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement.	PLEASE RECONSIDER your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals are informed by an assessment of the landscape to accommodate change. It is not envisaged that the landscape character of the area will be significantly undermined. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals will also not undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This issue is addressed specifically in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1217	Frances	Bunting	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. Westfield Road is a B road but carries an A road amount of traffic. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. There are few shops, more health services needed, additional water, sewage facilities etc.	PLEASE RECONSIDER your plans	<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
1217	Frances	Bunting	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. What will Westfield Road (a B road) become with more vehicles?	PLEASE RECONSIDER your plans	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	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 no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses cannot be built with no supporting infrastructure. There are few shops, more health services would be needed, additional water, sewage facilities etc.		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.	
1217	Frances	Bunting	GB14	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. What will Westfield Road (a B road) become with more vehicles? There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses cannot be built with no supporting infrastructure. There are few shops, more health services would be needed, additional water, sewage facilities etc.	PLEASE RECONSIDER your plans	<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
1217	Frances	Bunting	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. What will Westfield Road (a B road) become with more vehicles?	PLEASE RECONSIDER your plans	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	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 no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses cannot be built with no supporting infrastructure. There are few shops, more health services would be needed, additional water, sewage facilities etc.		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.	
1217	Frances	Bunting	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. What will Westfield Road (a B road) become with more vehicles? There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses cannot be built with no supporting infrastructure. There are few shops, more health services would be needed, additional water, sewage facilities etc.	PLEASE RECONSIDER your plans	<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
1005	David	Burke	GB15	There is no infrastructure to support the development. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	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, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0The various transports studies	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>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. 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>	
1005	David	Burke	General	The habitat in the area will suffer.	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 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
1005	David	Burke	GB15	Most new houses will have two cars which will	None stated.	The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				increase pollution to unacceptable levels.		bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context. In addition, the Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policy wording to prevent development proposals that will have a significant negative impact on air quality without identifying and implementing suitable mitigation measures.	is proposed as a result of this representation
1005	David	Burke	GB15	The Wey Navigation habitat is a sanctuary for wildlife and humans as there is no other Green Belt land within walking distance.	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 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
1029	Susan	Burke	General	Cynical of the whys and wherefores in the appraisal	None stated.	Noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1029	Susan	Burke	GB15	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation and pollution levels worse. This will impact the quality of life. The Wey navigation is a sensitive area and must be protected.	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 transport 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. 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	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>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. The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context. In addition, the Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policy wording to prevent development proposals that will have a significant negative impact on air quality without identifying and implementing suitable mitigation measures. The Council agrees that the Wey Navigation and Basingstoke Canal are important landscape corridors in the Borough. The Council also recognises that they are well used for recreational activities. The key requirements for the site note that additional green infrastructure could also be provided on land to the east which is within the same land ownership as GB15. This would act as a buffer to the Wey Navigation corridor with its distinctive character and wildlife corridor function. The proposed allocation also states that 4.7ha of public open space will be required to be provided as part of any development scheme. In selecting sites for development there is a 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 West Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The environment impacts of the proposed allocations are also set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p>	
1029	Susan	Burke	General	Questions who has undertaken the assessment and with whom.	None stated.	The Sustainability Appraisal was undertaken by the Council and follows a consistent approach in assessing each site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
171	Frances	Burrows	GB12	I oppose building houses on Green Belt land GB12 / GB13. I support all correspondence of objection received by Woking Borough Council WBC pertaining to this, including representations by Pyrford Residents Association.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
171	Frances	Burrows	GB13	I oppose building houses on Green Belt land GB12 / GB13. I support all correspondence of objection received by Woking Borough Council WBC pertaining to this, including representations by Pyrford Residents Association.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
65	Joan	Burton	GB15	The Green Belt around West Hall should be preserved. If we take this away, we are effectively	Land around West Hall should remain Green Belt.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters	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
				joining West Byfleet to Byfleet in an urban sprawl.		Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The development of the site will not significantly undermine the character of the area.	of this representation
65	Joan	Burton	GB15	It will increase traffic along Parvis Road. It is already impossible to turn right out of Dartnell Park, those junctions are an accident waiting to happen.	Land around West Hall should remain Green Belt.	The general approach to assessing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 respectively in 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. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is working with neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to make sure that the cross boundary traffic implications of their development are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
65	Joan	Burton	GB15	The mix of housing is not in keeping with the area. Planning on Dartnell Park is tightly regulated and this area is opposite Dartnell Park.	Land around West Hall should remain Green Belt.	Policies CS12 and CS11 of the Core Strategy sets out the policy context for the mix of houses needed in the area. However, the housing mix policies will be applied taken into account individual merits of the proposal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
65	Joan	Burton	GB15	If we allow building on there, where next? It would set an unpleasant precedent for building on Green Belt in West Byfleet and I can see the recreation ground and surrounding land being next.	Land around West Hall should remain Green Belt.	The Council believes that the proposals will ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
65	Joan	Burton	GB23	The land behind the schools is also being excluded from Green Belt, so planning permission for that could be next and we will be left with no Green Belt in West Byfleet at all.	Land around West Hall should remain Green Belt.	It is proposed to designate the site as public open space to serve the school. This provide adequate protection for its future development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
65	Joan	Burton	GB16	This is a site long overdue for redevelopment. Fully support the mixed use to create jobs and homes, but the increased traffic along Parvis Road must be addressed to facilitate right hand turns from Broadoaks and Dartnell Park by means of roundabouts or traffic lights.	Address the increased traffic along Parvis Road, to facilitate right hand turns from Broadoaks and Dartnell Park by means of roundabouts or traffic lights.	The support for the development of the site is noted. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. To inform the allocations, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the general character of the area will not be significantly undermined. 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	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
						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. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is also working its neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to make sure that the impacts of development in their area such as Wisley Airfield that has cross boundary implications are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation put in place to address any adverse impacts.	
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	Please reconsider your plans	The proposed school and leisure centre now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	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. 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
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	Please reconsider your plans	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
244	Alan J	Burton	GB7	I strongly object. 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. 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
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	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 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.	Please reconsider your plans	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	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 meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (Policy CS24).	Please reconsider your plans	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 lancape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancape 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
244	Alan J	Burton	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance"" and therefore should not be	Please reconsider your plans	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	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
				considered for development.		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.	
244	Alan J	Burton	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development.	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development.	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	GB11	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should	Please reconsider your plans	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.		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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	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 Acre Site as a Traveller site).	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	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).	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	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).	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	GB10	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).	Please reconsider your plans	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. The approach taken to meet the needs of Travellers is addressed in Section 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	GB11		Please reconsider your plans	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.		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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
244	Alan J	Burton	GB8	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	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. 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
244	Alan J	Burton	GB9	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	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. 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
244	Alan J	Burton	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected heathlands (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) due to the proximity of the development.	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	Please reconsider your plans	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	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
						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.	
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	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	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 carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape 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	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
				will have a disproportionate, totally unjustifiable impact on residents, who chose to live in a semi-rural not urban environment.		has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The flooding implications of the proposals is addressed in Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic implications is	
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	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 carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the lancape 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
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	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 proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape 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
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	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 proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	Please reconsider your plans	The school now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
244	Alan J	Burton	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 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.	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	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	Please reconsider your plans	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
				land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.			
244	Alan J	Burton	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. 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.	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	GB9	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.	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	GB10	Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area	Please reconsider your plans	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from 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
				of lancape importance has been ignored. The GBBR states a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on either side of the school later.		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	of this representation
244	Alan J	Burton	GB9	Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fiel either side later on.	Please reconsider your plans	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 lancape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. 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
244	Alan J	Burton	GB8	Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fiel either side later on.	Please reconsider your plans	The lancape implications of the proposals are fully considered. The Council has carried out a lancape character assessment. This matter is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
244	Alan J	Burton	GB11	Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fiel either side later on.	Please reconsider your plans	The lancape implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. 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. The Council is satisfied that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
244	Alan J	Burton	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>	Please reconsider your plans	<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</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 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.	
244	Alan J	Burton	GB11	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. 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.	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	GB8	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. 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.	Please reconsider your plans	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,	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
						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.	
244	Alan J	Burton	GB9	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. 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.	Please reconsider your plans	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
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	Please reconsider your plans	<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</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
						Core Strategy.	
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	Please reconsider your plans	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	Please reconsider your plans	<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</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
						Core Strategy.	
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	Please reconsider your plans	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
244	Alan J	Burton	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.	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
244	Alan J	Burton	GB7	Smarts Heath Road is not currently close to schools. It does not have easy access to local facilities required for a Traveller site.	Please reconsider your plans	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
797	Maureen	Burton	UA1	Will the proposed redevelopment of the site come off the number of dwellings proposed for Byfleet?	None stated.	The proposed allocation of Byfleet Library (Site UA1) is expected to come forward for development during the Plan period (2010-2027) and make a valuable contribution towards the overall housing requirement of 4,964 dwellings. The proposed safeguarding of sites GB4 and GB5 means they are not expected to come forward in this plan period and therefore will contribute	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
						towards future development needs (2027-2040). Therefore by 2040, it is expected that sites UA1, GB4 and GB5 will all have come forward for development.	
797	Maureen	Burton	GB4	Byfleet has no medical facilities at present and there are long waiting times for doctor appointments. Other infrastructure like schools are also at capacity. Further development will make the situation worse.	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. 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
797	Maureen	Burton	GB5	Byfleet has no medical facilities at present and there are long waiting times for doctor appointments. Other infrastructure like schools are also at capacity. Further development will make the situation worse.	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. 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
797	Maureen	Burton	GB4	The proposed area has previously flooded and has a high water table. Storage tanks under developments may be able to store water but development will increase flood risk to others.	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
797	Maureen	Burton	GB5	The proposed area has previously flooded and has a high water table. Storage tanks under developments may be able to store water but development will increase flood risk to others.	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
797	Maureen	Burton	GB4	Traffic and congestion are an issue, particularly along the A245. The road infrastructure will not support any further increase in traffic. Existing new developments in the area have increased traffic and made bus routes difficult.	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 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. 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	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
						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.	
797	Maureen	Burton	GB5	Traffic and congestion are an issue, particularly along the A245. The road infrastructure will not support any further increase in traffic. Existing new developments in the area have increased traffic and made bus routes difficult.	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 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
797	Maureen	Burton	UA1	The Byfleet petition should be taken into account when development in the area is being considered.	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
797	Maureen	Burton	GB4	The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored.	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	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
						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 Represor ID 1524.	
797	Maureen	Burton	GB5	The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored.	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 Represor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
797	Maureen	Burton	GB4	The housing quota for Woking should be spread across the county and allocated to brownfield sites rather than Green Belt. With the M25 in close proximity, residents need what little 'clean air' the Green Belt offers.	None stated.	The housing need in the borough and the Council's requirement to meet this need is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraphs 1.1 to 1.7. To clarify, the Council is committed to facilitating the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy, including the provision of 4,964 dwellings over the Plan period. The Council accepts that the allocation of the proposed site will reduce the amount of Green Belt land in Byfleet and the benefits it brings to the community. 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 (SA) Report provides the evidence to support this view. The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context. The key requirements for the site also note that open space and green infrastructure should be designed into any future development scheme. 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). 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
797	Maureen	Burton	GB5	The housing quota for Woking should be spread across the county and allocated to brownfield sites rather than Green Belt. With the M25 in close proximity, residents need what little 'clean air' the Green Belt offers.	None stated.	The housing need in the borough and the Council's requirement to meet this need is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraphs 1.1 to 1.7. To clarify, the Council is committed to facilitating the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy, including the provision of 4,964 dwellings over the Plan period. The Council accepts that the allocation of the proposed site will reduce the amount of Green Belt land in Byfleet and the benefits it brings to the community. 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	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>compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report provides the evidence to support this view. The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context. The key requirements for the site also note that open space and green infrastructure should be designed into any future development scheme. 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). 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>	
744	Shirley	Bushell	GB16	Traffic and congestion are an issue at present. Extra houses and a school will make the situation worse. Unless new road infrastructure is proposed then I object to the proposal. How will the area cope if you intend to build 1400 new homes.	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. 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. 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. The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices</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 research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.	
368	Roy	Butcher	GB12	The sites are used extensively by local residents for relaxation and exercise	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
368	Roy	Butcher	GB13	The sites are used extensively by local residents for relaxation and exercise	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
368	Roy	Butcher	GB12	The GBBR did not recommend the field to the east of Upshot Lane. This recommendation should be respected.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
368	Roy	Butcher	GB13	The GBBR did not recommend the field to the east of Upshot Lane. This recommendation should be respected.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
368	Roy	Butcher	GB12	Object to proposals at Pyrford. The sites are important for their views	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In lancape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
368	Roy	Butcher	GB13	Object to proposals at Pyrford. The sites are important for their views	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In lancape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
368	Roy	Butcher	GB12	Officers should respect the purpose of the GB and its importance to the local population. It should investigate brownfield sites where the environmental impact would be less severe	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0, 16.0 and 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
368	Roy	Butcher	GB13	Officers should respect the purpose of the GB and its importance to the local population. It should investigate brownfield sites where the environmental impact would be less severe	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0, 16.0 and 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
368	Roy	Butcher	GB12	Proposals would add a significant amount of traffic to Upshot Lane, Coldharbour Road and the surrounding roads. The roads are narrow (made narrower by on street parking) and the area is a through route for the traffic towards the A3/M25/M3	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; 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 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	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, 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 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.</p>	
368	Roy	Butcher	GB13	Proposals would add a significant amount of traffic to Upshot Lane, Coldharbour Road and the surrounding roads. The roads are narrow (made narrower by on street parking) and the area is a through route for the traffic towards the A3/M25/M3	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 24.0The 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. 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</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
						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.	
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 in fact 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 in fact 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 in fact 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of Mayford are recommended to be 	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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 in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.		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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB8	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB10	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB11	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB8	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB10	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.			of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB11	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how 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>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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how 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>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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how 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>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,</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
						cycling and public transport where feasible.	
651	Catherine	Butcher	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 best how 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. 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	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 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	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 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	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 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	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 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB8	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB10	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.		Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB11	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB8	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB10	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB11	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB8	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB10	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB11	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB8	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have 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	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>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>	
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB10	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB11	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB8	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB10	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB11	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of lancape importance are ignored.		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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of lancape importance are 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of lancape importance are 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of lancape importance are 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated	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	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
				unless they have a vehicle.		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.	
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB10	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB11	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB7	The site does not have the supporting infrastructure, particularly easy access to schools and local facilities (shops, medical facilities and	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	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
				employment) to support a Traveller site, with regard to the Core Strategy and SHLAA.		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.	
651	Catherine	Butcher	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	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 Lancape 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	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
						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 lancape setting of the area.	
651	Catherine	Butcher	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	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 lancape 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	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	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
						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.	
651	Catherine	Butcher	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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.	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB8	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.		Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB10	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB11	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB8	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need -including Traveller sites' does not justify 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, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need -including Traveller sites' does not justify 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, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB10	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need -including Traveller sites' does not justify 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, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB11	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need -including Traveller sites' does not justify 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, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB8	The Green Belt Review was worryingly	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.		Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB9	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB10	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB11	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	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	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. The part of the representation objecting to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification' and suggesting 'expansion' as the correct term 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
				(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'.		use, is noted.	
651	Catherine	Butcher	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, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2, and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
651	Catherine	Butcher	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
651	Catherine	Butcher	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 Lancape 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 lancape grounds. The Lancape 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
651	Catherine	Butcher	GB7	The site is adjacent to the main railway line so	The site should be removed	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				would require significant acoustic barriers.	from the DPD for the reasons stated.	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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 in fact 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 in fact 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 in fact 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	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 this particular location.	
652	Emma	Butcher	GB11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 in fact 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development. 	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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development. 	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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development. 	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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development. 	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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB8	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB10	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB11	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how 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>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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how 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>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
652	Emma	Butcher	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 best how 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. 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	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
						travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
652	Emma	Butcher	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how 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>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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	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. 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	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. 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	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. 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	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. 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB8	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB10	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB11	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB8	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB10	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB11	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB8	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB10	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB11	· No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB8	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have 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	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>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>	
652	Emma	Butcher	GB10	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB11	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have 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. 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB8	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB10	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB11	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				boundaries without a Lancaple Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of lancaple importance are ignored.		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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancaple Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of lancaple importance are 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancaple Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of lancaple importance are 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancaple Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of lancaple importance are 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated	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	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
				unless they have a vehicle.		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.	
652	Emma	Butcher	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB10	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
652	Emma	Butcher	GB11	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land 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
652	Emma	Butcher	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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	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
652	Emma	Butcher	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
652	Emma	Butcher	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
652	Emma	Butcher	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
652	Emma	Butcher	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
652	Emma	Butcher	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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB7	The site does not have the supporting infrastructure, particularly easy access to schools and local facilities (shops, medical facilities and	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	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
				employment) to support a Traveller site, with regard to the Core Strategy and SHLAA.		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.	
652	Emma	Butcher	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
652	Emma	Butcher	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
652	Emma	Butcher	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 Lancape 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	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
						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 lancape setting of the area.	
652	Emma	Butcher	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
652	Emma	Butcher	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.	<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 lancape 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
652	Emma	Butcher	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
652	Emma	Butcher	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	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	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
				value means it is likely to be economic viable at a low density.		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.	
652	Emma	Butcher	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
652	Emma	Butcher	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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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	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 journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	
652	Emma	Butcher	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. 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	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
						review.	
652	Emma	Butcher	GB8	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB10	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB11	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively 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
652	Emma	Butcher	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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB8	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need -including Traveller sites' does not justify 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, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need -including Traveller sites' does not justify 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, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB10	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need -including Traveller sites' does not justify 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, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	GB11	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need -including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green	None 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.	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
				Belt by inappropriate development			
652	Emma	Butcher	GB8	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB9	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB10	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site 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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB11	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site 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
652	Emma	Butcher	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
652	Emma	Butcher	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
652	Emma	Butcher	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
652	Emma	Butcher	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify sites for allocation, and the Green Belt Review	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0. 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
				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'.	stated.	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.	of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	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, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2, and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	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
652	Emma	Butcher	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.	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 Lancscape 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 lancscape grounds. The Lancscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. 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. 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
652	Emma	Butcher	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	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
						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 lancape 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.	
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	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.	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. 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 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. 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 lancape 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	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 lancape 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<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>	
653	Luke	Butcher	GB7	Pitches at the site would have a health and safety risk for children playing close to the Hoe Stream. It will also result in more debris in the water and could result in uncontrolled flooding.	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.	Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream. This representation regarding flooding 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
653	Luke	Butcher	GB8	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to 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
653	Luke	Butcher	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 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	
653	Luke	Butcher	GB10	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to 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
653	Luke	Butcher	GB11	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to 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. 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
653	Luke	Butcher	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>	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.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	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.	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 Lancap 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	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 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 lancape setting of the area.</p>	
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	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.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	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.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	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.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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>	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.	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 lancape	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
						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.	
653	Luke	Butcher	GB8	Significant developments are planned to take place in Guildford which will have a significant negative impact on traffic through Mayford.	None stated.	<p>The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0.</p> <p>The Council 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 relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
653	Luke	Butcher	GB9	Significant developments are planned to take place in Guildford which will have a significant negative impact on traffic through Mayford.	None stated.	<p>The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0.</p> <p>The Council 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 relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
653	Luke	Butcher	GB10	Significant developments are planned to take place in Guildford which will have a significant negative impact on traffic through Mayford.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0. The Council 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 relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
653	Luke	Butcher	GB11	Significant developments are planned to take place in Guildford which will have a significant negative impact on traffic through Mayford.	None stated.	<p>The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0.</p> <p>The Council 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 relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
653	Luke	Butcher	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Lancape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	GB9	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Lancape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
653	Luke	Butcher	GB10	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Lancape 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. 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
653	Luke	Butcher	GB11	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Lancape 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. 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
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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 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.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				limited bus services.		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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
653	Luke	Butcher	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
653	Luke	Butcher	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
653	Luke	Butcher	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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	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
				stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.			
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	The site should not be included 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
653	Luke	Butcher	GB7	Other sites identified in the Green Belt Boundary Review for Traveller accommodation have been omitted from the DPD.	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.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	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.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	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.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	The DPD uses the term from the GBR of 'intensification' of Ten Acre Farm which is incorrect. The TTA term of 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD proposal.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	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.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	GB8	Mayford Local Centre has little supporting infrastructure and without a vehicle, future residents will be isolated from services.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
653	Luke	Butcher	GB9	Mayford Local Centre has little supporting infrastructure and without a vehicle, future residents will be isolated from services.	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	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
						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.	
653	Luke	Butcher	GB10	Mayford Local Centre has little supporting infrastructure and without a vehicle, future residents will be isolated from services.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	GB11	Mayford Local Centre has little supporting infrastructure and without a vehicle, future residents will be isolated from services.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	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 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	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
						sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.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.	
653	Luke	Butcher	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.	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 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.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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
653	Luke	Butcher	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	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	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
				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.		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 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. 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.	
653	Luke	Butcher	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 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.	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 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. 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	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
						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.	
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	GB7	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.	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.	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 Lancscape 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 landscaped grounds. The Lancscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. 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. 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	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
653	Luke	Butcher	GB8	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	GB9	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	GB10	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot.	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
653	Luke	Butcher	GB11	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot.	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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.	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.	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. 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 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	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
						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 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 lancape 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.	
654	Mark	Butcher	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 lancape 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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB7	Pitches at the site would have a health and safety risk for children playing close to the Hoe Stream. It will also result in more debris in the water and could result in uncontrolled flooding.	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.	Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream. This representation regarding flooding 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
654	Mark	Butcher	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	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>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>	
654	Mark	Butcher	GB9	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to 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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB10	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to 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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB11	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to 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</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
						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.	
654	Mark	Butcher	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008. 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.	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.	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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.	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.	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 Lancape 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 lancape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB7	The site is adjacent to 22 houses, including	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.	Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
654	Mark	Butcher	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.	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.	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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	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.	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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. The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	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.	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 lancape 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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB8	Significant developments are planned to take place in Guildford which will have a significant negative impact on traffic through Mayford.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0. The Council 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 relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
654	Mark	Butcher	GB9	Significant developments are planned to take place in Guildford which will have a significant negative impact on traffic through Mayford.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0. The Council 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 relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
654	Mark	Butcher	GB10	Significant developments are planned to take place in Guildford which will have a significant negative impact on traffic through Mayford.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0. The Council 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 relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
654	Mark	Butcher	GB11	Significant developments are planned to take place in Guildford which will have a significant negative impact on traffic through Mayford.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0. The Council has also worked with the County Council and 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
						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 relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	
654	Mark	Butcher	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Lancape 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. 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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB9	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Lancape 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. 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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB10	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Lancape 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. 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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB11	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Lancape 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. 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
654	Mark	Butcher	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.	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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	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
				these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.			
654	Mark	Butcher	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.	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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 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.	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB9	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
654	Mark	Butcher	GB9	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				surrounding properties.			
654	Mark	Butcher	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
654	Mark	Butcher	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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.	The site should not be included 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	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 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.</p>	
654	Mark	Butcher	GB7	Other sites identified in the Green Belt Boundary Review for Traveller accommodation have been omitted from the DPD.	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.	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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.	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.	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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.	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.	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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.	The DPD uses the term from the GBR of 'intensification' of Ten Acre Farm which is incorrect. The TTA term of 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD proposal.	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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.	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.	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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</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
						village and Green Belt.	
654	Mark	Butcher	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
654	Mark	Butcher	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. 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
654	Mark	Butcher	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB8	Mayford Local Centre has little supporting infrastructure and without a vehicle, future residents will be isolated from services.	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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB9	Mayford Local Centre has little supporting infrastructure and without a vehicle, future residents will be isolated from services.	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. 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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB10	Mayford Local Centre has little supporting infrastructure and without a vehicle, future residents will be isolated from services.	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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB11	Mayford Local Centre has little supporting infrastructure and without a vehicle, future residents will be isolated from services.	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	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>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>	
654	Mark	Butcher	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. 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. 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
654	Mark	Butcher	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. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be</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
						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 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.	
654	Mark	Butcher	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.	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 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
654	Mark	Butcher	GB11	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a	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
				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.		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 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. 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.	of this representation
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB7	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.	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.	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 Lancap 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 Lancap grounds. The Lancap Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. The impact on local character has been 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 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. 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. 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.	
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB8	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot.	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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB9	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot.	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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB10	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot.	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
654	Mark	Butcher	GB11	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot.	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	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
						walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
294	Justine	Butler	GB15	Oppose GB15 and the proposed use of the GB here. The main concern is the increase of traffic on Parvis Road	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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0The 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
294	Justine	Butler	GB15	The site is adjacent to the Wey Navigation which is of historic importance. The waterway is important wildlife corridor The waterway and Dodd's Lane track are important for access to natural green space- area is frequented by cyclists, dog walkers and runners.	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 that could not be addressed. Nevertheless this GB15 will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. This is already set out in the proposal The proposed allocation of GB15 (Land surrounding West Hall) does not alter the existing Dodd's Lane track. As noted under the key requirements for the site, development design should additionally have regard to the existing footpath network. The pedestrian access from Dodd's Lane to the Wey Navigation should therefore be unaffected by the proposal and will continue to serve as a public right of way.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
294	Justine	Butler	GB15	Object	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
294	Justine	Butler	GB15	Object	None stated.	Objection noted	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
294	Justine	Butler	GB15	Concern about the impact proposals will have on existing services and facilities .e.g. doctors	None stated.	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 24.0The 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. 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.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
1072	Mandy	Butler	GB5	Doctors are already stretched, appointments are offered 2 weeks ahead.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals 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. Hospitals traditionally has responded to the needs of the population.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1072	Mandy	Butler	GB15	Doctors are already stretched, appointments are offered 2 weeks ahead.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough.	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
						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.	of this representation
1072	Mandy	Butler	GB16	Doctors are already stretched, appointments are offered 2 weeks ahead.	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
1072	Mandy	Butler	GB23	Doctors are already stretched, appointments are offered 2 weeks ahead.	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
1072	Mandy	Butler	GB4	Doctors are already stretched, appointments are offered 2 weeks ahead.	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
1072	Mandy	Butler	GB15	Green Belt must be preserved. The main road into Byfleet gridlocked and could not cope with more traffic.	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 infrastructure and traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3 and 20.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1072	Mandy	Butler	GB23	Green Belt must be preserved. The main road into Byfleet gridlocked and could not cope with more traffic.	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 infrastructure and traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. see Section 3 and 20.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1072	Mandy	Butler	GB16	Green Belt must be preserved. The main road into Byfleet gridlocked and could not cope with more traffic.	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 infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1072	Mandy	Butler	GB5	Green Belt must be preserved. The main road into Byfleet gridlocked and could not cope with more traffic.	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 traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1072	Mandy	Butler	GB4	Green Belt must be preserved. The main road into Byfleet gridlocked and could not cope with more traffic.	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 traffic implications of	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 proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.	
1072	Mandy	Butler	GB23	I object to Green Belt Release in the Byfleet and West Byfleet areas. There are insufficient schools, both primary schools in Byfleet have large waiting lists.	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 infrastructure and traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. see Section 3 and 20.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1072	Mandy	Butler	GB15	I object to Green Belt Release in the Byfleet and West Byfleet areas. There are insufficient schools, both primary schools in Byfleet have large waiting lists.	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 infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1072	Mandy	Butler	GB16	I object to Green Belt Release in the Byfleet and West Byfleet areas. There are insufficient schools, both primary schools in Byfleet have large waiting lists.	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 infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1072	Mandy	Butler	GB4	I object to Green Belt Release in the Byfleet and West Byfleet areas. There are insufficient schools, both primary schools in Byfleet have large waiting lists.	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 infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. see Section 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1072	Mandy	Butler	GB5	I object to Green Belt Release in the Byfleet and West Byfleet areas. There are insufficient schools, both primary schools in Byfleet have large waiting lists.	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 infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1397	Cliff	Butler	GB12	Pyrford is a village, not a New Town, as it would become with the extensive new build joining up Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford.	None stated.	The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. 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. To clarify further, even in the West Byfleet and Byfleet areas, the majority of Green Belt land would remain, with well over half remaining in West Byfleet ward and over 80% remaining in Byfleet ward. Further to this, please see Sections 21.0 and 23.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1397	Cliff	Butler	GB13	Pyrford is a village, not a New Town, as it would become with the extensive new build joining up Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford.	None stated.	The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. 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. To clarify further, even in the West Byfleet and Byfleet areas, the majority of Green Belt land would remain, with well over half remaining in West Byfleet ward and over 80% remaining in Byfleet ward. Further to this, please see Sections 21.0 and 23.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1397	Cliff	Butler	GB12	Urges the Council to reconsider the proposal. It cannot be a workable solution to new homes in the area.	None stated.	The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1397	Cliff	Butler	GB13	Urges the Council to reconsider the proposal. It	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				cannot be a workable solution to new homes in the area.		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. The Council's approach to ensuring that new homes can be supported by infrastructure is covered in Section 3.0 of this paper.	is proposed as a result of this representation
1397	Cliff	Butler	GB12	Infrastructure would change considerably. Traffic would increase, and there is no room to make wider roads without serious destruction of trees and hedgeways. There would be further issues when reaching Old Woking Road or on Newark Lane towards Ripley. There are also insufficient amenities in terms of health and school provision. Another health centre and school would be needed.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, 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
1397	Cliff	Butler	GB13	Infrastructure would change considerably. Traffic would increase, and there is no room to make wider roads without serious destruction of trees and hedgeways. There would be further issues when reaching Old Woking Road or on Newark Lane towards Ripley. There are also insufficient amenities in terms of health and school provision. Another health centre and school would be needed.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, 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
1397	Cliff	Butler	GB12	Moved to Pyrford due to its village status and the fact it was close to Green Belt that allegedly could never be changed. The proposal goes completely against that assumption. Cannot believe anyone could think it is a viable proposal.	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
1397	Cliff	Butler	GB13	Moved to Pyrford due to its village status and the fact it was close to Green Belt that allegedly could never be changed. The proposal goes completely against that assumption. Cannot believe anyone could think it is a viable proposal.	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
531	Lynn and Nigel	Butt	GB12	Acknowledges that a lot has been said and written about the proposed housing developments in Pyrford. While appreciating the pressure for more housing, raises the critical issue of ensuring adequate local infrastructure for existing and additional populations. This includes roads, schools, medical facilities, car parking and other facilities, already under extreme pressure. The Council will already be aware of these issues but have not given any convincing explanations of major steps that will be taken to deal with the increased use of current infrastructure.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. On medical facilities, 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
531	Lynn and Nigel	Butt	GB13	Acknowledges that a lot has been said and written about the proposed housing developments in Pyrford. While appreciating the pressure for more housing, raises the critical issue of ensuring adequate local infrastructure for existing and additional populations. This includes roads, schools, medical facilities, car parking and other facilities, already under extreme pressure. The Council will already be aware of these issues but have not given any convincing explanations of major steps that will be taken to deal with the	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. On medical facilities, 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				increased use of current infrastructure.			
531	Lynn and Nigel	Butt	GB12	Even if an exceptional case can be made for releasing Green Belt, unless infrastructure concerns are met satisfactorily the proposals do not make rational sense and so will be opposed by people living and working in the area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See 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
531	Lynn and Nigel	Butt	GB13	Even if an exceptional case can be made for releasing Green Belt, unless infrastructure concerns are met satisfactorily the proposals do not make rational sense and so will be opposed by people living and working in the area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See 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
531	Lynn and Nigel	Butt	GB12	A convincing case has not been made to justify release of Green Belt land. Without this case we shall continue to oppose such random and opportunistic development. While there is pressure from county and central government to find more housing, this is not in itself a reason for reducing the Green Belt as proposed.	None stated.	The principle of Green Belt development and the need to safeguard land in the Green Belt for future development needs has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0. Attention is drawn in particular to paragraphs 1.3 to 1.5 and 1.9.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
531	Lynn and Nigel	Butt	GB13	A convincing case has not been made to justify release of Green Belt land. Without this case we shall continue to oppose such random and opportunistic development. While there is pressure from county and central government to find more housing, this is not in itself a reason for reducing the Green Belt as proposed.	None stated.	The principle of Green Belt development and the need to safeguard land in the Green Belt for future development needs has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0. Attention is drawn in particular to paragraphs 1.3 to 1.5 and 1.9.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1374	E.C.	Butterworth	GB12	The GB was established for good reason including to protect the countryside and local heritage. Consider redeveloping greenfield sites in the first instance	Consider brownfield sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 2.0, 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1374	E.C.	Butterworth	GB13	The GB was established for good reason including to protect the countryside and local heritage. Consider redeveloping greenfield sites in the first instance	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 2.0, 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1374	E.C.	Butterworth	GB12	The proposal will threaten historic views from the Escarpment to the North Downs	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0The 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. 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 lancape of the immediate	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
						area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features. There is also the requirement that proposals should have regard to the nearby Escarpment lancape and heritage assets. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0, Section 21.0 and Section 23.0.	
1374	E.C.	Butterworth	GB13	The proposal will threaten historic views from the Escarpment to the North Downs	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 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.</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 lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features. There is also the requirement that proposals should have regard to the nearby Escarpment lancape and heritage assets.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0, Section 21.0 and Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1374	E.C.	Butterworth	GB12	The GBBR does not recommend one of the sites as being suitable for residential development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1374	E.C.	Butterworth	GB13	The GBBR does not recommend one of the sites as being suitable for residential development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1374	E.C.	Butterworth	GB12	The roads in the area are severely congested, local speed limits are ignored making roads dangerous. Other roads have become rat runs for cars from Ripley. The proposals will only exacerbate 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; 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 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. 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	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 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.	
1374	E.C.	Butterworth	GB13	The roads in the area are severely congested, local speed limits are ignored making roads dangerous. Other roads have become rat runs for cars from Ripley. The proposals will only exacerbate 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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0. The various transport 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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1374	E.C.	Butterworth	GB12	Local infrastructure including roads, education, healthcare and social facilities will not cope. The proposed development is disproportional and Pyrford cannot accommodate this.	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	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>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 sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</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>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0</p>	
1374	E.C.	Butterworth	GB13	Local infrastructure including roads, education, healthcare and social facilities will not cope. The proposed development is disproportional and Pyrford cannot accommodate this.	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 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 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. The representation regarding infrastructure 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
1374	E.C.	Butterworth	GB12	Local utilities is also unlikely to cope with the proposed growth	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 in particular paragraph 3.9-3.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1374	E.C.	Butterworth	GB13	Local utilities is also unlikely to cope with the proposed growth	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 in particular paragraph 3.9-3.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1374	E.C.	Butterworth	GB12	Object to proposals for Pyrford	None stated.	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 in particular paragraph 1.9</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1374	E.C.	Butterworth	GB13	Object to proposals for Pyrford	None stated.	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 in particular paragraph 1.9</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1374	E.C.	Butterworth	GB12	Appreciate the national housing need however does not consider this a suitable site	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 in particular paragraph 1.9	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1374	E.C.	Butterworth	GB13	Appreciate the national housing need however does not consider this a suitable site	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 in particular paragraph 1.9	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1074	Christine	Bye	GB4	A disproportionate amount of local Green Belt would be removed compared to the rest of Woking.	None stated.	Because of the existing constraints in the area, the Council has to allocate sites in sustainable locations. The sites that are being proposed are the most sustainable when compared with other reasonable alternates considered. The Council accepts that this does not enable an equal distribution of development across 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
						borough.	
1074	Christine	Bye	GB5	A disproportionate amount of local Green Belt would be removed compared to the rest of Woking.	None stated.	Because of the existing constraints in the area, the Council has to allocate sites in sustainable locations. The sites that are being proposed are the most sustainable when compared with other reasonable alternates considered. The Council accepts that this does not enable an equal distribution of development across the borough.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1074	Christine	Bye	GB15	A disproportionate amount of local Green Belt would be removed compared to the rest of Woking.	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. Because of the existing constraint in Woking, the Council has to identify sites in sustainable locations. Based on the available evidence, the proposals in the DPD are the most sustainable when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1074	Christine	Bye	GB16	A disproportionate amount of local Green Belt would be removed compared to the rest of Woking.	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. Because of the existing constraint in Woking, the Council has to identify sites in sustainable locations. The proposals are considered the most sustainable when measured against all other reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1074	Christine	Bye	GB12	A disproportionate amount of local Green Belt would be removed compared to the rest of Woking.	None stated.	The proposals are the most sustainable when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. This is set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Report.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1074	Christine	Bye	GB13	A disproportionate amount of local Green Belt would be removed compared to the rest of Woking.	None stated.	The proposed site are the most sustainable when compared against all other reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1074	Christine	Bye	GB4	Object to plans to build over 1400 houses plus a private school. The infrastructure needed is not there. Parvis Road is already gridlocked from 3pm, access to Byfleet a nightmare. Problems on the A3 or M25 cause knock on effect on the local roads.	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. 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
1074	Christine	Bye	GB5	Object to plans to build over 1400 houses plus a private school. The infrastructure needed is not there. Parvis Road is already gridlocked from 3pm, access to Byfleet a nightmare. Problems on the A3 or M25 cause knock on effect on the local roads.	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. 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
1074	Christine	Bye	GB15	Object to plans to build over 1400 houses plus a	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet	No further modification

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				private school. The infrastructure needed is not there. Parvis Road is already gridlocked from 3pm, access to Byfleet a nightmare. Problems on the A3 or M25 cause knock on effect on the local roads.		development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2. The Council is satisfied that the site can be development without significantly undermining the overall character of the area. The traffic and infrastructure implications 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.	is proposed as a result of this representation
1074	Christine	Bye	GB12	Object to plans to build over 1400 houses plus a private school. The infrastructure needed is not there. Parvis Road is already gridlocked from 3pm, access to Byfleet a nightmare. Problems on the A3 or M25 cause knock on effect on the local roads.	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. All the sites have been subjected to the same level of detailed assessed. See the Sa Report and the Green Belt boundary report.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1074	Christine	Bye	GB13	Object to plans to build over 1400 houses plus a private school. The infrastructure needed is not there. Parvis Road is already gridlocked from 3pm, access to Byfleet a nightmare. Problems on the A3 or M25 cause knock on effect on the local roads.	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	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 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.	
1074	Christine	Bye	GB16	Object to plans to build over 1400 houses plus a private school. The infrastructure needed is not there. Parvis Road is already gridlocked from 3pm, access to Byfleet a nightmare. Problems on the A3 or M25 cause knock on effect on the local roads.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1074	Christine	Bye	GB13	Risk of flooding in Byfleet would be increased.	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
1074	Christine	Bye	GB4	Risk of flooding in Byfleet would be increased.	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
1074	Christine	Bye	GB5	Risk of flooding in Byfleet would be increased.	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
1074	Christine	Bye	GB12	Risk of flooding in Byfleet would be increased.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1074	Christine	Bye	GB16	Risk of flooding in Byfleet would be increased.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed comprehensively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1074	Christine	Bye	GB15	Risk of flooding in Byfleet would be increased.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
202	Susan	Byrne	GB12	Change the village feel of Pyrford.	None stated.	Based on the evidence as elaborated in detail in Sections 7, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, it is not envisaged that the proposals will significantly undermine the affect the character of Pyrford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
202	Susan	Byrne	GB13	Change the village feel of Pyrford.	None stated.	Based on the evidence as elaborated in detail in Sections 7, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, it is not envisaged that the proposals will significantly undermine the affect the character of Pyrford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
202	Susan	Byrne	GB12	I object to the proposed 223 dwellings. I enjoy proximity to the countryside and Pyrford's village feel. Building would be detrimental due to increased traffic, particularly around the primary school and associated danger.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, it is not envisaged that the overall character of Pyrford will be significantly undermined by the proposals. this matter is specifically addressed in detail in Sections 7, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic implications of the proposals 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
						<p>Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. 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. In addition, 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 Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.</p>	
202	Susan	Byrne	GB13	I object to the proposed 223 dwellings. I enjoy proximity to the countryside and Pyrford's village feel. Building would be detrimental due to increased traffic, particularly around the primary school and associated danger.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, it is not envisaged that the overall character of Pyrford will be significantly undermined by the proposals. this matter is specifically addressed in detail in Sections 7, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. 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</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
						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. In addition, 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 Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.	
202	Susan	Byrne	GB12	Increased burden on local services such as doctor's. The sites are unsuitable, ask the Council to reject the proposal to build.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals 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. The collective evidence set out in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
202	Susan	Byrne	GB13	Increased burden on local services such as doctor's. The sites are unsuitable, ask the Council to reject the proposal to build.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals 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. The collective evidence set out in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1247	Alan	Byrne	General	Historic England provided advice on the site assessment methodology on how to reflect the requirements of the historic environment in the preparation of the document. Historic England are satisfied that this has been taken into account.They are satisfied that the combination of Core Strategy policy and Site Allocation DPD will ensure that development takes place in a sustainable way and reflects objectives in the NPPF to conserve heritage assets.Historic England emphasise the importance to seek their advice at an early stage of planning application for schemes that may cause harm to significant assets.	None stated.	The Council welcomes continued constructive cooperation between Historic England and itself. The Council agrees that the combination of the Core Strategy, emerging policies from the Development Management Policies DPD and Site Allocation policies will ensure that development takes place in a sustainable form that includes the objective to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. The Council will continue to engage with Historic England throughout the preparation of the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation